HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 18, 1975

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

PETITION: BUS DEPOT

Mr. MATHWIN presented a petition signed by 250 residents of Morphettville, Glengowrie, Oaklands, Parkholme, and surrounding suburbs, stating that the building of a Tramway Trust bus depot at the corner of Morphett and Oaklands Road would add to the congestion of traffic, endanger the lives of children attending schools in the area, increase noise and air pollution in the area, and rob them of their heritage of one of the oldest vineyards in the State, and praying that the House of Assembly take the necessary action to prevent the building of the bus depot.

Petition received.

PETITION: FEMALE TITLE

Mr. BECKER presented a petition signed by 72 electors of South Australia stating that they took exception to the Government's decision to address all women as Ms without allowing them to choose to continue to be addressed as Miss or Mrs. if they wished, and praying that the House of Assembly would ask the Government to rescind its decision and save taxpayers unnecessary expense in having departments change the present practice.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

CORNY POINT SCHOOLHOUSE

In reply to Mr. BOUNDY (February 25).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member has said, the Principal of the Corny Point school is now housed in a rented building, the lease of which expires at the end of 1975. It seems that no other suitable alternative accommodation is available, and therefore the housing programme will be examined to see when a residence can be supplied at Corny Point. When this information is available, I shall be pleased to convey it to the honourable member.

PORT BROUGHTON SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. VENNING (March 5).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Education Department is aware of the desirability of replacing the existing classroom facilities at Port Broughton Area School. However, the lack of finance available for replacement schools has meant that, to date, there has been no opportunity to transfer Port Broughton from the list of projects referred to the Public Buildings Department for inclusion in future design programmes.

MOTOR REGISTRATION DIVISION

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (March 4).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Definite information as to an intended site for the Modbury branch of the Motor Registration Division cannot be given at this stage, as negotiations with the developer have not been completed. Nevertheless, it is hoped that the branch will be open before the end of this year.

MOUNT BARKER BRIDGE

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (March 12).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is expected that the bridge over the South-Eastern Freeway at Mount Barker will be opened to traffic in June, 1975. Present advance programming for the Strathalbyn-Wistow district road does not contemplate completion before 1979. This is because of the limited funds now available, and expected to be available up to that year, for rural arterial roads. However, the Highways Department is conscious of the desirability of expediting this project, and an investigation is being carried out into the possibility of allocating a higher priority to this work.

PORT AUGUSTA TRAFFIC

In reply to Mr. KENEALLY (March 11).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When the intersections of Victoria Terrace and Carlton Parade and Victoria Terrace and Flinders Terrace were designed, provision was made for the installation of traffic signals at a later date when traffic volumes increased sufficiently to justify this action. As an interim measure, a roundabout was provided at the Victoria Terrace and Carlton Parade intersection and "stop" sign control was installed at the Victoria Terrace and Flinders Terrace intersection. These controls are considered appropriate for present traffic conditions and volumes. The Highways Department will continue to keep the operation of these intersections under review, and will take action to install traffic signals when the traffic volumes increase sufficiently to justify such measures.

ROYAL PARK SCHOOL TRANSPORT

In reply to Mr. OLSON (March 5).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Because all existing buses in the area are fully committed at this time, the only service that could be provided for the Royal Park High School for students who live in the Semaphore Park area is a bus arriving at the school not later than 8.10 a.m. or at 9.5 a.m. after being released from existing service commitments. However, when the Municipal Tramways Trust previously intended to operate services that arrived at the school at 8.20 a.m. and 8.50 a.m., the proposal was rejected by the school principal on the following grounds:

(*a*) Teachers were not willing to attend as early as 8.20 a.m. to supervise students arriving at that hour, and he was unwilling to have unsupervised students on the school premises.

(*b*) As school begins at 8.50 a.m., an 8.50 a.m. bus arrival time was unacceptable, having regard to the time required for students to alight and proceed to classes.

STUDENT TEACHERS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many student teachers were enrolled in each of the teacher training colleges for each of the scholastic years 1970 to 1975 inclusive?

2. How many were enrolled in each year of the course?

3. What number of students received financial support from the Education Department in each of the subject years?

4. What numbers of students had financial support withdrawn after having commenced the course as financed students?

5. What were the reasons for withdrawal of finance?

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

1. It should be noted that before the commencement of the elimination of the bond, students admitted to a university under an Education Department scholarship were normally attached to either Adelaide or Sturt Colleges of Advanced Education. Since the beginning of 1974, no Education

Department scholarships were offered to students entering university for the first time, and some second-year students were given the option of switching to a Commonwealth tertiary allowance. The figures for Adelaide and Sturt in 1974 and 1975 reflect this change, which will have a progressive impact, as the previously bonded students progress through their courses. At the University of Adelaide in 1971, and the Institute of Technology in 1972, and at Flinders University in 1973, some students were awarded Education Department scholarships without being attached to any college. The first unbonded students were introduced in 1973, and the figures for that year and subsequent years reflect the number of these students as follows:

1970	
Adelaide	1 292
Sturt	1 113
Salisbury	284
Murray Park	895
Torrens	896
	4 480
1971	
Adelaide	1 306
Sturt	1 309
Salisbury	567
Murray Park	902
Torrens	904
Adelaide University	52
	5 040
1972	
Adelaide	1 360
Sturt	1 414
Salisbury	828
Murray Park	837
Torrens	939
Adelaide University	118
S.A. Institute of Technology	2
	5 498
1973	
Adelaide	1 348
Sturt	1 539
Salisbury	896
Murray Park	892
Torrens	1 014
Adelaide University	142
Flinders University	50
S.A. Institute of Technology	15
	5 896
1974	
Adelaide	1 124
Sturt	1 311
Salisbury	957
Murray Park	916
Torrens	1 069
Adelaide University	143
Flinders University	45
S.A. Institute of Technology	8
	5 573
1975	
Adelaide	1 035
Sturt	1 249
Salisbury	841
Murray Park	992
Torrens	1 070
Adelaide University	115
Flinders University	87
S.A. Institute of Technology	7
	5 396

2. The number of first and second-year students in 1974 and 1975 reflect the progressive discontinuation of awarding bonded scholarships to students entering university:

1970	
Year 1	1 786
Year 2	1 352
Year 3	912
Year 4	367
Year 5	61
1971	
Year 1	1 936
Year 2	1 558
Year 3	1 078
Year 4	411
Year 5	57
1972	
Year 1	1 916
Year 2	1 655
Year 3	1 405
Year 4	458
Year 5	64
1973	
Year 1	1 911
Year 2	1 776
Year 3	1 570
Year 4	585
Year 5	54
1974	
Year 1	1 580
Year 2	1 623
Year 3	1 647
Year 4	655
Year 5	68
1975	
Year 1	1 348
Year 2	1 597
Year 3	1 610
Year 4	766
Year 5	75

3. The number of students on allowance in 1974 and 1975 reflects the discontinuation of the award of bonded scholarships to university students. The figures below include both students under bond and those who have been on unbonded scholarships at a lower rate:

1970	4 204
1971	4 741
1972	5 134
1973	5 529
1974	5 097
1975	4 783

4.

1970	113
1971	140
1972	101
1973	141
1974	77

5. Courses were terminated for academic failure or on medical grounds.

JOINT COMMITTEES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many joint committees or other consultative bodies are there now in existence with representation from State and Commonwealth Government departments?

2. What is the title, purpose, membership and date of establishment of each of these bodies?

3. What other joint committees is it intended will be set up, for what purposes, and when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Joint working parties or committees, which involve both State and Commonwealth departments, are so many and so varied and change so regularly with work completed or initiated that it is quite impossible to justify officers working on the compilation of lists of the kind sought.

BIRD SMUGGLING

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What number of prosecutions for infringements of fauna and flora regulations have followed receipt of paid information?

2. How many such payments have been made and for what individual amounts?

3. What amount is outstanding in respect of the reply given to part 2 of question No. 12, on March 11, 1975?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. Four.

