HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, February 10, 1966.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

Decimal Currency Act Amendment,
Education Act Amendment (Service),
Juvenile Courts,
Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment (Decimal Currency No. 2).

QUESTIONS

HILLS WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yesterday the Minister of Works replied to a question regarding a water supply for certain high-lift areas adjacent to Crafers, where water is required not only because of the serious fire hazard but also for domestic use. The Minister said yesterday that the previous Government had not provided this water, but he omitted to say that it was impossible to provide it until the trunk mains had been established back to the Murray River through the Onkaparinga Valley. As the previous Government spent about £12,000,000 to bring water into the area, could the Government spend what is after all only a small sum to reticulate it to the residents?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I did not know that I said, in so many words, that the previous Government had refused: from memory, I said that requests had been made to my predecessor. I did say that the Leader and the members for Onkaparinga and Mitcham had made requests, which we were investigating. This work, however, must be considered together with the economic position of the State. I assure members, as I assured them yesterday, that the Government and the department are sympathetic toward these claims, but they cannot be acceded to overnight. These requests are still being considered, as the Government is anxious to complete the schemes as soon as practicable.

MAIN NORTH-EAST ROAD.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of January 25 about the widening of the Main North-East Road at Holden Hill?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the Adelaide-Mannum main road No. 33 between Holden Hill and Grand Junction Road is at present being reconstructed and widened to provide for two carriageways of 32ft. each, with a 16ft. raised median. Several land acquisitions are still outstanding and, from past experience, it is not possible to predict a date for the final completion. However, considerable improvements affecting the motoring public will be completed in two months' time.

TEENAGE DRIVERS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Further to my recent question about teenage drivers, I quote from an article in an interstate magazine publicizing road safety. which states:

> Moves to introduce driver training courses for senior high school students in Victoria have received support from education, road safety and motoring authorities. The manager of the Victorian division of the National Safety Council (Mr. R. W. Carmichael) said his organization fully supported intensive driving training beginning in schools, and proposals to draw up a curriculum of driving instruction were under consideration.
>
> Mr. Carmichael said he could not give a date when the plan would be available for submission to the Victorian Education Department, but he was anxious for it to be completed as soon as possible. If the plan were acceptable it would include in the curriculum provisions for practical training, visual aids on road hazards and safety measures, instruction in road law (in conjunction with the police), discussion groups and an enclosed training area.
>
> Students from 16 years of age would receive practical training in the enclosed area. They would not be allowed on the road until they had turned 17 and had driven with a licensed instructor and "L" plates. The Assistant Director of Education (Mr. W. D. Russell) said there was no formal departmental policy on driving instructions for students, but he felt all headmasters would welcome any moves to improve the road habits of young drivers. "If the department can get a workable proposal from bodies expert in driving matters, we will be glad to get together to consider introducing it in connection with school activities," Mr. Russell added. He suggested the instruction could best be given as an extracurricular activity.

The Premier said that Cabinet was considering this matter. Will he refer this proposal to the Minister of Education so it may be examined in the interests of road safety and as a means of saving juvenile lives in this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall ask my colleague to consider this matter, and to submit a report as soon as possible.

WINDOW CLEANING.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked some time ago

concerning the cleaning of windows in large city buildings?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the honourable member's previous question, I took up with my colleague the Minister of Labour and Industry the question of whether the situation was covered by any legislation. I am informed that this matter was raised with the previous Minister of Labour and Industry by a deputation from the United Trades and Labor Council in October, 1963. It was considered at that time (and the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council was so notified) that regulation 257 of the Second Schedule of the Building Act already provided adequate safeguards for window cleaners on multi-storey buildings. This regulation reads as follows:

> Every window in every building above the first storey shall be equipped with a suitable device which will permit the cleaning of the exterior of the window without undue danger to the person cleaning the window. The device shall be of such pattern and construction as will reasonably and safely answer the purpose for which it is intended; provided, however, that if any window is of such construction that it may be easily cleaned from the inside, it need not be so equipped.

It is the responsibility of the local government authority concerned to ensure that the provisions of the Building Act and the regulations thereunder are complied with. My colleague finds it difficult to understand why the *Advertiser* building was erected without regulation 257 being complied with. This, however, is a matter for the Adelaide City Council, and not for the Minister's department. The Minister adds that the Building Act applies only to buildings erected after July 1, 1924.

CRUSHING PLANTS.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question in regard to metal crushing plants to be used in connection with the sealing of the Broken Hill road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that a plant erected for crushing stone for the sealing of the Broken Hill road commenced operations on January 24. It is located in section 95, hundred of Paratoo, about 3½ miles west of Paratoo.

NURIOOTPA ROAD.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my previous question relating to the proposed re-opening of the road from Tolley's Corner to the Greenock road, with a view to obviating the traffic hazard that exists on the main road from Nuriootpa to Greenock?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that some time ago a report was prepared by the Planning Section of the Highways Department which recommended a new road to by-pass Greenock and Nuriootpa. Having regard to a letter from the District Council of Angaston, in which reference was made to the problem outlined by the honourable member, and to other considerations, it was decided to re-examine the whole proposal to include the condition of traffic from Tanunda and Angaston. Further information regarding the traffic movement in the Nuriootpa, Greenock, Tanunda and Angaston area is currently being obtained, and the points mentioned in the honourable member's question will be taken into account in the re-appraisal of the proposal.

JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. RYAN: I recently told the Minister of Marine about the great difficulty in opening and closing Jervois bridge, and about the terrific traffic congestion that is created because the mechanism will not allow the bridge to close once it has been opened. Last evening the bridge was opened to allow a vessel to pass through and once again, as usual, the mechanism broke down; traffic could not get through and had to be diverted over Birkenhead bridge. With the building of the new bridge, the reaches south of Jervois bridge will naturally be closed to commercial shipping, and this is expected to take place early in the 1966-67 financial year. In view of the exceptionally poor state of repair of the bridge, will the Minister of Marine ask the Harbors Board to take immediate steps to see that Jervois bridge is not opened again as a sea lane and that it remains closed until it is replaced by the new bridge?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The bridge is in a bad state of repair but its jamming is not a new experience for the Harbors Board. For many years the board has had difficulties with the bridge because it is constructed of metal and, as long ago as the mid-1950's, the assistance of the fire brigade had to be enlisted in warm weather to cool down the metal so that the bridge could be closed. The Harbors Board operates the bridge on behalf of the Highways Department. This morning I had a lengthy discussion with the General Manager of the Harbors Board about the problem raised by the honourable member. He tells me that the number of occasions on which the bridge is opened are very few and that it is opened only on notice being given.

I have discussed the matter with the Minister of Roads and he has promised to supply me with a report on the request of the honourable member and also on the commencement date of work on the new bridge.

BUSH FIRES.

Mr. QUIRKE: Over the last day or two there has been a disastrous fire in the foothills, which threatened both the Cleland Reserve and the annexe to the Botanic Garden in the Mount Lofty area. Both areas provide remarkable evidence of the work by devoted people on areas of country and it would be dreadful indeed if plant life in these areas was to be obliterated by fire. Has the Minister of Lands, as Minister in charge of national parks, wild life reserves and the Botanic Garden, information as to damage that may have occurred during the recent bush fire? More important (and bearing in mind that they can be menaced by fire now when they are so near completion), can the Minister say whether further steps can be taken to safeguard these areas from the dangers of recurring bush fires?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: With regard to possible damage to the reserves, I can say only that Mr. Lothian, who was in this area at 6 a.m. yesterday, has not yet submitted a report.

Mr. Quirke: There has been some damage.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, but it was not close to these areas; I think it was on the southern side. Regarding preventive measures, I believe a question was asked in another place about whether burning off prior to the closed season could be carried out, but, as yet, no consideration has been given to this suggestion by me or by the commissioners. Immediately I have some information, however, I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member.

AIRPORT DRAINAGE.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Last week I referred to the Minister of Works the complaints of residents of Plympton North about mosquitoes breeding in pools of water in a drain running through the Adelaide Airport. These residents said they believed that it was the responsibility of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to eradicate these mosquitoes. Has the Minister a reply to my question?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This matter has been the subject of a recent approach to the department by the West Torrens corporation, but the Director and Engineer-in-Chief states that, to effectively combat mosquito breeding, it is essential that spraying should be carried out before summer and not later than the end of November. However, as a result of recent complaints, it was considered advisable that the diversion drain be sprayed, and I am pleased to inform the honourable member that this has now been done.

FOOT-ROT.

Mr. RODDA: Last year, when I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question about foot-rot, especially in the Kalangadoo district, I was told that some of the Minister's officers would look into the matter. Will the Minister say whether anything has come of these arrangements?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: In reply to a question last year, I said that my officers would go down and talk to members of the Australian Primary Producers Union, which I think was the body mainly concerned, and that the resident officer and Mr. Smith (Chief Inspector of Stock) would address a meeting if so requested. As yet, there has been no invitation, but I again make this offer. In view of the question the honourable member asked a week or two ago, when he suggested that perhaps not everything had been done that should have been done, I point out that the department is doing everything in its power and that some of the things suggested may not be in accordance with fact. My officers are willing to go to the district and discuss this matter thoroughly with the people concerned, and I believe this would be a wise move in the interests of good public relations.