2. Four; $33·33, $512·00, and $132·00. The outstanding amount is estimated at $2 000.

3. Estimated at $2 000.

RAILWAYS TAKE-OVER

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What stage has been reached in negotiations for the South Australian railways system to be taken over by the Australian Government?

2. What financial advantages will such a take-over bring to the South Australian Government and to users of rail freight facilities within the State?

3. Is it assured that rail freight rates in South Australia will retain their advantages under an Australian national railways system and will not be increased to the higher levels of other states, particularly Tasmania?

4. Does the planned take-over include suburban services and, if so, how will the Government ensure that the Australian national railways provides these services at the required level?

5. Will the Minister investigate the feasibility of suburban commuter services being provided by the national body under charter to the State Government, to schedules, levels of service and charges laid down by the State, in a manner similar to the provision by the Canadian National Railway in Toronto?

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

1. Negotiations are still very much in the preliminary stage.

2. Until negotiations are further advanced, it is not intended to make public the details.

3. 4. and 5. See 2 above.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What sections of the South Australian railways are being considered for transfer to the Australian Government?

2. What financial remuneration is being offered by the Australian Government for part of the South Australian railways?

3. What is the future of Islington workshops?

4. Will Parliament have the opportunity by way of legislation to accept or reject the offer by the Australian Government?

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

1. Non-urban.

2. Not determined at this stage.

3. As 2 above.

4. As 2 above.

TRAMWAYS TRUST

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. When is it intended that the Municipal Tramways Trust will vacate its present depot at Hackney?

2. What future use is planned for this property?

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

1. This has not been determined.

2. This has not been determined.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many Volvo buses have been ordered by the Municipal Tramways Trust?

2. What is the monetary value of this order?

3. When are these buses due for delivery?

4. Will it be possible to air-condition them and, if not, why not?

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

1. 310 Volvo chassis.

2. About $10 700 000.

3. Delivery of these chassis is expected to commence in August, 1975, in Adelaide.

4. It is planned to install an evaporative air-cooling system in these buses.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): Has the Municipal Tramways Trust cancelled orders for any new Leyland buses and, if so—

(*a*) how many buses were involved;

(*b*) what was the value of the order;

(*c*) why was the order cancelled;

(*d*) through which agent were the buses ordered; and

(*e*) what was the expected date of delivery of these buses?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No.

RAIL FARES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Have any metropolitan railway passenger fares been reduced within the last four weeks and, if so, when?

2. If fares were reduced which and why?

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

1. No.

2. See 1 above.

MONARTO

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What is the justification for going on with the new city of Monarto?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Monarto has, as one of its objectives, the diversion of some of the growth of Adelaide over the next 25 years. The alternatives to the diversion of growth are the continuation of urban sprawl on the Adelaide Plains, or considerable redevelopment at the centre of the city. Some parts of Adelaide may be redeveloped in that time, but redevelopment of inner or suburban areas of Adelaide, as advocated by some critics as an alternative to Monarto, would almost certainly be a slow and costly procedure. If undertaken by government, it would involve the acquisition of existing properties, demolition and/or rehabilitation of buildings, resubdivision and development. A source of funds would have to be identified.

Because such redevelopment would be a relatively slow process, and would as in other States be undertaken mostly by the private sector (assisted by rezoning and possibly other legislative action), it would have little effect on reducing the increasing growth pressures elsewhere in the metropolitan area; for example, Noarlunga in the south and the peripheral subdivisional areas in the north, where burgeoning development and urban demand is already threatening valuable rural land. The obvious way to relieve these kind of pressures is to provide an urban alternative, reasonably close to, but outside the metropolitan area, which can be developed quickly and relatively cheaply on land not of great value for other purposes. This is the system city concept on which Monarto is based (in contrast to that of a completely decentralised city which, because of additional infrastructure requirements, such as ports, railways, highways, etc., would be a much more costly proposition).

Monarto is intended as South Australia's system city, which, although far enough away from Adelaide to enable separate urban development to take place, is close enough to take advantage of existing major public infrastructures in the capital city. This will provide a least-cost development which, if proceeded with quickly, will offer the urban alternative which will reduce existing subdivisional pressures on Adelaide. The population projections set out in the Borrie report are not strictly relevant to the development of Monarto in its initial stages. Monarto is being planned to accommodate a population of between 25 000 and 35 000 people by 1983, a population whose sources have already been identified; for example, public servants in the three departments to be relocated plus their families; permanent construction workers and their families; other public and private employees who will provide city service amenities and commercial activities; the regional backlog of people who are now employed in the region but who will move to Monarto; and the employees of some industry, which is expected to be established at Monarto by 1983.

After 1983, to the year 2000, the rate of development at Monarto will depend on circumstances then to be determined, and it is too early at this stage to predict what these circumstances will be. However, there is no reason to suppose that Monarto will not reach a maximum size of about 180 000 people by about the turn of the century, allowing a margin of say about 10 years. In the meantime, it would be expected that the city would be fully viable on a population of about 50 000 people and possibly less. Declining birth rates, which result in a slackening of the growth rate of the population, documented by the Borrie report, do not mean that the demand on urban facilities (that is, building blocks, public services, housing, etc.), will slacken at the same rate.

Indeed, it is unlikely that there will be any slackening of demand for such facilities in the short or medium term. This substantial lag effect will ensure that there will be a continuing pressure in the Adelaide metropolitan area for land, housing, and facilities, which cannot be provided in the Adelaide metropolitan area without aggravating the present situation. Monarto provides the safety valve for relieving such pressures. There is, therefore, no logical or economic alternative to Monarto. If the critics of the project can demonstrate otherwise by submitting specific proposals, the Government would be interested to hear of them. Nor does there seem to be any other location near Adelaide suitable for a system city, a location which would provide relatively cheap land, not required for rural purposes, a link with existing rail and road systems, and in consequence, port and harbor and other city facilities and which will be attractive to industry because of those links which are available to Eastern States. Monarto has a location which with adequate planning controls to preserve the hills face zone, the hills area near Nairne and the Bremer Valley, as rural or public areas, will ensure that corridor urban development does not take place, as the other essential links with Adelaide are maintained.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What consideration has been given to the paper "Can the People Trust the Planners?" published by the South Australian Council of Social Service, Incorporated, in response to the document "The Social Plan for Monarto"?

2. Will the social planning process involved in the development of Monarto be deferred until it can be furthered in co-operation with potential residents of Monarto, allowing for the participation of the people most closely concerned?

3. If there is to be no delay, why not?

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

1. The report "Can the People Trust the Planners?" issued by the South Australian Council of Social Service, Incorporated, was in fact a formal reply to a covering letter from the Monarto Development Commission in connection with the draft document "The Social Plan for Monarto, Section 1, Methodology". About 250 copies of the methodology have been distributed to Government departments, voluntary organisations, professional organisations, academics, libraries, and interested laymen. Thus far the commision's request for criticism of the document has resulted in 37 replies being received. The reply of the South Australian Council of Social Service, Incorporated, and all other replies to this draft document will be analysed and a final methodology report will result from this public participation process.

2. No, the social planning process will not be deferred.

3. It will not be deferred because the commission sees this aspect of planning as part of the overall integrated planning process. To hold up the social planning process would result in social factors not being given sufficient consideration in the overall planning process.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): When, if at all, is it now expected that the indenture Bill concerning the Redcliff petro-chemical project will be introduced in Parliament?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The project is now being reviewed by all the parties concerned. Studies are in progress to reassess the availability of Cooper Basin feedstocks in the light of the revised start-up date for the intended plant. Other outstanding matters receiving attention over the next few months include the terms of supply for natural gas and feedstocks, the basis of financing the infrastructure, and the confirmation of markets in relation to production cost estimates. The environmental study programme is continuing in any case and, when the review of these matters is complete, it should be possible to give an indication of when the indenture would come before Parliament.

FEMALE TITLE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the Government intend to insist on the use of the sexist, improper, and discriminatory description of men by their occupation and women by their marital status and, if so, why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. Forms will be revised as they are reordered, so that men and women will be described on an identical basis.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What does the Government intend as the plural of "Ms", and how is such plural to be pronounced?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far as I am aware the plural is the same as the singular. It is not intended to use the term orally, unless the woman addressed has indicated such a preference.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How long is it expected to take to alter all records in State Government departments from "Mrs." and "Miss" to "Ms"?

2. How much will it cost to alter them?

3. What is the purpose of making such change?

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

1. It is not intended to alter existing records. Any new records created will use Miss or Mrs., if the woman concerned has indicated her marital status as such. In the

absence of an indication (and forms, etc. will no longer seek such information), departments will use Ms.

2. See 1. There will be no extra cost.

3. The purpose is to give women parity with men.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Government received any protests at the decision that State Government departments are to substitute the prefix "Ms" for the prefixes "Miss" and "Mrs." and, if so, how many?

2. What form have such protests taken?

3. What action has been taken as a result of them?

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

1. Yes, but number not known.

2. About 70 letters to the Premier's Department: the number of the phone calls has not been recorded.

3. Acknowledgments will be sent together with a copy of a new circular setting out policy in greater detail.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. How many student teachers are being trained at the Torrens College of Advanced Education for work in special education for children with learning difficulties?

2. Are any other colleges of advanced education training student teachers for this work and, if so, which are they and how many students are involved?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The situation with regard to training of teachers concerned with exceptional children of all kinds, is that all colleges provide some background in undergraduate courses about the needs of such children. Salisbury College, for example, has 22 non-diplomates doing special education as an option, with the diploma of teaching. In addition, they have 10 students doing an advanced diploma in the teaching of slow-learning children within the normal classroom. Torrens College, in 1975, has 16 students undertaking a course known as adaptive and remedial education for teachers of exceptional children in ordinary classes, 11 students being trained as teachers of hearing handicapped children, and 42 students being trained in undergraduate and advanced diploma courses as teachers of a variety of exceptional children.

EDUCATION EXPENSES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): Has the South Australian Government made any approach to the Commonwealth Government to have the $400 tax deduction for education expenses restored and, if not, why not?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It has been suggested to the Australian Government that instead of an education tax deduction there should be a flat rate rebate of tax for each dollar spent on education up to a limit of expenditure of $400 a student.

CLASS SIZES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): What were average class sizes in South Australian Government primary and secondary schools for the last 10 years?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The following figures show the average class sizes for primary schools for the period 1965 to 1974, inclusive. Rural schools, special rural schools, and special schools such as Aboriginal schools, have not been included, because they are atypical and would distort the average figures:

Year	Class I schools Prim.	Class I schools Inf.	Class II schools Prim.	Class II schools Inf.	Class III schools	Class IV schools	Class I-IV schools	No. of teachers concerned
1965	36·9	37·2	36·5	37·6	34·8	29·3	35·2	3 492
1966	36·6	35·9	36·5	36·9	35·8	29·9	35·2	3 552
1967	36·5	35·9	36·7	35·6	35·6	30·1	35·1	3 618
1968	35·6	34·2	35·4	35·1	33·9	28·7	34·0	3 801
1969	35·5	35·1	35·1	34·6	34·2	27·9	33·9	3 859
1970	34·2	34·5	35·2	35·1	33·6	27·4	31·6	3 836
1971	34·5	34·3	34·2	33·4	32·1	24·4	33·0	4 000
*1972	33·3	31·7	32·5	31·4	30·0	23·0	31·7	4 097
*1973	31·9	32·0	31·6	32·7	29·2	23·1	29·4	4 235
*1974	30·5	31·1	31·0	31·2	28·4	22·0	29·8	4 380

* Includes Open Space

Average class sizes for secondary schools are as shown in the table hereunder. These statistics were not kept for technical high schools, area and special rural schools before 1968:

Year	High schools	Technical high schools	Area and special rural	Total
1965	36			
1966	35			
1967	35			
1968	35	32	18·1	31·9
1969	34·6	31·3	18·8	31·8
1970	34	30·3	18·5	31·4
1971	33·9	29·0	18·5	31·0
1972	32·9	27·4	18·7	30·1
1973	31·1	27·1	18·5	29·1
1974	28·8	24·8	16·9	27·1

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. How many relieving teachers employed by the Education Department have been used in independent schools this year, and for what periods of time?

2. How many Education Department schools are sharing facilities with independent schools this year?

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

1. No statistics or records are kept regarding relieving teachers who are employed in independent schools.

2. Arrangements have been made for students at Rostrevor College to use craft facilities at Morialta High School when they are available. In addition, evening classes are arranged by the Department of Further Education whereby independent schools use Education Department and Further Education Department facilities. Students from Rostrevor, St. Peters, and Westminster Colleges attend woolclassing classes at Marleston Technical College. Westminster students attend Mitchell Park High School for junior electronics, metalwork, and woodwork. Prince Alfred College students attend Croydon High School for general metalwork. Students from Immanuel College attend Mitchell Park for junior electronics. Students from Prince Alfred College also take correspondence classes in woolclassing and meat inspection at the South Australian College of External Studies. Several other informal arrangements are involving Government and independent schools including, for example, some co-operative use of facilities between Strathmont High School and St. Paul's College.

MOBILE EDUCATION UNITS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. How many mobile outdoor education units with equipment and trained staff to take students on educational camps are operating in South Australia at present?

2. What plans exist for future activity in this area?

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

1. One.

2. There is at present a committee investigating outdoor education, and it is expected that a report will be submitted within a fortnight. Plans for future activity in this area will depend on the recommendations contained in the report.

MATRICULATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): Is it intended that the Matriculation examination be abolished and, if so, when?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Any change in Matriculation requirements would require the agreement of the universities and the colleges of advanced education. Entry requirements have been modified in several respects over the last few years, and this process is likely to continue.

VOCATIONAL COURSES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. How many secondary schools in South Australia have vocational courses involving work experience outside the school?

2. What are the courses offered?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is only one purely vocational course, that for nurses at Port Adelaide High School. Some prevocational courses provided by technical colleges hold an interest for certain secondary students. Year 12 students from Croydon High School have been involved with Kilkenny Technical College, Mitcham with Panorama Technical College, and Christies Beach with O'Halloran Hill Technical College. These courses are instructional rather than vocational. If commercial courses can be described as vocational (and of all widely offered subjects these come closest to being vocationally oriented), high schools (with the exception of boys' schools) and some area schools offer all or some of the following subjects: shorthand, business typing, commerce, clerical studies, and business calculations.

Various schools in both city and country are experimenting with work experience programmes. These are activities undertaken for a limited time unconnected with any vocational course. There is not a complete list available of schools involved in work experience programmes, but the following schools are among those offering some kind of experience in the community involving a work activity: Christies Beach, Taperoo, Goodwood, Elizabeth West, Playford, Seaton Boys, Marion, Mitchell Park, Balaklava, Kadina, and Mannum High Schools, and Maitland Area School.

TEACHER RESIGNATIONS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. Has there been any noticeable drop in teacher resignations from the Education Department in the last three years?

2. How many teachers have resigned in each year of these years?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The total number of teachers that resigned in the last three years has been relatively stable. However, the resignation rate expressed as a percentage of teachers employed has fallen significantly. Relative figures are as follows:

	1972	1973	1974
Total resignations	1 555	1 435	1 527
Percentage loss	14·37	12·71	12·22

CHILD-CARE CENTRES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. How many community centres for children as young as 2½ years of age are under construction in South Australia at present, and how many will be completed this year?

2. Where are they located?

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

1. Two child-care centres are at present under construction.

2. East Terrace, Adelaide, and Waterloo Corner Road, Salisbury North. Thirteen other child-care centres have been approved for funding, and these will be located at:

Stepney	Port Adelaide
Christie Downs	Athol Park
Millicent	Adelaide
Whyalla	Brompton
Elizabeth	Campbelltown
Mount Gambier	Nangwarry
Port Augusta	

It is likely that some of these centres will be completed this year.

DARWIN CHILDREN

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): How many children evacuated from Darwin are estimated still to be in South Australian schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is estimated that there are about 1 200 children evacuated from Darwin who are at present attending South Australian schools.