NEWSPAPER PRICES.

Mr. CLARK: My question is addressed to the member for Glenelg. In yesterday's *Advertiser*, in an editorial note appended to the report of the question on newspaper prices asked by the honourable member on Tuesday, he was accused of not having his facts correct. Can the honourable member substantiate the information he gave to the House on Tuesday or, if he cannot, will he apologize to the press?

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member wish to reply?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am glad that someone has asked this question, because I want to substantiate my remarks. In calculating the additional revenue that would be obtained by the *Advertiser* (and a similar calculation can be made in relation to the

News) I took the circulation figure of 202,000 that is printed on the front page of that paper. An extra 1d. a day on 202,000 newspapers—

Mr. Heaslip: It is not a penny a day.

Mr. HUDSON: The price is being increased from 5d. to 5c, which is equivalent to 6d. If the member for Rocky River looks at any decimal conversion table he will find that what he has said is just gobbledegook. There is an exact equivalent for 5c, and it is 6d. The equivalent increase is 1d. exactly or 5/6ths of a cent: members may take their pick. Dealing in terms of our present currency, on 202,000 newspapers a day the extra revenue a day is £841 13s. 4d. As there are 52 weeks in a year (and allowing for no newspaper on Good Friday or on Christmas Day), there is a newspaper on 310 days of the year and, therefore, the revenue of the *Advertiser* would increase by almost £261,000. The figure given on the front page for the circulation says "In excess of 202,000". This increase of 1d. in the price of the *Advertiser* and of the *News*, as I said previously, follows on the increase announced in August, 1964, when a similar increase in revenue would have been obtained.

The editorial note that appeared in the newspaper on Wednesday stated that my figure of £260,000 per annum increase in net revenue was incorrect because I had not taken account of costs. Now, costs are not revenue; any fool knows that. Revenue has to cover costs, and, to the extent that it gives a surplus, this represents an additional profit. The *Advertiser* and the *News* have not informed the public by what their costs have increased and how much of this extra revenue represents additional profit. My view (and I am sure all members will agree with me) is that the newspapers have a responsibility to the public and to their readers to inform them of the additional costs that they have incurred since August, 1964. At present the *Advertiser*, in particular, in its editorials has commented adversely on Government proposals to raise revenue and has, in fact, encouraged another place to throw out Government revenue legislation. If the newspaper proprietors are not prepared to give this information to the public, then they are applying a double standard: one standard for the State Government and another standard for their own behaviour. Unless they give this information to the public (and I apply this both to the *Advertiser* and to the *News*)—

Mr. Lawn: An open challenge!

Mr. HUDSON: — the *Advertiser* in particular may be accused of needing the extra revenue to cover the dividend required on the one for five issue of capital that is shortly to be made; and the *News* may be charged, unless it gives this information, with requiring the extra revenue to finance the activities of certain newspapers produced elsewhere in Australia.

Mr. Heaslip: Land tax and water rates are up.

Mr. HUDSON: Well, why not give this information.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think members will agree that I have been more than indulgent. The honourable member for Glenelg is entitled to reply to the question.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, my figures in respect of revenue are completely accurate, and it is up to the *Advertiser* and the *News* to substantiate and justify the increases in prices that have been announced, otherwise they stand charged, in my view, with profiteering on the changeover to decimal currency.

TELEVISION NEWS SERVICE.

Mr. HEASLIP: On January 26 I addressed a question to the Premier regarding the change of time of the news service on television channels 1 and 2 from 7 p.m. to 6.30 p.m. Originally this question was taken up by the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) six or seven months ago. The people of Rocky River, the people of the Victoria District, and, in fact, all rural people object to this change of time, and now I am told that the city people also object to it. Has the Premier yet received a report from the Australian Broadcasting Commission on this subject? Following the trial period for this news service, has the A.B.C. decided to keep the news service at 6.30 p.m. or revert to 7 p.m.?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I thank the honourable member for his long preamble. On January 27 I wrote to the Postmaster-General, and he replied to me on February 7 from Brisbane in the following terms:

> I acknowledge receipt of your letter on 27th ultimo regarding the time at which the A.B.C. televises its news service in South Australia. I have discussed this matter further with the Chairman of the Australian Broadcasting Commission, who regrets that it has not been possible as yet to reach finality in this matter, but he hopes shortly to be in a position to advise you of the commission's decision.

RENMARK HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. CURREN: Some time ago I discussed with the Minister of Education the housing of implements at the Renmark High School. Can the Minister of Works say whether approval

has been given for the erection of a shed for this purpose at the school?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member was good enough to indicate that he might ask this question today. Only this week I approved of the expenditure of about £2,400 for the construction of an implement shed at the Renmark High School.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works any information regarding the proposal to reticulate water to Watervale from the Warren reservoir?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am informed by the Director and Engineer-in-Chief that the investigation into a scheme to supply Watervale from the Warren trunk main has commenced but is not yet completed, and that a report will be made as soon as the investigation is completed.

POLICE FORCE.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier seen the reply, given by the Chief Secretary to a question about the strength of the Police Force, which stated that the Police Commissioner had recommended an increase in the number of members of the force? In view of this, will the Premier say when he will be able to reply to my recent question about the future intake of police cadets to be trained in this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have not read the Chief Secretary's reply, but if it is necessary to obtain information I shall do so, and inform the honourable member when I have it.

PRICES.

Mr. LAWN: From time to time when the price of pies and pasties is increased the explanation given by the Prices Commissioner is that the price of meat or potatoes, or of both, has risen. Recently, the price of meat and potatoes was reduced, but not the price of pies and pasties. Will the Premier, as the Minister in charge of the Prices Department, obtain a report from the Prices Commissioner?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, I will obtain a report soon.

GRAND JUNCTION ROAD.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads to my question of January 27 about the extension of the widening of Grand Junction Road towards Strathmont?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads states that the widening and reconstruction of Grand Junction Road will proceed to its intersection with the North-East Road. Progress of the work will be governed by the necessity to construct two new bridges over the Dry Creek, and for this reason all works will not be completed until the end of next year.

LOXTON HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Some time ago when inspecting the Loxton High School, the Minister of Education saw considerable damage and undertook to have something done. As I assume that this matter has been referred to the Public Buildings Department, can the Minister of Works say whether work has been commenced to repair the terrific damage at this school?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I cannot say from memory whether I have seen a docket about this matter, but that does not necessarily mean that work has not commenced. As members realize, 16,000 dockets a year pass over my table and it is not possible for me to remember every one. I will investigate the matter and inform the honourable member next week.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, 1955-1964. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to provide that South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited shall have the exclusive right to handle oats in bulk within proclaimed areas. Honourable members will recall that the principal Act was amended in 1964 to grant similar rights with respect to barley, but those provisions are State-wide in operation. The Government has received representations from oatgrowers in some areas of the State requesting that the company have the sole right to handle bulk oats in the State, and for various reasons the Government considers it desirable at this stage to provide for such rights only in areas to be proclaimed

from time to time. Clause 4 (*a*) accordingly inserts new subsection (1*a*) in section 12 of the principal Act relating to oats. The remaining subsections make only necessary consequential amendments to other parts of section 12. Clause 3 makes a consequential amendment which was overlooked in 1964. The Bill is self-explanatory, and I commend it to honourable members.

South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited approached me earlier about having complete control of bulk handling of oats as well as of wheat and grain, as it does today. Oatgrowers in the South-East, by way of deputation, made representations to me and, following that, I have received petitions from them and from growers on the West Coast asking for these provisions. They had also considered the bulk handling of oats throughout the State. However, I had had representations from a group of merchants who did not at first favour this system, but, after discussions with them, I discovered that their main objection was to the co-operative's having full control in northern areas. The merchants were not concerned particularly with the South-East and the West Coast. Because of the discussions, I have introduced this Bill in its present form, and initially I intend to proclaim only the areas of the South-East and West Coast. As time passes the Government of the day will have an opportunity to examine the matter further, so that it can determine what action, if any, should be taken. I thought that this was the fairest way to meet the requests of the various sections concerned, and that is why the Bill has been introduced in its present form. I commend the Bill to members and trust that it will receive the consideration it merits.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Irrigation) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

The Report.

The Select Committee to which the House of Assembly referred the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act Amendment Bill on January 27, 1966, has the honour to report:

1. In the course of its inquiry, the committee met on three occasions and took evidence from the following witnesses: Dr. W. A. Wynes, Parliamentary Draftsman; Mr. G. H. P. Jeffery, Auditor-General; Mr. T. M. Price, Chairman of the Renmark Irrigation Trust; Mr. R. H. Maddocks, Engineer-Manager of the Renmark Irrigation Trust; Mr. D. J. Tripney, Secretary of the Renmark Irrigation Trust; and Mr. A. M. Kinnear, Assistant Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage in the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

2. Advertisements inserted in the *Advertiser*, the *News*, and the *Murray Pioneer* inviting interested persons to give evidence, brought no response.

3. The committee is of opinion that the financial arrangements made by the Government and contained in the Bill are acceptable to the Renmark Irrigation Trust. However, witnesses informed the committee that the trust had not yet drawn up plans for the necessary works, and therefore was not in a position to express agreement or otherwise with the estimates of cost made by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Should the financial provisions of the Bill prove inadequate to complete the rehabilitation of the water distribution system, it may be necessary for the trust to make a further approach for financial assistance.

4. The committee is satisfied that there is no opposition to the Bill and recommends that it be passed in its present form.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Provision for further grant and loans to trust."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As a member of the committee, I endorse the committee's report which states, in effect, that the present arrangements made between the Government and the trust are acceptable to the trust. However, the report also recognizes the fact that the trust has not yet finalized plans for the rehabilitation of its water distribution system. This, of course, will be done, and the trust desires to proceed with the work as soon as possible. Indeed, it will have the necessary finance available to it in that regard through this legislation. Although it is the trust's obligation to furnish plans for the approval of the Minister in relation to Government expenditure, the trust has not yet estimated the costs involved. The trust considered it necessary to point out that any estimates so far made have been provided by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in regard to its views of a suitable plan. However, those plans do not belong to the trust, and a discrepancy between

the trust's plans and those of the department may well arise.

The committee was told that the trust had already increased its water rates by, I think, £2 an acre, and was proceeding with its part of the obligation. It is clear that the rating applying to settlers in the trust's area is higher than that applying to most other settlements along the river, with the possible exception of private settlements such as those at Golden Heights and Waikerie Extension. The rating is certainly higher than that applying at Mildura and other settlements around Renmark. I point out that, in the present economic circumstances of the various branches of the horticultural industry generally, further increased rating is not desirable, for the industry is at present experiencing difficulty in matching costs with its returns. The possible discrepancies in the costs of this scheme probably would not occur for several years, if at all. It is anybody's guess as to what would be the situation regarding both costs and returns if those discrepancies did appear. Officers of the trust said in evidence that a completely piped system would be the ideal water distribution scheme for Renmark. It is not yet known whether that is possible. They could possibly undertake particular piping of the system early in the scheme and leave a decision on the final outcome for some years. The view that pipes were more satisfactory than open channels was also supported by the witness from the Engineering and Water Supply Department. We can take it that the channels, although they may have an initial advantage because of a heavy reduction in costs in some cases, cost more in maintenance and other charges than pipes. Therefore, pipes are desirable if they can be used.

All members of the committee were struck with the evidence given about the urgency of getting on with the project. We were also impressed with the sound evidence given. The only point we found it necessary to report upon (other than reporting that the Bill should be passed) was that the actual plan made by the trust has not yet been produced. Therefore its estimates have not been made and it could not definitely comment on the accuracy of the department's estimates. Another fact was that, although the trust had already put up rates to meet its obligations, in the present situation further charges on the growers would be inappropriate. Whether anything should be done in the future remains to be seen as things develop. That is why the committee reported that it had some slight qualification about the financial arrangements. We all agreed it was a sound scheme and fully supported the provisions of the Bill. I support the clause.

Mr. CURREN: The Bill concerns an important section of my district and I express my pleasure that it is before the Committee. It will no doubt receive the sympathetic consideration of members and be passed without delay. The Renmark Irrigation Trust has had to face up to many problems in past years. The fact that the water distribution system deteriorated to such an extent is a case of the sins of the fathers being visited on the sons, because in the early days of the Renmark settlement there was a cheap water rate considerably below that charged in other irrigation settlements. A study of the water rates charged in other settlements compared with those charged in the trust area proves this point. A proposition was put to the trust by the previous Government. In his second reading speech the Leader of the Opposition compared the proposition he had offered and that put forward by the present Government. He said:

> I have not had much time to analyse the Bill and compare it with the provisions which I previously discussed with the trust, which I indicated would be made available to the trust, and which the trust accepted. I think the provisions of the Bill are probably not so generous as those provided by the agreement entered into with the Government before the last election.

I believe that statement was an attempt to play politics and is not borne out by the facts.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That is not playing politics.

Mr. CURREN: As I know quite a lot about what goes on in my district, I know this was an attempt to play politics. I know what went on before the last election.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I think you a little over-sensitive.

Mr. CURREN: The honourable member is also sensitive when anybody interjects while he is speaking. Much politics was played in the matter before the last election. During the election campaign I said that this was not a matter of politics and that, if returned, I would do my best to see that any future Government provided for the work to be done.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: And you are accusing us of playing politics!

Mr. CURREN: I am accusing only the Leader of the Opposition because he said that

this proposition was not as generous as the one he put forward before the election.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: He had not had a chance to examine the Bill when he said that.

Mr. CURREN: Then why make that statement if he did not have the facts?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: On the face of it this proposition was not as good, and that is still a matter of opinion, anyway.

Mr. CURREN: I have discussed both propositions with the people of Renmark and they are satisfied with the proposition put forward by the Government. It is well within the financial means of both the settlers and the trust, for the repayment will be over a 40-year period. At the moment the trust is paying off a drainage loan over 18 years. The proposition put forward by the previous Premier was for a 30-year period. However, the water ratepayers of Renmark will have no trouble paying for the Government proposition. The Chairman of the trust said that any further increases in water rates would be unpopular, and I agree. However, I do not agree with the member for Alexandra that growers will not be able to meet any further charges if the industry remains at its present low level. I have confidence in the industry and believe that, from the moves being made to obtain stability and bring about improved returns, the water ratepayers in Renmark will obtain a benefit not only from increased returns brought about by increased productivity from the new drainage and a much more efficient water system, but from an economic improvement in the industry. They will also benefit from a big capital gain on their properties. I have much pleasure in supporting the clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the remarks of the member for Alexandra, and wish to say something, particularly in reply to the points raised by the member for Chaffey. On the evidence given to the Select Committee, I think there is a good chance that the financial arrangements embodied in this Bill, and in this clause particularly, will not be sufficient for all the work that will have to be carried out and that the trust will have to come back to the Government for more money. The member for Chaffey reflected on the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition. As the member for Alexandra said by interjection, the Leader did not have the opportunity to study the Bill and make a detailed comparison between the two schemes. The Leader made that clear when he spoke.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It is not usual to make a speech on the second reading of a hybrid Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Minister suggesting that the Leader should not have spoken? Is he trying to take away the right of the Leader or any other member to speak at any stage?

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I did not say that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The implication behind the interjection was that the Leader was in some way to blame for having spoken at all. That is the dictatorial attitude that is all too common on the front benches now, and I have had enough of it.

Mr. CASEY: I object to the statement of the honourable member.

Mr. Heaslip: Sit down.

Mr. CASEY: I will not sit down. I object to the honourable member for Mitcham's criticizing as he has.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is this a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Frome is raising the point that the honourable member for Mitcham is not speaking strictly to the clause. I ask the honourable member to observe Standing Orders in that regard. He knows as well as I that some latitude is allowed, but I ask him to speak to clause 5.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was merely commenting on the interjection of the Minister, but I think all that need be said has already been said. The member for Chaffey reflected on the Leader of the Opposition. Evidence was given on this point by both Mr. George Jeffery (Auditor-General) and Mr. Thomas Price (Chairman of the Renmark Irrigation Trust). At page 11 of the evidence, Mr. Jeffery said:

> . . . the proposals I have put to the present Government are not basically very different from the original proposals, except that their application is different.

Having made that point, at page 12 he said (I think this is accepted by all members of the Committee):

> The new scheme is not strictly comparable from the cost viewpoint as the trust is meeting the £500,000 out of revenues and increased charges—

that is, the £2 an acre increase in the charges already mentioned—

> thus saving interest. It is largely for this reason that the new suggestions were made.

I think this is the gist of what he said, so I will not go into the details of his submission.

Let us look at what the Chairman of the Renmark Irrigation Trust said in evidence on this point. At page 20 he was asked by the member for Alexandra:

When you spoke about Sir Thomas Playford going to Renmark and a scheme under discussion in those days, as I see it, from the comparison by the Auditor-General, you were really going to borrow more instead of putting up the rates?

He replied:

When Sir Thomas Playford was up there, the money the trust had to find the Government said should be obtained from a lender, whereas now we have to find it ourselves. We have, by Act of Parliament, a bank limit of £75,000. If you borrow, you must pay it back, otherwise nobody is going to lend money to you, so we are now in the position, instead of being able to borrow and pay it off on a few channels, we have to turn around and find £500,000 in 13 years; that is what it amounts to. To do it and to keep faith and show that we are sincere, we have had to put our rates up to match that, instead of paying it over 40 years.

It was not an unfair inference to draw from that answer that Mr. Price would have preferred the other scheme, which would have allowed a repayment over 40 years instead of it being necessary to raise £500,000 out of revenue in 13 years.

Mr. Curren: It was not offered to him.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think it is fair for the honourable member for Chaffey, in view of the evidence he has heard from Mr. Jeffery and Mr. Price to say what he has said.