SCHOOL VANDALISM

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): Has a security officer been appointed to investigate vandalism in South Australian schools and, if so, what are his duties?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. However, it is hoped that an appointment can be made within the next few months.

MINISTERS' OVERSEA VISITS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): What oversea visits are planned by Ministers in the near future?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney-General plans to attend a conference in Toronto in September. The Minister of Transport intends to attend a Local Government Ministers' Conference in New Zealand from Saturday, March 29, 1975. The Minister of Agriculture intends to visit Middle East countries in May, 1975. The Minister of Development and Mines intends to visit North America, Europe, Libya, Japan, and South-East Asia from May 16 to July 7, 1975.

RESERVOIRS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. Are any new reservoirs contemplated on the Torrens River in the Cudlee Creek area and, if so, when will the reservoirs be constructed?

2. Are any land acquisitions likely to occur in the near future?

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

1. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has developed a long-range plan for augmenting the headworks of the metropolitan Adelaide water supply system, which includes another reservoir on the Torrens River below Cudlee Creek. It is expected that this storage would not be required before the late 1990's.

2. No.

NARACOORTE CAVES

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. How many people visited Naracoorte Caves during 1973 and 1974 respectively?

2. What income has been received from visitors to the caves and from the caravan park, respectively, in this period?

3. What amounts have been spent during these years on (*a*) capital development; and (*b*) maintenance?

4. Is it Government policy to upgrade facilities to attract more visitors to the cave complex?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. Naracoorte Caves attendance figures:

1973	47 522
1974	59 314

2. Income received from:

(*a*) Caves—

1973	$17 763
1974	$22 655

(*b*) Caravan Park—

1973	971
1974	2 359

3. No major capital works were carried out at Naracoorte Caves during the years referred to, nor can information be segregated for the total cost of maintenance works during those years. During the present financial year, $1 650 will be spent on minor capital works and $1 900 on maintenance. An amount of $80 000 has been provided by an Australian Government tourist grant, with a similar commitment from State sources for the construction of an interpretative centre and toilet facilities at Naracoorte.

4. It is the policy to upgrade the caves facilities to attract more visitors. However, emphasis will be to:

(1) Upgrade the present caves open to the public.

(2) Upgrade the outstanding features of the area, that is, fossil deposits—

(*a*) Improve facilities for visitors in the fossil chambers of Victoria Caves;

(*b*) provide interpretative facilities in the new centre to be constructed.

(3) Devise more modern approaches to facilitate visitors by providing a walk-through principle, psychological barriers and a live and active display at the fossil bed.

NARACOORTE LAND

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. What area of land does the Housing Trust hold in Naracoorte township?

2. What was the purchase price of each specific area?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The details are as follows:

	Acreage	Price $	Year
Sections 1048, 1049, 1052, 1053	about 40·5	10 136	19/11/57
Part section 27	about 21·0	33 000	15/8/74
Part 653	about 16·2	45 360	21/11/74

The trust also holds 31 scattered allotments bought from individual vendors throughout the town.

COASTAL DUNES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What area of coastal sand dune is being purchased by the Woodville City Council with the $225 000 grant from the Australian Government?

2. What is the total amount being spent on this purchase of land?

3. Who now owns the land that is being purchased?

4. What will the land be used for once it has been purchased?

5. Was the land owned by the State Government at any time during the last 10 years and, if so, what was its value and to whom was it sold?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. None. However, the Government is negotiating with West Lakes Limited regarding the purchase of an area of coastal sand dunes south of Estcourt House. It is unlikely that the $225 000 grant from the National Estate Programme of the Australian Government will be sufficient to obtain all of the area involved, so the Coast Protection Board has agreed to spend $250 000 of its funds, if necessary, to assist with the purchase.

2. As negotiations are proceeding, it is not known what the total cost of purchasing this land will be.

3. Transfer of the title over this land to West Lakes Limited was effected on July 19, 1974.

4. The area is intended to be retained as an example of the dunal land typical of the Adelaide metropolitan coastline before European settlement.

5. The land was owned by the South Australian Government before the passing of the West Lakes indenture in November, 1969, which provided for its transfer to West Lakes Limited for development for residential purposes. The land in question formed part of the large parcel of land involved in the West Lakes development scheme.

STATE PLANNING AUTHORITY

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware that the listed telephone number in the 1974-75 telephone directory for the State Planning Authority is incorrect?

2. Why has the Government not taken action to ensure that people ringing this number are informed by a recording of the correct telephone number?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, as is the listed telephone number for the Minister of Environment and Conservation, the Director of Environment and Conservation, and the following divisions of the Environment and Conservation Department—Administrative, Environment, Coast Protection and State Planning. It was intended that the number listed be in use early this year and was printed to prevent confusion over most of the year.

However, technical difficulties have delayed the Postmaster-General's Department bringing it into use. The new number (87 0461) was listed specifically at the request of the Postmaster-General's Department. Current indications from that department are that the equipment will be installed by June, 1975.

2. The question is not understood. The listed number is that now in use for the Community Welfare Department, where staff are on switchboard duty during official hours and advise callers of the correct number.

LEGAL DELAYS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Following the feature article in the *Advertiser* of February 22, 1975, can the Minister indicate whether he or the Ombudsman has received similar complaints of delays in legal cases?

2. If similar complaints of delay have been received, what are the most common causes of such delays?

3. What action is the Government taking to minimise legal delays and costs?

4. Is it intended to institute a public inquiry to investigate delays within the legal profession and legal structure, and means of reducing these delays?

5. How many civil cases are now awaiting trial before the Supreme Court?

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

1. From time to time I receive complaints about delays in hearing civil cases, and each complaint is investigated. The Ombudsman has, on occasion, referred a complaint of this nature to me; again an investigation is always carried out.

2. There is probably no common cause of such delays, except in so far as there is a waiting time for Supreme Court civil trials.

3. The Government has no control of the situation where delays are due to protracted negotiations between the parties and court action results from an ultimate failure to compromise or settle. Once a case is set down for trial then the court has control of the situation, and both the court and the Government have recently taken action to minimise such delays. The Government passed legislation increasing the jurisdiction of the Local Court to $20 000. This will have the effect of removing some matters from the Supreme Court, and thus shortening the waiting period. Legislation was also passed setting up a small claims court within the Local and District Criminal Courts Department. This will not only facilitate the handling of small claims, but also reduce costs to the parties concerned. The Supreme Court is currently preparing amendments to its Rules, which are designed specifically to minimise costs. These Rules will be made shortly. That court is also planning to introduce new administrative procedures to reduce delays and costs and is also taking action to see that as many cases as possible can be transferred to the Local Court to be dealt with by that court in its enlarged jurisdiction. Every effort is being made to minimise delays in the civil list. The need for a further judge or judges is under review.

4. No, a public inquiry is not planned.

5. There are 416 cases that have been set down for trial and not finally disposed of. This figure includes some part-heard cases.

HOUSE LOANS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether he has been informed by the boards of either the State Bank of South Australia or the Savings Bank of South Australia that they will reduce the rate of interest on house loans in step with actions being taken by other major banks throughout Australia? Two weeks ago I asked the Premier whether he was aware of any move by either of these banks to reduce the interest rate on house loans following an announcement by one of the major trading banks that it intended to take such action itself. The Premier replied that the boards of both banks would be examining the position of interest rates and advising the Government on the matter. Since that time a succession of announcements of interest reductions has been made by major banks, so why cannot the State Bank and the Savings Bank take similar action? This question is of critical importance because of the disastrous situation in South Australia concerning the cost of houses. At the weekend it was reported that the cost of an average house in Adelaide had soared by almost $10 000 in less than three years, and it has now been announced in Canberra that South Australia led the way in increases for house-building materials in the 12 months to January, our increase having been a staggering 26·1 per cent. Since house owners now need to borrow so much more money to buy a house and interest repayments are therefore major expenses for most people, I ask whether the Premier is aware of any move by either the State Bank or the Savings Bank to ease the burden on hard-hit South Australians by reducing interest rates.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not yet been informed by the Chairman of either bank board of any further move in interest rates by the banks. I point out to the Leader that the banks are running concessional interest rate schemes for house loans, with rates considerably below rates charged by private banking systems.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier seen recent reports that indicate that house-building approvals in South Australia have taken a sharp drop to be at their lowest level for many years? At the same time, building costs in South Australia show the sharpest increase of any State. Will the Premier therefore explain to the House the reason for these two factors, which are so seriously affecting many young couples who wish to build their own houses, and say what action, if any, he intends to take to alleviate this situation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Already I have told the House the reason for the increase in building costs. The major increase in building materials costs is in the area of imported timber, for which the increase has soared markedly. Imported timber is a significant component in South Australian house building because, given the kind of soils that we have, many of our houses are built in a timber frame form of construction. I am aware that there has been a considerable drop in house-building approvals in previously reported quarters, but I point out to the honourable member that the amount of money available for housing from public sources has expanded in the past two months by over $12 000 000. Consequently, there will be a considerable stimulus in house building from the public sector.