The Hon. D N. Brookman: He just bought himself an argument.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and he did not choose very good grounds on which to fight it either. Let me make two points in support of the main reason why I speak, that is, to point out to members that there will probably be another approach from the trust, quite justifiably, for further financial assistance. First, the Renmark Irrigation Trust has not yet decided on the nature of the work it desires to undertake, and therefore it cannot say (and Mr. Maddocks, the Engineer-Manager, said this in answer to several members of the committee) whether the estimates that have been made by the Engineering and Water Supply Department are sufficient to cover the work that eventually the trust will want to do. I know the Minister will say that it is up to him to approve of every piece of work done under this scheme. That is so: the Minister does have the final control. However, it is for the trust to decide what plans are put up.

One would have expected (indeed, I assumed it before the evidence was given to the committee) that the estimates of cost would have been worked out by the E. & W.S. Department after the works to be done had been agreed upon between the trust and that department. One would assume that there would be some common ground so that the estimates given could be either agreed with, or disagreed to, by the trust, but that, in fact, was not the case. The trust, according to the evidence given, has had very little discussion with the E. & W.S. Department and does not know the basis on which the department's estimates have been worked out. That evidence was contradicted subsequently by Mr. Kinnear, the officer from the E. & W.S. Department who gave evidence before the committee. Unfortunately, Mr. Kinnear was not the officer who had handled this matter. Mr. Ligertwood, the engineer and Mr. Kinnear's superior, was not available to give evidence, and Mr. Kinnear had no personal knowledge of what had been done, although he believed, as he told the committee, that there had been liaison between the two. However, this was not the evidence given by the Renmark Irrigation Trust's witnesses. I will refer to certain parts of the evidence given on this subject. I asked Mr. Maddocks, the Engineer-Manager:

As I understand it, you have not obtained any firm estimate of costs?

He replied "Yes", meaning that that was so, that the trust had not yet worked the estimates out. I then asked:

How are the arrangements in this Bill worked out, as they are obviously based on some estimate?

He replied:

I am not too clear on this point. I believe that the E. & W.S. Department has prepared preliminary estimates which confirm the basis of the amounts mentioned in the draft Bill. I don't know on what basis the calculations were prepared. I am assuming it was on the basis of completely renewing our channel system with concrete construction;—

there is a doubt whether that is the correct course or whether pipes should be installed either wholly or in part—

also, the preliminary estimates for the pumping station and rising mains have been estimated by the department.

I then asked, "In consultation with you?" and he replied, "To a very small degree." This, I think, is unfortunate. It means that the estimates which have been presented by the E. & W.S. Department and on which this Bill is founded have not been agreed, anyway. Whether they have been discussed, as I say, is open to doubt; it depends on which evidence we accept. They certainly have not been

agreed (and that is common ground) by the trust, and we do not know whether or not these estimates will be sufficient to cover the work. If, for example, it is decided that piping is preferable to the open channels, then it looks from the evidence as though the cost will be greater than that embodied in the evidence. I think that, too, can be seen from the evidence.

I come now to the second point. Assuming that the costs are higher (and as I say there is good reason to expect that they will be), the trust is already sailing pretty close to the wind financially, and it may be extremely difficult for it to find any other money. The only practicable source, as I have suggested, will be the Government. This may be challenged; I do not know. I shall refer, therefore, to part of the evidence on this financial aspect. You will have noticed, Sir, that in the report the committee says that the financial arrangements are acceptable to the trust. That is literally so, but it is so (according to the evidence of Mr. Price) only because beggars cannot be choosers, and they could not do any better with the Government. It is not the same as saying that the trust is happy with the arrangements. On this question of the finances of the trust, I asked:

If these estimates are accurate, I gather from what has been said this morning that you will be sailing fairly close to the wind financially anyway?

Mr. Price replied, "Yes". In his evidence Mr. Price also described the attitude of the trust to the offer of financial assistance made by the Government. He was asked:

In view of what has just been said, can you say whether the trust is happy with the financial arrangements embodied in this Bill?

He replied:

It is not a question of being happy with them. That is what was offered to us, and beggars can't be choosers, so we just had to accept that and to do the best we can with it, being thankful for small mercies.

As a result, the trust has increased the charges for watering by another £2. I think (and I am subject to correction by the Minister on this, as on other points) that the charge is now £10 15s. per acre as against £6 at Mildura. The trust says that the growers there simply cannot afford to pay anything more by way of water charges. If that is so, the only source of additional finance, should that be necessary, will be the Government.

I have mentioned these passages from the evidence simply to emphasize again that we can properly expect that it will be necessary to give further financial assistance to the trust in years to come. Alththough the report was agreed to by all members (and I agree with it), it is proper to warn members that Parliament has probably not heard the last of this matter, as it may have to be reconsidered in the future.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This measure will substantially assist the trust to do something that is necessary in this settlement. Comparisons were made by the Leader of the Opposition between the offer made by the previous Government and that made by this Government, but the purpose of the Bill, and of the Select Committee, has apparently been lost sight of. I consider that both offers were comparable. The main result of this Bill will be that the trust, which is now in difficulties, will be assisted. We have recognized that there may not be sufficient money available to complete the system, and that it may be necessary for the trust to approach the Government of the day for further financial assistance. Because of the safeguard that the Minister has to approve the sum spent on any phase of this scheme, the trust cannot get into financial difficulties as a result of over-spending. This Bill provides assistance for the trust, and I am sure that a future Government will be sympathetic if it is necessary for the trust to ask for further assistance.

Mr. Jennings: Was there a minority report?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It was a unanimous report.

Mr. QUIRKE: The trust will require much more money before everything is done. This trouble was precipitated by nature in the flood of 1956, when the whole area was swamped with water and the ground filled. It was after 1956 that demands were made to drain the Renmark area. Despite great difficulties, much of that drainage has been completed, but the trust is not liable for the full cost of that because the then Government contributed enormously to the cost of that work. At one stage the trust had to pump for up to 30 hours before receiving suitable water for irrigation. The Government of the day realized the difficulties, and a scheme was submitted for a new pumping station that would eliminate the old system. The irrigation channels at Renmark are a complete shambles today and will have to be renewed at an estimated initial cost of £1,000,000. Pipes will be used in some cases and where necessary open channels will be constructed, but this will be expensive work for many years. The reason for this present

expenditure is that at Renmark the costs outgrew the recovery from the collection of rates, particularly as the system deteriorated and had to be renewed. What was suitable for the Chaffey brothers is obviously not suitable now. Although the present scheme will cost about £500,000 a year it will be necessary to continue with it for some time.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is not £500,000 a year.

Mr. QUIRKE: How long is it estimated that this scheme will take?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: About 15 years.

Mr. QUIRKE: By then there will be the extra cost of maintaining what is already there. Although the present attempt is generous, I do not think it will be sufficient to rehabilitate the Renmark area: the sum involved is too small and has to be spread over too long a period. Under the original considerations, the trust would have received £1,350,000 for the total rehabilitation of the scheme. A domestic water supply should be insisted on for the Renmark settlement. I think the trust will find that the sum involved is insufficient to meet its requirements.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 9. Page 3937.)

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): Having been in Parliament since 1933, I have naturally had much experience in dealing with various Bills. However, never in the whole of that time have I seen a Bill as far-reaching as this one. Although commendable in parts, the Bill contains other parts that may well be improved by constructive criticism. The measure is a complete departure from the existing provisions of the Real Property Act, as we have known it in this State since 1886: it affects the whole system of the transfer of land titles under the Torrens system which became a model not only for this State but throughout the Commonwealth.

Mr. McKee: The Bill isn't as far-reaching as some legislation in other States.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: That may be so. However, it is sufficiently far-reaching for us to require more time than this to analyse its provisions, and for local government bodies to examine them so that they can express their views.

Mr. Heaslip: Local government bodies haven't seen the Bill yet.

Mr. McKee: The Town Planner's report has been in existence since 1962.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: That is not a law, which this Bill will be if it is passed. The previous legislation gave powers to the Town Planner, but he has none of the legal power given to the authority in this Bill. I do not oppose a town planning authority as such. However, I shall criticize what I believe should be criticized and I hope to suggest improvements. I emphasize that we should proceed slowly in this matter and allow those concerned to comment on it. Various local govenment authorities throughout the State will have their powers interfered with by the Bill. They should be able to comment on the provisions of the Bill.

The Bill is well and cleverly prepared, and the Attorney-General is to be complimented on his able second reading explanation. It is probably the most far-reaching of any planning Bill ever submitted to a Parliament in Australia and, as one man of authority in this State remarked to me, "It is town planning run mad." I gave evidence before the present town planning authority on behalf of several landowners and I objected to certain proposals. At that time I was concerned that an appeal had to be made to a body the chairman of which had made the decision that was being appealed against. I do not think that should ever happen. I am glad to see that the Bill provides for a new appeal board. I have no doubt that those concerned took notice of my constructive criticism, and I am pleased that it did some good. This is like the curate's egg: there is much good in the Bill, especially in connection with the rehabilitation of run-down areas and the provision of funds, which are available to the Town Planner (to be the Director of Planning) for the purposes of the Bill and for the acquisition of recreational areas.

Another point of note is a separate appeal board under a legal person outside the authority of the Town Planner, who never, in my opinion, ever desired to be chairman of the old appeal board, which was constituted of the members of the Town Planning Committee. I wholeheartedly agree with this move, which I have always fought for.

The metropolitan planning area is a huge area from the Gawler River in the north to the top of the Willunga hills on the south, following a line of ranges on the east, to the east of the Mount Bold reservoir area, thence

north to include Norton Summit, Inglewood (including Humbug Scrub), thence along the South Para, skirting Gawler on the south and west to the Gawler River, and thence following this to the sea; but it includes the controversial area of Buckland Park adjoining the sea which is the only subdividable area at Port Gawler. This area is shown as required for recreational purposes but it is needed to establish a seaside town here for the growing cities of Salisbury and Elizabeth. There are other areas to the south of this area which could, at little cost, be reclaimed for recreational purposes.

Much criticism has been levelled at the sprawling growth of Adelaide, but the adoption of the proposed planning area will further accentuate this until Adelaide eventually becomes a mass of houses from Gawler River to the Willunga hills. This has occurred in Melbourne where a similar plan provides for a population of 4,000,000; Adelaide is envisaged as reaching an unbroken population of some 1,384,000 by 1991. The position of Sydney is similar to that of Adelaide and Melbourne. We have heard much from the present Government, from the previous Government and from different administrators concerned with land, about decentralization. By 1991, if this plan is allowed to come into being, probably nearly 75 per cent of the State's population will be in the metropolitan area and probably all the State's industries except those at Whyalla and a few at Port Augusta and Port Pirie. A few country towns, such as Murray Bridge, Mannum, Mount Gambier, Loxton and Port Lincoln, will have small industries in common with the forms of primary production in the areas. This proposal will kill other country towns in the State. Australians generally are overwhelmingly in favour of decentralization and seek to see a better spread of population throughout the States. We must have town planning but we should not go too far with it to the detriment of country towns and districts.

There are problems attached to decentralization because of the distance from the main seat of markets (Adelaide), and because of freight costs and carriage of goods. Adjustment of freights is a problem that must be faced soon unless our country towns are to gradually die out. A very important point in the proposed octopus growth of Adelaide is the fact that it will throw out of production the most fertile area of the State and it is a plain fact that we are short of good land with an assured rainfall. Problems will arise from this sprawling growth. Congestion of the city centre can be relieved by freeways, although this is a very controversial subject at present. I remember reading a week or two ago in the newspaper that an outstanding authority had said that freeways had served their purpose. The problems are great in Los Angeles (which I have visited twice) and cities like that. On one of my visits to Los Angeles, on landing at the airport I had to wait a considerable time for the bus. On inquiring, I was told that the bus was waiting for another aircraft to land. As I had an appointment I decided to take a taxi and directed the driver to proceed to the Hotel Statler. After travelling for some time I wondered whether he had heard correctly as to my destination, but he explained that the airport was 25 miles out. That gives an idea of the sprawl of cities like that.

Let us consider the Main South Road on a public holiday: cars are bumper to bumper despite the widening and construction of the fine new highway as far as Reynella. I ask members to visualize this in 1991 even with freeways, and probably more than those planned today will be necessary. A reversion to public transport will be necessary; in fact, it will be the main way to transport passengers, as our roads will be unable to cope with the number of cars in use by 1991. We have only to look at the increase in the number of motor vehicles even in the last five or 10 years. We may have to consider what has already been started in Melbourne and some other cities—the use of helicopters. The Scandinavian countries go in for this in a big way.

Some time ago I advocated the construction of a new bridge across the Torrens River, and work is now to proceed at Morphett Street. At that time I advocated another north-south highway, as we then had only the outlet along King William Road. My idea at the time was to extend the Morphett Street bridge across the Torrens River and have an outlet through Montefiore Hill to the north and connect with the Glenelg line to the south. I also advocated constructing an underground railway system to run under Parliament House towards the Parade Ground, and to take a circular route around Adelaide, with escalators up to the main shopping centres to handle the increasing population. I think that is a possibility. In a comprehensive plan such as that foreshadowed by this Bill we must think of these things in the future. Even with freeways, it will still be a problem handling the population within the city of Adelaide, and I cannot see that we can cope without some form of public transport. We have only to look at the motor vehicles parked around the fringes of the city

today; people are leaving their cars there and using public transport to come the extra half-mile or so. The Adelaide City Council, in its wisdom, is putting parking meters farther and farther out, and the result will be that the average person will leave his car at home and use public transport.

The establishment of satellite towns is most important, but this aspect seems to have been passed over by the committee in its report. These towns would break up the sprawl of Adelaide which, from a defence point of view in an atomic age, would be most vulnerable. In a few minutes an atomic bomb or two could put Adelaide and most of our key industries out of action, and once this is done all resistance to attack would collapse. The establishment of satellite cities would allow for the dispersal of key industries. This applies not only to Adelaide but to all the main cities of Australia: they are all vulnerable to attack from the sea as well as from the air. Yet throughout Australia planning authorities want to extend our cities still farther and to congregate more and more people and industries in and around these areas, thus making us more and more vulnerable. Satellite cities could be established at such places as Murray Bridge, Mannum, Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln, and Balaklava. The towns of Wallaroo, Kadina and Moonta could comprise one such city.

Mr. Casey: What about Peterborough?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, that is a possibility, with the advent of rail gauge standardization. Other such centres could be built in the Willunga and Sellick Beach area, in the Buckland Park area, and to the east of Gawler. This would help restrict the outward sprawl of Adelaide. Fast rail transport of the Japanese style could assist people desiring to work in the city of Adelaide. In addition, it would save for primary production much good land around Adelaide. Near the towns I have named, in the main, there are sources of water supply. I believe we should take our population and industry to the water. In the long run this would probably be cheaper than our present method of establishing a city and industries to which water must be brought. By this policy alone we would more evenly spread our population and make our industries less vulnerable. We would then really start to bring about the decentralization about which we have heard so much in this place for so many years. If we could be sure that the world would always remain in peace we could extend our capital cities; but, as I have pointed out before, we would have to solve the problem of traffic congestion.

To my mind, in any form of town planning industry and land play the most important basic part. Land is the basis of our whole financial structure. If we interfere with the security of land tenure, chaos will ensue unless all land is nationalized. The genuine landowners—by far the majority (I am not referring to the go-getting subdivider whose day has practically passed)—generally acquired their land by fair means in the knowledge of the security of tenure under the Real Property Act. In the main, such persons desired nothing more than to use the land for productive purposes. They placed their money in land as an investment, just as others place money in shares and industry. They pay ever increasing land tax, council rates, and other charges on land to such an extent that their income from production is ever on the decrease.

Naturally, there has always been an increase in the value of land in a growing State. This has been referred to as "the unearned increment". I have listened to an exposition on this subject from a great stalwart who passed away only a short time ago. I refer to the late Mr. E. J. Craigie, who referred to this matter every time he spoke. The genuine landowner has been severely criticized and condemned at times because of this unearned increment, but it is not of his own making. If he desires to subdivide (and he would be foolish to do so today), he has to give away 10 per cent of the land for reserve purposes. Further, he has to construct roads and provide for water, sewers, etc., the cost of which has to be passed on to the purchaser, thus increasing the cost of the house to the purchaser. On the other hand, the party who invests in shares can receive an increment in the capital value of his shares, and he pays practically nothing in the way of tax on transfer. If shares were treated the same as land there would be a shortage of capital for investment.

The Bill, by the adoption of the metropolitan plan, places encumbrances on practically all land in the plan. This devalues it from a sale and security point of view. The landowner has never been directly consulted except by a small notice placed in the daily newspaper, which few people saw. He was asked not to appeal but to raise objections. The judges of the objections were the body that drew up the plan. Is this democratic? In countries behind the Iron Curtain it would be acceptable but not in Australia. It is highly probable that the Town Planning Committee,

which drew up the plan, would have desired an outside body to judge the objections. Therefore, it is essential that a representative of the landowner have a voice on the proposed State planning authority.

Industry, next to land, plays a most important part in the wellbeing of a State. It provides the capital to establish industries on land, and it is most important that industry should be represented on the State planning authority. No Town Planner, without the advice of industry, should set aside land for industrial purposes. Areas set aside for this purpose could be regarded by industry as unsuitable for such purpose, as is much of the Port Stanvac area. The landowner would then have an encumbrance placed on his land which would devalue it for sale and security purposes, and his assets could be frozen for years. The Bill gives combined representation to industry and commerce on the authority. Industry alone should be represented, as it buys land and constructs factories, while commerce deals mainly with the sale and import of goods from the industrialist who manufactures them and supplies the necessary capital.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The Chamber of Manufactures is not exclusively commercial: it represents industry.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Not the same as the Chamber of Manufactures represents it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I can show you a few industrialists who are members of the Chamber of Commerce.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I can show the Minister a few members of the Chamber of Commerce who do nothing at all.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There are many in that category.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: That goes for the legal profession, too. Clause 3 provides that the recent regulations that were so freely criticized are still to remain. Evidence was given before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and it has been proved that these regulations should have been disallowed at the time. Now is the opportunity to amend this clause to provide that new regulations shall be made. I am perturbed that the Bill gives authority to the Town Planner by regulation. These regulations, which were not disallowed, will automatically have the effect of a Bill that becomes law. If these provisions are necessary because they were in the old Bill, they should be included in this Bill.