Mr. Coumbe: If they can afford it!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The provisions for borrowing have been made more generous: it has been made easier for people to borrow than has been the case previously.

Dr. Eastick: The cost—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I point out to the honourable member that a much higher proportion of funds is available for house assistance in South Australia from public sources than is available in any Liberal-governed State. It is more than twice the maximum provided in any other State in Australia.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Works, as Leader of the House, tell the House the legislative programme and what will be the sittings of the House for the remainder of this session before Parliament prorogues?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. The programme for this week has been circulated to honourable members and I think they will appreciate, because of the amount of business on that sheet, that it may not be possible for them to be able to participate in grievance debates this week, and it will almost certainly—

Mr. Dean Brown: We have lost—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This can be arranged easily, if the member for Davenport wants it. I can apply the guillotine and he also can have his privileges.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: However, I do not intend to do that. I warn honourable members that they should be prepared to sit on Thursday evening this week. The Government does not intend to sit next week on Maundy Thursday as a separate sitting, but it intends to sit on Wednesday and, if necessary, to continue through until Thursday morning to complete the business that the Government has set down.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether the member for Davenport wants to hear the reply.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Davenport consistently infringes Standing Orders, he will suffer the consequences. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I repeat that the Government does not intend to sit on Thursday, but it intends on Wednesday to complete the business that it has set down, even if we must sit through until Thursday morning. I should hope that we did not have to sit too late during this week. Nevertheless, we will do what we must do to get through the business. Next week there will be second reading debates on Bills that the Government wants to stand over until June this year. The Government intends to recommence on June 10 and to sit for about three weeks. In other words, the House will not be prorogued, and this session will be completed in June. Then the House will prorogue, the intention being to reconvene late in July. I do not think I need say any more about the programme of business, as I think what I have said is perfectly clear. However, I repeat that we may have to sit this week on Thursday evening and that we will return to complete this session on June 10 this year.

CHARITABLE COLLECTIONS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Treasurer say whether the Government has considered taking any action to ensure that the public interest is protected by organisers of public charity appeals? From time to time, several public appeals are held by reputable charitable organisations. When interviewed about these appeals, the Treasurer has said that the Government will provide a $2 for $1 subsidy for sums collected, provided that the money is put into a building account. It is generally accepted that the main purpose of holding public appeals is to collect money for building purposes. I understand some confusion has arisen in relation to the recent appeal for victims of the Darwin cyclone. Conflict seems to exist with regard to the sum promised, the sum actually collected, and the disbursement of the moneys. Members will realise that, although certain sums are promised, they are not all received by the organisers of the appeal. Has the Government considered taking action to protect the public interest? Could a balance sheet be made available publicly showing the amount actually raised, and the sum credited to the building account that will attract the $2 for $1 subsidy? Does the Government set aside fund money to meet that subsidy, if and when it is needed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was no offer of a Government subsidy in the case of the Darwin cyclone relief appeal.

Mr. Becker: No, I didn't mean to—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Regarding the Darwin relief, the position is that the Lord Mayor's fund was established, and the Government provided $100 000 for that appeal. That was not provided as a subsidy on anything else: it was a simple outright provision from the South Australian Government. Whatever extra was raised was not then the subject of a subsidy, but was simply part of the moneys of the appeal. In connection with the Darwin relief fund, at one stage there was some dispute between the organisation set up by the Commonwealth Government and that set up by some members of the Northern Territory Legislative Council and the Darwin council. However, I understand that any differences on that score have in fact been settled. A condition of the Government's subscription to the Lord Mayor's fund was that the money in that fund must go to whatever designated fund was authorised by the Commonwealth Government in Darwin; that is how the money will be disbursed. Other moneys raised by charitable appeals in South Australia are raised under the provisions of the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act. The Chief Secretary's office keeps a watch over collections for charitable purposes that are authorised under its licence, seeing to it that in those cases there are properly audited accounts.

PORT AUGUSTA COURT

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Attorney-General say what plans the Government may have to upgrade court facilities at Port Augusta? As the Attorney-General will know from his own experience, the Port Augusta courthouse does not provide adequate accommodation for people involved in court proceedings. When the Juvenile Court at Port Augusta is in closed session, children and parents who are required to stand outside the courthouse are exposed to the elements and to public view. It is a matter of urgency that either a new courthouse be constructed or additions be made to the existing building. I understand that the existing building has a National Trust A classification, which would prevent its demolition. Indeed, Port Augusta citizens agree that this is a building of historical interest but unfortunately it no longer serves the purpose for which it was constructed.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

FILM CORPORATION

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the South Australian Film Corporation is exempt from the provisions of the Models and Mannequins Award of South Australia? I have been told that the corporation employs models for film and other work but does not pay the award rate, which is $16 an hour. Mr. Gordon Phillis, of 638 Goodwood Road, Daw Park, was asked to model for the corporation for one hour. It took him about half an hour to go from his place of work and then change; he then did the hour's modelling, and it took him about another half hour to return to work. However, as he was not paid, he telephoned the corporation and asked whether he could be paid and, after being duck-shoved around by three or four people, a Mr. Cochrane said that the fee normally paid was the scheduled casual rate, namely, $14 a day. Mr. Phillis complained, and he was then told he would be paid $7·50 for the hour's work he had done as a model. Is the corporation exempt from this award and, if it is not, will the Minister investigate this situation to see whether the corporation is paying the award rate to its employees?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Mannequins and models are covered by a Commonwealth award. However, if the honourable member cares to give me any details he may have, I shall be pleased to take up the matter with the appropriate person.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Government introduce legislation immediately to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act so that some of the grave anomalies that exist can be corrected before Parliament rises? Some of the present anomalies in this Act are causing South Australian industries to lose their competitive position with industries in the Eastern States. This is clearly proved by information I released yesterday regarding surveys that had taken place. In addition, figures released at a seminar at the Royal Adelaide Hospital last evening indicated that workmen's compensation premiums collected in South Australia for the year ended June 30, 1974, amounted to about $70 000 000, the estimates from three independent sources ranging between $70 000 000 and $76 000 000. The premiums collected in 1972-73 under the old Act totalled $19 000 000, according to the Bureau of Statistics. That suggests that South Australian industries are now having to pay about an extra $50 000 000 a year for workmen's compensation premiums. It is this $50 000 000 that is causing such a significant increase in production costs.

Yesterday I released information from a survey, which I understand the Government criticised on the basis that it had been conducted among a restricted number of companies. However, I understand that a subsequent survey conducted among a larger number of companies has confirmed the figures I released yesterday. Furthermore, the Attorney-General last evening released statistics taken out by the Australian Bureau of Statistics for the last six months of 1973 and the first six months of 1974. I was the person who went to the bureau originally and asked for that information to be collected, and I have a copy of the relevant original computer print-out. Having examined that document, I believe the information released by the Attorney-General last evening is false, because much of it was obviously not included in the survey. Other information released at the seminar last evening confirmed the figures I quoted on the number of days lost and the increase in the amount being paid out under the Workmen's Compensation Act. It is because South Australian industries are suffering so gravely that I ask this question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Workmen's compensation matters in South Australia are being continually examined. I expect that workmen's compensation legislation will come before the House next session.