The Bill provides that further regulations can be made; in fact, throughout the Bill power is given to make regulations until people will be so tied up that no-one will be able to understand the Act or regulations. The private developer and builder could be so harassed that capital would not be available for this work. This provision is retrospective. If an application to subdivide has been made and is nearly to the approval stage, it may have to be reprocessed. The process is difficult enough today without the new Act. I fear that genuine developers and finance for private development will dry up altogether: many developers have told me that this could have happened if the recent regulations had been agreed to. Clause 3 (3) refers to plans already finalized and deposited. The Bill does not apply to the division of land above 20 acres as does the present Act, and the metropolitan planning area covers the whole area shown in the Town Planning Committee's report.

In the present Act the district council areas of Noarlunga, Meadows, East Torrens, Tea Tree Gully and Munno Para are not included. Clause 5 (2) (*b*) clears up the matter of when a plan is deposited. Litigation did arise on this question and a court ruled that a plan was deposited immediately it was produced to the Lands Titles Office, the necessary fee paid, and a request for township titles made. Under this ruling the Registrar-General was required to produce the titles immediately but this was impossible, and he had, in effect, to ask for time to do so. No objection can be taken to the titles of Director and Deputy Director of Planning. The Bill allows the authority to enter into the real estate business, using public moneys. The authority shall consist of nine members, with the Director of Planning as chairman. The committee is naturally loaded with Government or quasi-Government men with a preponderance of three local government members.

I do not object to the representation of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide, but I consider that the Municipal Association and the Local Government Association should have only one representative between them. The vacancy created should be filled by a representative of landowners whose representatives at present are the Wheat and Woolgrowers Association, which is now amalgamated with the Primary Producers Association, and with which I have the honour to be connected. The Chamber of Manufactures (or industry, as I term it) should have a representative, but not the Chamber of Commerce. This I think would give a well-balanced authority and give nearly all affected parties

representation. I stress the need for representation of the landowner who is probably the most affected by the Bill. He will never be satisfied until he has a representative to watch over his interests.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Where do you get a representative of landowners?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: From the organization I represent, which will give proper representation of all landowners in the areas affected. No objection can be taken to the proposed panel method of selection. The Planning Appeal Board is a much needed separate body, and no objection can be taken, except that it would give more confidence if the landowner were represented because all appeals are made on his behalf. In this connection, the local government representative should be eliminated because in at least half, or even more, of appeal cases, the appeal is against the decision of a municipal or local government authority. Clause 26 (1) provides:

The board shall hear and determine any appeal by any person having a right of appeal under this Act against any decision of the authority, the Director or any council.

I suggest that a representative of the landowners should be on the board, rather than the representative of a council. Clause 26 (5) should be amended, so that a copy of the evidence produced shall be available to an appellant on request. In relation to clause 27 (6) (*c*), the question of oath or affirmation is unnecessary. Neither has been used on appeals in the past. I point out that more regulations can be made, as provided by subclause (8).

Clause 28 (1) gives the authority power to declare by proclamation any part of the State to be a "planning area". By the time we have finished we shall be over-planned, and this will be a handicap to development which, I think, will kill the incentive of the private developer and builder. Indeed, I fear that private finance for development will dry up, because there will be too much harassment and interference with the rights of the landowner. Section 10 of the Real Property Act provides:

The objects of this Act are to simplify the title to land, and to facilitate dealing therewith, and to secure indefeasibility of title to all registered proprietors, except in certain cases specified in this Act.

Section 70 provides:

In all other cases the title of the registered proprietor of land shall prevail, notwithstanding the existence in Her Majesty, Her heirs or successors, or in any person of any estate or interest whatever, whether derived by grant from the Crown or otherwise, which but for this Act might be held paramount or to have priority; and notwithstanding any want of notice, or insufficient notice of any application, or any error, omission, or informality in any application or proceedings.

The Bill interferes with such rights under the Real Property Act. The procedure under the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act has always been by way of treat. Previous Governments and Government departments, such as the Education and Railways Departments, have, in the past, approached an owner with a view to his selling certain land, but here we see that the procedure will go much further. I am perturbed at the way in which the Bill interferes with the Torrens system. Most people are willing to co-operate and may resent that interference.

Mr. Quirke: It is not a new departure.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes it is.

Mr. Quirke: Have you read the Land Settlement Act?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, and I have read the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act. The honourable member should know, having been a Cabinet Minister, that the policy has always been to secure land by agreement rather than by force. Even though appeals against decisions may be lodged, I do not like this new procedure. Parliament should not take such drastic action without first examining the situation. Clause 29 (*e*) (iii) states:

the extent to which community facilities are or are likely to become available to the occupiers of such land:

Such facilities would probably be non-existent until after development, and the word "likely" overcomes this. In many country towns sewers are not likely to be available for years to come, but development should not be held up because of that.

In relation to Division 2 (Development Plans), a clause should be inserted giving objectors the right of appeal to the Town Planning Committee instead of to the authority which prepares the plan. It is proposed that objections shall be made in writing. A decision by the authority could mean great loss to an individual landowner or, alternatively, wealth to another. I do not subscribe to the term "open to corruption" but the grounds for it may exist. Otherwise the procedure of preparing a development plan is normal.

Concerning Part IV (Implementation of Authorized Development Plans), power to make regulations is given in clause 36 (1) and, in addition, power is given to councils to make regulations. Subclause (4) gives power by regulation to define zones for specific purposes, and to regulate, restrict or prohibit either absolutely or subject to any prescribed conditions.

This relates to the development of any land or any class of land within any zone or locality. Paragraph (*c*) states:

> prescribe the cases and circumstances in and under which—
>
> (1) an existing building or structure within the planning area shall not be altered, enlarged or extended for the purposes of its existing use without the consent of the authority or the council within whose area the building or structure is situated;

This is carrying planning to a degree of absurdity. The council only should be consulted, as it is at present. To consult the authority will cause needless delays and annoyances in simple matters which are well provided for today. A multitude of other restriction is set out, such as the mode of construction, conversion, alteration or siting of buildings either generally or in specified zones, or localities within the planning area or in any specified circumstances.

I refer members to clause 36 (4) (*c*) (iii). Provision is made in subparagraph (iii) for the discontinuance of an existing use of land. The authority can prohibit the carrying out or completion of any work of any class on land which it has reserved for compulsory acquisition without the consent of the Minister in writing. While the acquiring body is making up its mind (and the period of this is unspecified) power is given to stipulate as to how the land is to be used in the meantime. The authority has power to prohibit the erection of any building or any excavation within a prescribed distance from a road.

It can prohibit the construction of any building or structure which could cause increased and excessive vehicular traffic along a road or traffic congestion. It can provide for the conservation, preservation or enhancement of natural beauty of foreshore or banks of the ocean, harbours, rivers, creeks, lakes, lagoons and the like and of any routes or localities of scenic beauty or value. The authority can prohibit the alteration or desecration of buildings or sites of architectural, historical or scientific interest or natural beauty without its consent. It can prohibit the cutting down, topping, lopping or destruction of trees without its consent. It can regulate, restrict or prohibit the erection of advertising signs attached to buildings or other structures. It can require suitable action to be taken against ruinous buildings or dilapidated conditions of any objects, buildings or structures on land within the locality or by reason of the condition of any derelict, waste or neglected land. This is desirable. It is all to be carried out by regulations. Provision is made for appeals in all cases.

In seeking all these powers and more, apparently, the authority does not overlook an ancient convenience generally known as a "thunder box", which certainly has historic value and must not be demolished or altered in any way without the consent of the authority. Just recently an application in L.T.O. 1878/65 was made to the present authority to resubdivide into lots an old property in Unley Park. On this was a more modern outside convenience which was at one time used for toilet purposes but was cut off and left on one lot on which the owner desired to erect a new house for himself. This fact remained unnoticed in the first resubdivision. The owner desired it for use of workmen on the construction of the new house instead of the usual temporary convenience which is used during construction. It was located right in front of the new house. The owner decided to add a small strip of land to his new house lot. This brought trouble. The authority said he should destroy his ancient thunder box, which had already been destroyed (unknown to it) and stand and deliver an extra 4ft. to the cut at the street corner. It said it would then approve of his resubdivision. So that not all that is ancient is kept.

Clause 36 (7) gives the authority power to delegate or confer upon any person or persons of a class of a discretion or a discretionary power or authority. The question is: is this not going too far too soon in these matters? We are practically in the dying hours of the session and I sincerely hope that the Government is not anxious to push this legislation through before March 3. I suggest that it should be left and revived next session. In the meantime members representing rural areas can get in touch with landowners, local authorities and so on, and get their impressions. We should get the blessing of the people on this far-reaching legislation.

If the authority desires to acquire land under the provisions in the Bill, the Director shall furnish the Registrar-General with a copy of the *Gazette* containing the regulations and, if the land is under the provisions of the Real Property Act, 1886-1963, the Registrar-General shall make any necessary entries on the Certificates of Title for the land as is deemed necessary. Again I repeat that this remains for an unstipulated period. In effect this freezes the person's asset in the land until the party desiring it makes up its mind. This means that no-one is in competition with the

authority or department desiring the land. The land is therefore devalued and the owner's right or an indefeasible Real Property Act title is interfered with and a hardship could be brought upon the owner who might have purchased the land for a specified purpose. A time limit of two months should be set upon the order as the owner may have to look for an alternative site. This also applies to old system conveyances, Crown leases and so on.

Subclause (12) is frightening as it refers to land tax, water rates, and the Sewerage and Local Government Acts; therefore a long period of freeze could be anticipated. If council by-laws are inconsistent with this legislation they shall be deemed to be invalid. Notice of desire to acquire must be given in the *Gazette* and in daily newspapers. Written objections may be lodged with the authority and the objector may appear before the authority or council and may be represented by counsel. Why should there not be an appeal to the appeal board instead of to the authority or council making the order?

Part V deals with the interim development control plan within the metropolitan area. It appears to differ from the ideas in the committee's report. Clause 41 (2) stipulates that land as classified in the report shall hold for a period of three years and after that for further periods of three years. On any areas declared no person shall change the existing use to which the land or any buildings or structures thereon is or are being lawfully put, or construct, convert or alter any building or structure thereon, without the consent of the authority. The penalty is $500. Subclause (6) provides that construction can be made with the approval of the authority. A number of provisions lay down matters which will be taken into consideration in coming to a decision to allow or disallow construction, alterations and so on. There is a right of appeal to the board against the authority's decision on any refusal or conditions. The metropolitan development plan is divided into the following sections:

General industrial zone, light industrial zone, extractive industrial zone, special industrial zone, hills face zone or rural zone or where any such zone has been expressly superseded by a zone or locality defined for specific purposes by a regulation relating to the metropolitan development plan, means the zone or locality so defined.

Any zone defined on a plan places an encumbrance on the land which is held under an indefeasible Real Property Act title. The word "indefeasible" means absolute or unchangeable. This devalues the land from a sale or security point of view and, in short, interferes with the rights enjoyed by an owner under a Real Property Act title. The objects of the Real Property Act are to simplify the title to land, to facilitate dealings therewith, and to secure indefeasibility of title to all registered proprietors except in those cases specified. I maintain that clause 4 of this Bill has been included to interfere with the rights enjoyed by the owner of an indefeasible title under the Real Property Act. We have been working under this system since 1886, yet now we are to have these sweeping provisions.

Regarding the hills face zone, I maintain that this is a most drastic classification. It deprives an owner of the right of subdivision, except in 10-acre lots, in the interests of the State and of the surrounding areas of Adelaide in particular. Much of this land around Adelaide is bare-faced hills which would be far better and more attractive if developed for housing, provided the grade did not exceed one in three. Because of its proximity to the city, and because of trespassers and the dog and fire menace, this land is practically useless for primary production. If the grade of one in four as set out in the recent regulations was applied in Sydney, practically 60 per cent of that area would not be built on; Wellington (N.Z.) would exist as a few scattered small towns; Hong Kong, Kowloon and the New Territories would not carry the present population of 4,000,000; and many cities in Japan would hardly exist. If land is not suited to primary production, it should be used for housing. Many people enjoy the magnificent view from the hills, and those people will develop and build in areas with grades of more than one in four. Magnificent views are obtained from the area between the South Road and the sea.

Mr. Quirke: What about the road from Sydney to Palm Beach?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes. Those who wish to build in such places should be encouraged to do so. A man may wish to build on a cosy area at the top of the Willunga hills, from which an excellent panoramic view can be obtained. He is not permitted to do this unless he buys 10 acres of land, much of which would probably be useless to him. At present, if water and sewers cannot be connected, he can be prevented from building even though he can supply his own water by catchment as the early settlers did. Before condemning the whole hills face zone as unsuitable for development, a much closer

examination is necessary. If it is so desirable in the interests of the State that this land should not be developed, then it should be acquired by the Crown and re-let to the present owners on conditional perpetual leases. (That will probably appeal to honourable members on the Government side.) Its scenic beauties could then be preserved, and no hardship would be suffered by the owners. Before this zone existed, a number of houses were built above Tea Tree Gully, and these places get a beautiful, panoramic view of much of the city, Port Adelaide and the gulf. Just recently, despite the fact that a water supply exists along the road, an application for resubdivision was refused, although the land is reasonably level and the grades are much less than one in four. It could be that the draftsman who was colouring the plan had his arm knocked and his brush slipped, and that this was followed by errors in printing and plan reproduction. A detailed analysis of these areas should be made. Land to the north of the Little Para is classified within this zone, while similar land on the south is outside the zone. Some land in the Mount Lofty and Aldgate area is classified as country living areas, while similar land in the Norton Summit area is included in the hills face zone. There are other anomalies.

As far as I know, the industrial zones have been selected without consultation with industry, and they may remain frozen for many years. Much of the industrial area around Port Stanvac, because of the grade, is unsuitable for industrial purposes. The metropolitan plan covers far too large an area, and for the present should be restricted on the south to the Onkaparinga River. Much of the land north of St. Kilda toward the Gawler River should also be excluded. If the Bill is passed, and if Adelaide develops as expected, then, and only then, should further areas be added to the plan. We should proceed slowly and not make the provisions too wide, for the Minister or the Government could always proclaim an area later.

Anomalies exist in the country township zone. For instance, it permits the extension of Aldinga, but it does not permit the extension of Port Noarlunga to the east and south. The whole question of the zones should be gone into by the new authority, if constituted, with the addition of a landowners' representative and an industrialist who can give invaluable advice.

The question of leases has been brought into the control of land subdivision. Some owners, to defeat the legislation, are lodging G.R.O. plans and selling leases on terms of up to 250 or 500 years. This obviously is subdivision, as access rights are given over certain areas and the Town Planner is powerless to stop the process. Unsuitable land—even land subject to inundation—could be subdivided and sold. This practice should cease, and the fact that a lease of five years only is provided for in the Bill should overcome this.

Regarding the shack site areas, consideration should be given where a man obviously does not want much land, especially as a "weekender". No great harm could come if provisions were made for this purpose, subject to review every 10 years. The matter could be dealt with similarly to the way units are dealt with today. Clause 45 (4) should be clarified. If Form A has been granted under the old Act, does the clause apply to that? I should like the Minister to clarify that point. Clause 49 (*f*) provides that land adjoining an airport shall not be subdivided. The airport has been established, in the main, of late years. The adjoining owners had no say where the airport was to go, yet they suffer loss of subdivisional rights because of this without any compensation. Perhaps this could be deemed a Commonwealth matter. In clause 49 (*g*) a grade of one in four should be amended to one in three. In clause 51 (1) it is noted that detailed construction plans must be signed by a prescribed engineer. For many years this class of work has been carried out by surveyors who are fully qualified to do this work. They should be allowed to continue to supply plans and, if necessary, an engineer could supervise the construction.

I understand that some criticism has been made of roads constructed in the past. It must be realized that all roads constructed must be approved and accepted by a council engineer. In the old Town Planning Act a 24ft. wide pavement of 4in. metal seal was to be provided with no reference to drainage. In many cases these roads were constructed before water and sewerage were provided and over them has passed heavy material for house construction. The light roads were not sufficient to take these loads. At the time the immediate construction of roads was opposed by many surveyors who advocated that a light gravel surface should be laid, followed by a secondary construction after water and sewers were provided and most houses were built. Councils which advocated the early construction of roads soon changed their minds, and welcomed an arrangement whereby the roads could be made later. Surveyors should not be penalized and lose work that they have carried out for years.

Clause 52 (*c*) provides that 10 per cent of the area subdivided shall be given as a reserve. It is proposed to take 100ft. of reserve along all foreshores: this should be included in the 10 per cent, as should all land taken along creeks, lagoons, lakes, etc., plus any extra roads that have to be provided. The provisions of clause 52 (1) (*d*) (iii) could force people to settle on unsatisfactory land already subdivided, although much more desirable land could be subdivided. Land acquisition and special provisions relating to compensation under Part VII apply only to the acquisition by purchase. No provision is made for compensation to landowners who, by the proclamation of the various zones, suffer a loss while owning an indefeasible real property title. In certain cases of reservation for a purpose and not finally acquired, compensation can be obtained.

Compensation can be obtained if the authority refuses to consent to the alteration or destruction of any building or site of architectural or scientific interest, or natural beauty, and for the cutting down, topping, lopping or destruction of any trees. This provision has merit. I favour town planning in principle, but I fear that this Bill goes too far too soon, and could cause many repercussions. If we go as far as is proposed there is no return, as we will be so bogged down with controls and regulations as to cause embarrassment to many people. In effect, the Bill gives the authority control of the whole of local government, and powers given it will have to be delegated by the authority. I fear that developers who subdivide and build houses will so fear the controls that, rather than be harassed, they will go out of business. Many people have already told me that.

Mr. Langley: Who are they?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: All I can say is, wait and see. Let us consider this legislation closely: these are sweeping changes, and I want all members to consider them earnestly.