Mr. Dean Brown: The Government is always too late.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry explain under what authority his Government can exempt certain industrial organisations from the responsibility for the outrageous charges applicable to Workmen's Compensation Act policies? At a meeting I attended last evening at Booleroo Centre, Mr. John Tidswell and other South Australian Meat Corporation Board colleagues provided certain information. Part of the address included details of annual workmen's compensation premiums relating to Samcor during the past four years. The report was that the respective premiums had been $90 000, $200 000, and $400 000, with the current figure being $1 200 000. These premiums were based on the organisation's wages during the four-year period. This organisation has recently been relieved of this burden, apparently being granted the right by the Minister or the Government to carry its own insurance. I was under the impression that the law regarding workmen's compensation was applicable to all industries and employers throughout the State. Can the Minister explain how exemption or dispensation has been granted in the circumstances to which I have referred?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It is common for certain industries that can carry their own insurance to be exempted, the Minister having the right under the legislation to exempt companies from the need to take out policies with insurance companies, so long as they make other satisfactory provisions. Of course, they are certainly liable to pay workmen's compensation. There is no fear of a workman's not being paid workmen's compensation in the event of an injury; workers are covered. However, some companies are financially able to carry their own liabilities.

RAILWAYS DEPARTMENT

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Transport say why the South Australian Railways Department has not accepted its responsibility for controlling weeds on roads adjacent to railway lines? I have received a letter from a council in my district complaining that, as the department has not co-operated with that council as regards weed control, the council has had to spray weeds and bill the department for the work it has done but that that account has not been paid by the department. There are areas throughout South Australia where the railway line runs parallel to the main road and this situation applies, for instance, at Two Wells and in the area between Gladstone and Georgetown. I have here an account from the Georgetown District Council for the sum of $167·36 for spraying artichokes along the railway line at Georgetown, the sum of $71·74 relating to the spray used, and the balance relating to 12¾ hours spent on this work by a weed unit operator.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member would serve his cause better in this matter if he approached me or the Railways Commissioner, rather than by trying to make an allegation for which he has produced no evidence at all. He has accused the Railways Department of failing to meet its responsibility. I am not interested in the piece of paper the honourable member produces, because it is probably as unreliable as the statement he has just made. When the honourable member provides me with information

that can be investigated in order to determine whether the Railways Department has not engaged in weed eradication, I shall be happy to look at it, but I am not willing to look at the matter on the basis of the accusation made by the honourable member in his question.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Transport obtain information on the Railways Department's increase in revenue of $6 000 000? Is this due to increased charges or additional goods carried by the railways? Also, will the Minister explain why railway expenditure has, in the first eight months of this financial year, increased by 40 per cent, resulting in an additional loss of more than $8 000 000 during this period?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Railways Department budgeted in this financial year for an income of about $3 000 000 more than was actually received last year. The department is now running at about $3 500 000 over the budget; in other words, about $6 500 000 more than the sum for last year. Whilst it is true that this is partly because of rate adjustments, it is mainly because of the efforts of railway officers and employees. I therefore hope that members opposite, including the member for Heysen, will take this opportunity of congratulating the department, rather than criticising it as they normally do. Increased operating costs are principally involved, as a result of award decisions, etc., handed down. However, I will obtain further factual information for the honourable member.

MONARTO

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Government serious in saying that the population of Monarto will be between 25 000 and 35 000 people by 1983, relying on the sources of population enumerated in the Premier's reply to my Question on Notice today? The reply I received today is long, and is in justification of going on with Monarto. The relevant sentences of the reply are as follows:

The population projections set out in the Borrie report are not strictly relevant to the development of Monarto in its initial stages.

I am not sure what the qualification "strictly" means, because they are either relevant or they are not. The reply continues:

Monarto is being planned to accommodate a population of between 25 000 and 35 000 people by 1983; a population whose sources have already been indentified, for example, the public servants in the three departments to be relocated plus their families;—

it seems there will have to be an enormous mushrooming of numbers in those departments—

permanent construction workers and their families; other public and private employees, who will provide city service amenities and commercial activities; the regional backlog of people who are now employed in the region but who will move to Monarto; and the employees of some industry which is expected to be established at Monarto by 1983.

If that is as much as the Government can scrape up to justify a projected population of that number, I am surprised. It looks to me as though everyone is going to take in everyone else's washing to make up the numbers.

The SPEAKER: Order! Comments are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, Mr. Speaker. It is because of the extraordinary justification that is given in the reply to part of my question that I ask whether the Government is serious in saying that the population projection by 1983 will be 25 000 to 35 000 people, rising much higher by the year 2000. This reply is in complete contrast to what the Minister of Development and Mines said recently, namely, that no population projections could be made so far ahead that would mean anything. I put the question to the Premier to give him a chance to justify the nonsense he has included in the reply to my Question on Notice.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Unlike the member for Mitcham, the Government is serious about its policies and does not deal in the pettifogging trivialities on which the honourable member wastes time.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't agree that this is a pettifogging triviality.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position in relation to the population of Monarto is that the Government considers it essential that two policies be followed in relation to the industrial base of the city of Adelaide. One is that we should limit the population growth of the metropolitan planning area so that we get as near as we can to the proposals in the Jordan committee report, and that means that we would limit the growth of Adelaide permanently to a population of about 1 000 000. That is an addition by the year 2000 of about 160 000 people. In addition to that policy, it is quite vital for us to improve the diversity and security of employment in our present South Australian industrial base. That means that we must pursue the policy that already has attained quite signal success in the past four years in diversifying our industrial base. In the course of doing so, some of the present policies in relation to immigration will have to be reversed.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you tell us in what way?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will not be possible for us to provide the diversity and security of employment in depth on the manufacturers' supply base in the metropolitan area of Adelaide without importing additional process workers, and it will not be possible for us to provide that security and diversity of employment and to work within the limitations in the Jordan report if we do not put the extra industrial capacity into Monarto.

Dr. Eastick: That assumes that they want to go there.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier is replying to a question asked by the honourable member for Mitcham, and interjections are not permitted. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are satisfied, from the applications that the Monarto Development Commission has received already, that that is a policy which we will be able to achieve and which will be of significant benefit to the people of this State.

Mr. Millhouse: Are they applications for industries?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position that the Government has adopted on this matter from the outset is clear, and we do not vacillate with every opportunist wind on these policies, unlike members opposite, who search desperately for something with which to criticise the Government.

AQUATIC SPORT

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Education say whether he is satisfied with the expenditure of the funds involved and the results obtained in aquatic sports organised by the Education Department? My attention has been drawn to this matter by a letter to the Editor from a correspondent to the South Australian *Teachers Journal* of March 12. I will paraphrase the letter, rather than quote it at length, as follows:

The public is not getting its money worth because the boats, skis, canoes, and sailing craft were used for two to

three weeks and are now sitting, waiting for January, 1976, to come around.

I add only that, from my own observations of the sports at Goolwa in early January this year which were arranged by the Education Department, they seemed to be well organised. The students taking part certainly seemed to be enjoying the training they were getting and they also seemed, during the period I was there (and that was long enough to see improvement in handling canoes, skis, and so on), to be benefiting from the training. However, it seems from this letter that there may be doubt, at least, about the use of public money and, therefore, I ask the question of the Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Certainly, there was a generally-expressed satisfaction with the aquatic activities in the Victor Harbor and Goolwa area at the beginning of this year, and the courses arranged were much enjoyed by those who took part. Those activities resulted in a flood of applications for the provision of similar courses next year. Certainly, both the Education Department and I have received many expressions of support in relation to those activities. I am not sure whether the equipment used in those courses is the property of the Education Department. I will check that matter and, if it is, I will check whether there are plans for ensuring that the equipment is used more intensively than otherwise might be the case. When I have that information, I will give it to the honourable member.