Mr. Hurst: Don't you think that sweeping changes are necessary?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, but they should not be done in one day: they should be considered properly, as there could be a constant loss of private capital and investment so necessary to real estate. The day of the go-getting subdivider is over, as most people cannot afford the purchase price of a lot for which they must have a title before they build. Instead, they pay a small deposit on a house and get a title although the deposit so paid might not equal one-tenth of the value of the land. Further, the rights of the landowner will be so impaired that it will not pay to own land. The indefeasibility and security of a real property title will be a thing of the past. The authority will be forever breathing down our neck and watching over us: it savours of "big brother". It will always be with us, and it is doubtful whether the benefits that will arise from the Bill will be what are desired.

Some form of planning control is necessary, but the Bill goes too far and amendments are necessary before it becomes law. Under it, as it stands, far too many people will be pushed around unnecessarily, and if we pass it we will go down the path of no retreat and may live to regret action so hastily taken. I do, however commend the Government for recognizing the fact that town planning costs money and is the responsibility of the State as a whole. Also, I give credit to those people who put so much work into the town planning report. It was something that had to be done, but these people should be congratulated on their effort. We have reached the stage where Parliament should take certain steps, as it now recognizes that there is a transport problem and that people are being attracted to the city. However, we should not proceed too quickly: let us consider the whole question. This is probably one of the most serious subjects that this Parliament has dealt with for many years, and I appeal to all members to proceed slowly. We must be careful, so that in this democratic Parliament we do not interfere too much with the democracy of the people whom we represent in this Chamber.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): Honourable members seemed strained with the ordeal of listening to the complaints of the member for Ridley. After listening to him, it is not difficult to know who wrote his speech. The purpose of this Bill is to secure the orderly and economic use and development of land within the State. I have studied the Bill and have listened to evidence about it from various people. The member for Ridley seemed to paint a black picture as he pointed out what he thought would be its effects. However, this legislation is necessary to allow the proper use of land whether for recreation, industry, shopping centres, or anything else.

The Subordinate Legislation Committee, of which I am a member, fully considered these regulations and decided that it would take no action. However, because of the evidence given before the committee and tabled in this House, I draw the attention of members to these regulations. One of the main objections was on

the ground that the Town Planner would be appointed as chairman of the appeal committee, but that has been rectified. The committee was satisfied that none of these regulations was designed to prevent Adelaide's development, but that they would rectify any detrimental factors existing at present. The Bill will not hamper (as the member for Ridley suggested it would) the honest developer who has more than his own interests at heart. It is intended to preserve our limited resources of scenic beauty and to prevent untimely and uneconomic development. Pursuant to the Bill, the Town Planner will be able to guide development for the ultimate good of the whole community. The Bill is, in fact, designed to protect the interests of the developers, inasmuch as many uneconomic and undesirable pitfalls associated with land subdivision will be avoided.

Further, if all the Town Planner's past work is to be of any value, the Bill is absolutely essential, otherwise it would be impossible for him to implement both present and future proposals considered desirable for the benefit of the community. The measure is designed to secure orderly and economic use and development of land within the State, and to bring about in the future a far more efficient and acceptable pattern of development for healthy community living. I should be most surprised if any member opposed legislation designed for that purpose. We must agree that an effort should be made in relation to future planning. The member for Ridley will agree with that but, of course, he believes future planning should suit only a small section of the community. We should plan to keep factories and houses apart; that is most important in view of the rapidly developing metropolitan area. The member for Ridley referred to traffic congestion that is at present posing a problem, but with proper planning along the lines of the Bill that problem will be eased. The member for Burnside and the member for Alexandra complained that the Bill had received little publicity, but they know that is not true, for the regulations to be incorporated in the Bill and, in fact, its very foundation have been featured in editorials in leading newspapers throughout the State.

Mrs. Steele: Nobody knows anything about it.

Mr. McKEE: I think in 1962 the booklet on town planning was published and, as that is the real foundation of the Bill, members have had three years to read it, knowing full well that it comprised the contents of this legislation.

Mrs. Steele: We complained about the fact that people had not had a chance to see the Bill.

Mr. McKEE: Councils and many other interested parties have come forward to give evidence, most of those people supporting the principle of the Bill to the utmost.

Mr. Langley: Except one little group!

Mr. McKEE: Yes, and that little group obviously wrote the member for Ridley's speech. Of course, some claimed that the Bill would not go far enough, but I believe it constitutes the minimum requirements necessary to enable the Town Planner to fulfil his function. If the Bill is not passed in its present form, money already spent on the report of the Town Planning Committee will be completely wasted. I believe that any objections to this legislation will come from sources where private financial gain is expected at public expense, and at the loss of amenities to the community. The Bill is necessary; there has to be a starting point, and I believe the consensus of opinion is that the Bill will achieve good results. Therefore, I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I, too, support the second reading. The Opposition's approach has been clearly presented to the House by the remarks made by the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman), who comprehensively covered the Bill yesterday. However, members must reserve their right in Committee (and, after all, this is principally a Committee Bill) to criticize certain provisions. Indeed, that is what I intend to do. I assure the member for Port Pirie that, although I agree that all sorts of official bodies have had the opportunity to make representations to the authors of the Bill, many local councils have not seen the measure. Local councils will be affected by the Bill's provisions, for the Bill does not merely relate to individuals and companies that pay rates and taxes. A feature of the measure relates to the participation by local government in the Bill's implementation, and I should be opposed to any Bill that concentrated too much power in a central authority at the expense of a local authority. Provision is made in the Bill for an individual to make a plea or to appeal to a council and to the appeal committee.

This Bill is tremendously important to the State because it will provide the planning for, perhaps, 100 years to come. Therefore, we must pay particular attention to its provisions. Its broad concept has my approval. It will set up an authority and an appeal board, and

an interim plan is provided. Also financial matters and compensation are dealt with. However, I have some doubts about one or two features, and I hope that these matters will be considered by the Government.

The Bill will cover the whole of the State, not only the metropolitan area, and this is a major change from the existing Act, which deals mainly with the metropolitan area. The development report brought down a few years ago dealt with the metropolitan area, too. Many of the provisions of the Bill will be concentrated on the extended metropolitan area including the fringe areas surrounding the metropolitan area as it is defined in the Constitution Act. I do not intend to deal with those facets covered effectively by the member for Alexandra yesterday. I shall deal with the provisions for compensation. Part VII deals with land taken or compulsorily acquired for use as a reserve, for widening, or for general purposes. However, no mention appears to be made of compensation for zoning. An integral part of the Bill deals with zoning or rezoning. Clause 63 (2) provides:

> The authority may, with the approval of the Minister . . . acquire or take land for the purpose of developing it and making it suitable for any purpose for which the land is proposed to be, or is, reserved . . . under any authorized development plan.

The important part of that clause is where it states that the authority may acquire or take land for the purpose of developing it. Clause 63 (3) provides:

> The Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act (with some exceptions) . . . shall apply and have effect in relation to the acquisition or taking of land under this section.

Therefore, compensation is payable in certain cases, and the clause sets out how compensation will be arrived at and processed and how the landholder may apply for compensation. As I understand it, that compensation is payable only on land taken or acquired by the authority. Clause 29 provides:

> . . . the authority shall conduct an examination of the planning area and make an assessment of its future development, and for that purpose shall have regard to the following matters:
> (*c*) the classification or zoning of districts within the planning area for residential, commercial, industrial, rural or other purposes in order to meet the future needs of the community within the planning area;
> (*d*) whether any part of the planning area should be redeveloped, either comprehensively or otherwise, in order to rectify existing conditions of bad or unsatisfactory lay-out or unhealthy or obsolete development.

It can be seen that the authority has power to conduct an examination for a planning area in which rezoning, redevelopment or reclassification is an integral part of the plan. The plans and their implementation are provided for in Part IV. Clause 36 (4) provides:

> . . . a planning regulation may—
> (*a*) define any zone or locality for specified purposes and purposes ancillary thereto;
> (*b*) regulate, restrict or prohibit, either absolutely or subject to any prescribed conditions—
> (i) the development of any land or any class of land within any zone or locality.

Subparagraph (ii) deals with a specified zone or locality within the planning area, and subparagraph (iii) deals with the mode of construction within the zone. Paragraph (*c*) (i) provides:

> An existing building or structure within the planning area shall not be altered, enlarged or extended for the purposes of its existing use without the consent of the authority or the council within whose area the building or structure is situated.

Therefore, the regulation that would be made under the authority deals with zoning and redevelopment. The compensation clauses deal only with land taken for a specific purpose. There appears to be no compensation payable for zoning.

I refer to this because of cases that have been brought to my notice only recently. In these cases rezoning and resubdivision have caused definite hardship to the ratepayers concerned. People established in this area for many years now find that their operations are to be restricted and that no compensation is payable. I refer members to the Hindmarsh corporation by-law recently laid on the table of this House. I moved for the disallowance of that by-law because I was hoping (as others were) that this Bill, which came out the day after the by-laws were to expire, would provide for compensation. At this stage, to meet the wishes of the House, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

EXCESSIVE RENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments be insisted on.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference, at which the House of Assembly would be represented by the Hons. D. N. Brookman and D. A. Dunstan, and Messrs. Freebairn, Hudson, and Ryan.

INHERITANCE (FAMILY PROVISION) BILL.

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to the conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 3.30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 15.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 15, at 2 p.m.