FAUNA PRESERVATION

Mr. RODDA: In the absence of the Minister of Environment and Conservation, can the Minister of Transport say what is the Government's policy regarding the edict that has been issued to aviculturists that wild life and fauna, especially the golden shouldered parrot in my area, that are being kept must be disposed of within 28 days? Several people who are interested in preserving fauna and flora have, under permit, kept and maintained these rare species. Indeed, the birds have been bred in captivity. I understand that an instruction has been issued regarding birds declared under the eighth schedule of the Act to be rare species, and reference has been made to the golden shouldered parrot. An ultimatum has been issued that these birds be disposed of within 28 days of some time in March (the period would expire in April), and the persons concerned can dispose of these birds in other States provided they can get a permit to sell them. However, I have been told that they have been having difficulty in getting rid of the birds. I ask what will happen after the expiry date and whether these people will have to cast the birds to the four winds, to be eaten by hawks. If the birds were kept in captivity (indeed, they have been reared there) they would be maintained. This matter is causing much confusion among aviculturists who have done much to preserve our species.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will refer the matter to my colleague, who I am sure will report to the honourable member on this matter.

FEMALE TITLE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether he has been overruled by his Party, causing him to drop the proposal to refer to all women in Government departments as "Ms"? Last week, I asked the Premier whether he would review the directive which was issued by Mr. Bakewell to Government departments and which insisted that the change to "Ms" be made as soon as possible. In reply, the Premier said:

The honourable member obviously has not bothered carefully to read the directive. The reply to his question is "No".

Since then, various public statements have been made by the Premier. A newspaper headline in the *Australian* states "Dunstan backs down over 'Ms' ". A report states that the Chief Secretary (Mr. Kneebone) has said that most of the 11 Government Ministers opposed the change suggested by the International Women's Year Committee. A report in today's *Advertiser* states:

> The Premier has cancelled his department's controversial Ms memo . . . Mr. Dunstan said yesterday the original memo instructing all departments to use Ms instead of Miss or Mrs. was "cryptic and ambiguous".

That statement hardly accords with the Premier's accusation that I had not read the directive. The report states that blame has not specifically been attached to Mr. Bakewell, but has been placed on someone further down the line. It was perfectly obvious when I asked my previous question that I had read the directive; the Premier knew I had read it. However, last week he insisted that there would be no review. Obviously, the Premier has been instructed by Cabinet or his Party to back down on this issue. It appears that the Premier is now, in some way, trying to indicate that he has not backed down; that attitude is just as absurd as the original instruction. Has the Premier been overruled by his Party, causing him to decide to change the intention he obviously held last week when he replied to my question?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has asked me whether I have been overruled by Cabinet or my Party; in both cases, the answer is "No". The position is that a directive has been issued in accordance with the advice I gave to Parliament on Tuesday last week: that the matter of substance that was changed in Government policy was that we would not require in application forms of any kind to the Government or information supplied to the Government in relation to women that they be described by a marital status in cases where men making similar applications or returns to the Government were described by occupation. Consequently, since in most cases we would not have information as to the marital status of women, the previously existing practice of the Government of addressing women in those circumstances by the prefix "Ms" would be extended. That is what is happening; there is no alteration at all in that position. All the forms of the Government requiring returns in relation to description by persons making applications or returns, where previously they have described women by marital status and men by occupation, are to be altered.

Mr. Millhouse: And it isn't going to cost anything!

The SPEAKER: Order! It is apparent that calling him to order means nothing to the honourable member for Mitcham, who is only impressed by a warning. Therefore, I warn the honourable member for Mitcham. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All of those forms will be altered, and in due season that will mean that our records will be changed. However, I have made clear that, where on existing records we do know the marital status of women and have addressed them previously by the title "Mrs." or "Miss", we will continue to do so. If women seek to be called "Mrs." or "Miss", we will endeavour where practicable to comply with that request. In most cases, where in fact we will not have the information previously provided as to their marital status, they will be addressed on the "Ms" basis.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made on the survey being conducted into a reticulated water supply for Watervale? For some years now this matter has been investigated. I realise that difficulties have been experienced. However, on April 30, 1974, I was informed about a new survey to be conducted by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. A letter dated November 18, 1974, from the Acting Minister of Works states that this survey should be completed by the end of February this year. Can the Minister say what is the present position?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I cannot do so offhand, I will get a report for the honourable member and let him have it as soon as possible.

NAZI PARTY

Mr. CRIMES: In view of the report in this morning's *Advertiser* that the National Socialist Party of Australia intends to establish in the Adelaide Hills a secret camp in which to train Nazis in armed and unarmed combat, with finance being provided from overseas, will the Premier allay alarm caused by this statement by authoritatively declaring, as Leader of the State, that such activities will not be permitted?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Where there is a breach of the criminal law by any group engaging either in conspiracy or in training for armed violence within the community, that matter will be dealt with under the criminal law and, if it happens in this case, it will be dealt with as in any other case.

HALLETT COVE

Mr. MATHWIN: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Environment and Conservation, will the Minister of Transport obtain the latest information on the purchase of extra land at Hallett Cove adjacent to the amphitheatre? Some time ago the Minister of Environment and Conservation announced the spending of $7 000 000 on the coast of South Australia, and said extra money had been offered by the Commonwealth Government to assist the tourist industry in this State, which is indeed in a very sick condition. Can the Minister say what help, if any, can be expected from the Commonwealth Government to preserve this area, which is of great historical value not only to South Australia and to Australia but indeed to the world? If any money is forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government, what action will be taken by the State Government to stop the construction of houses and roads immediately adjacent to this area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will refer the question to my colleague.

DENTAL CLINICS

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health for a State-wide progress report showing details, which also refer specifically to the Tea Tree Gully district, concerning the establishment of school dental clinics?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

NOXIOUS WEEDS

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what action can be taken to prevent the sale of the noxious weed calomba daisy in Adelaide florist shops and elsewhere? I have received a letter from a district council in my area reporting that the sales are taking place. This weed, with the botanical name of *Pentzia Suffruticosa,* is a declared noxious weed under the third schedule of the Weeds Act in the District Councils of Bute, Clinton, and Kadina. The weed has become established in parts of the Adelaide Plains and is posing a great threat to agricultural land. It has an attractive yellow flower, but allowing it to be sold in florist shops will permit its spreading to other areas.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague for a report for the honourable member.

NURSING HOME BEDS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health what action has been taken by the Government to tell the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security of the present critical shortage of nursing home beds in South Australia, and to ask him urgently to revise his decision not to approve of the establishment of additional nursing home beds in South Australia? It is well known that there is a critical situation in relation to nursing home beds in this State. Certain patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and other hospitals cannot be found accommodation in nursing homes, and they are using beds that are urgently needed for ordinary patients. Rest homes are at full capacity and domiciliary care services, such as the Eastern Domiciliary Care Service, are having considerable difficulty and are under great pressure to provide services that they have been designed to provide. The Commonwealth Minister for Social Security has replied to a submission from the East Torrens County Board of Health, and it seems that the main reason for reaching the decision, as stated in the letter, is as follows:

> . . . is that in the locality in which your nursing home is located it is considered that an adequate number of nursing home beds already exists to cater for the aged population in the area . . . I must advise that if you were to proceed with the extensions to your nursing home the beds would not be approved for the payment of nursing home benefits under the provision of the National Health Act.

As a result of this intrusion of the Commonwealth Department of Social Security into the affairs of this State, many people have been placed in a serious predicament, because the matter has reached crisis point.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

SWINE COMPENSATION

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government and the Minister will consider reducing the levy paid by the pig producers into the Swine Compensation Trust Fund? In the past few years there has been a considerable accumulation of funds under this scheme, and the annual receipts are now about $108 000, with payments of about $24 000. As there is now $701 000 accumulated in this fund, will the Government consider reducing the head levy to pig producers?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the honourable member's request to my colleague. I seem to recall that twice in the past three years we have done something about either the pig or cattle levy, but I am sure that my colleague will consider this matter sympathetically.

INFORMATION PAYMENTS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what criteria are used in payment of information fees to persons who provide information that leads to the conviction of other persons? In reply to a Question on Notice today, the Minister of Environment and Conservation has indicated that four payments for information have been made by the Crown

in respect of prosecutions against persons under the wildlife legislation. The Minister has indicated the amount that has been paid, and he has said that the cost to the Crown in the fourth instance is estimated to be $2 000. That sum is still outstanding: it has not been paid.

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

VICTORIA SQUARE HOTEL

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say what is the present position regarding the plan to build a luxury hotel in Victoria Square? I ask this question as a result of the reported statements made at the travel convention held in Adelaide last week. Can the Premier say whether the plan to build such a hotel on Government-owned land in Victoria Square (which was previously the subject of questions in this House) has been abandoned, or are plans being prepared to make use of this land?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The consortium that was negotiating with the Government has indicated that, at present, it cannot provide final plans of its proposals. We have been pressing for these plans for some time. The consortium has told the Government that it cannot proceed immediately with the plans, simply because, with the increase in interest rates and the bad track record of hotels in central city areas in Australia over the past four years, it does not consider it can raise the necessary investment. In consequence, the Government committee that has been dealing with the consortium has written to the other persons who have inquired since we gave the consortium the opportunity to make a submission to the Government.

Dr. Eastick: Is the new offer more favourable?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, the same offer and provisions obtain and the people concerned, including a number of oversea interests, have been informed that it is now possible for them to make a submission if they wish to do so. It will be essential for the development of tourism in South Australia and for the implementation of the provisions of the City of Adelaide Development Plan to have a first-class international hotel established in South Australia. The Government has at times been criticised in this House for its expenditure on tourist development. In fact, however, it was revealed at last week's seminar (newspapers in South Australia seem loath to report it because such achievements are never sufficiently interesting to sell newspapers) that South Australia now has the highest proportion of domestic tourism of any State in Australia, exceeding a $15 000 000 surplus and a tourist expenditure in South Australia of $12·20 a head, whereas the figure in Queensland is only $9 a head. The total tourist proposals of the Government up to the present have brought us signal extra stable employment within this State already.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What have you done?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has not taken notice of what has been done. I suggest that he open his eyes and have a look. If the honourable member is not aware of the degree to which the Government has funded the improvement of tourist facilities in South Australia, the provision of entirely new tourist marketing projects, and the co-ordination of Government activity with local government and the Australian National Travel Association, then he has been in Rip van Winkle land. A signal increase has taken place in tourism in South Australia although members opposite in the corner have denigrated our efforts. Indeed, I recall the member for Mitcham saying that it was fanciful for the Government to be interested in tourism because we did not have anything to see in this State.

Mr. Millhouse: I will check all your figures before I accept any of them.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Mitcham for the second time. He is totally disregarding Standing Orders and the authority of the Chair. I call him to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If we are to consolidate the progress made so far and get a share of the convention trade that should be available to South Australia, it is essential we have an international standard hotel within the State and particularly in a central city area, which so far we do not have. It is constantly reported by investigators of the South Australian tourist industry that one of the major things we lack is a hotel of that standard. We are therefore proceeding with the offers we originally made in relation to the site in Victoria Square in an attempt to get an investor to build the hotel. Many operators are available if we can get an investment consortium to erect the building.

COLEBROOK HOME

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution recommending that those pieces of land being sections 553 and 565, hundred of Adelaide, be vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

LISTENING DEVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had disagreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL (EQUALISATION)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Tax Act, 1936-1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Since 1972 there has been a considerable inflation of land values in both urban and rural sectors. The higher values have been reflected in new general revaluations made by the Valuer-General for land tax purposes under the Valuation of Land Act, 1971-1973. Under that Act the Valuer-General has had to adopt a cyclical system of revaluation whereby about one-fifth of the State is revalued each year. It is physically impossible for him, with existing resources, to undertake revaluations for both land tax and water and sewer rating in each year for the whole of the State although, with the development of computer systems, annual revaluations for all rating and taxing purposes may ultimately be possible.

The first revaluation of one-fifth of the State made in 1972-73 produced fairly moderate increases in the land tax assessments. The next one-fifth of the State was revalued during 1973-74, at which time the inflation of land values was reaching a peak. As a result, there were substantial increases in the valuations which, for the areas concerned, imposed sharp increases in the amounts of land tax when the new valuations became operative for taxing purposes in 1974-75. Whereas for 1974-75 taxing purposes the other four-fifths of the State were taxed on lower levels of valuations established in 1970-71 and 1972-73, there is now a serious inequity in the incidence of the tax as between various areas of the State. The inequity in the

incidence of land tax cannot be corrected by the imposition of differential rates as in the case of water and sewer rating, where differences in levels of valuations can be compensated for in this manner. As land tax must be calculated upon the aggregate value of all land owned by the taxpayer irrespective of its location, there can be only one scale of rates. It is therefore impracticable to adjust the tax scale to compensate for sharp increases in valuations for a portion of the State, unless the valuations for other portions of the State are brought to the same level.

A working party comprising the Valuer-General and the Deputy Commissioner of Land Tax was requested to develop an effective land tax equalisation scheme. In their report they concluded that, under the cyclical system of general revaluations, the only means of preserving equity between taxpayers was the use of "equalisation factors" which, if applied to the existing valuations for the areas not subject to a general revaluation in the specific year, would bring them into line with the level of valuations established for the areas which are subject to general revaluation. They said that any method of reducing the tax calculated on the new valuations for land subject to a general revaluation would not be equitable. This, basically, is because of the effects of the graduated tax scale under which increases in tax are not in direct proportion to increases in the valuations if values in excess of $10 000 are involved. Fundamentally, it is the value of the land that determines the rate of the tax; therefore, if equity is to be preserved, all valuations must be brought to the same level.

The proposed tax scale halves the basic amounts of tax payable on taxable values up to $40 000. There are significant reductions for the middle range values, the reductions tapering to about 17 per cent when the maximum rate of 38c is reached at $200 000. This maximum was previously reached at $180 000. In addition to the benefit of the new scale, primary production land will be subject to a basic exemption of $40 000 in lieu of the existing rebates of tax and exemptions for values up to $12 500. Computer studies have been made using the new scale and the new concession for primary producers in application to the level of values that might be expected to apply under the equalisation scheme. These studies show that, in relation to land in the lower value ranges, increases in tax that would have otherwise occurred will be substantially reduced and, for land in areas revalued for 1974-75 taxing purposes, there will be reductions in tax. However, for higher value properties, sharp increases in tax can still be expected in 1975-76. Current trends indicate that taxable values for higher value land within the commercial centre of the city of Adelaide are unlikely to be increased for 1975-76 taxing purposes under the equalisation scheme; on the other hand, that land will benefit from some reduction in tax under the new scale. Land outside the city of Adelaide which is coming into the high value brackets must expect to bear the same incidence of tax applying to high value city properties.

The extension of the concession for primary production land has necessitated some tightening of its application. The existing definition enables the concessions to be applied to high value land in areas within and adjacent to the metropolitan area, where the land is not owned by people deriving their main livelihood from primary production or an associated business. The significance is mainly confined to the "rural" area proclaimed under section 12c of the Act so that, within this area, a tightening of the definition will apply. It is proposed to give some further relief from land tax to non-profit organisations that contribute significantly to the welfare of the community. Land owned by religious, charitable, and educational organisations, and subsidised hospitals qualify for full exemption only if it is used solely or mainly for their particular purposes. Land which is owned and used for purposes incidental to their activities, for example, for a minister's residence, is subject to partial exemption under section 12a of the Act. It is proposed to exempt such land fully with the exceptions of land held for investment purposes. The partial exemption is to be extended to land owned by ex-servicemen's organisations, trade union and employer associations, progress and community associations, and agricultural societies, and to land of historic value held for preservation by trusts or other organisations, provided in each case the land is actually used for the purposes of the organisations. The partial exemption will also extend to land owned by sporting bodies and used for the purpose of organised sport.

It is estimated that land tax receipts for 1975-76, based on the modified tax scale and the allowance of the exemption of $40 000 for primary producers, will be about $18 000 000. This estimate is based on the level of land values likely to prevail when the equalisation scheme operates from July 1, 1975. There could be some variation depending upon the equalisation factors finally determined by the Valuer-General.

I point out to members that, in relation to rural tax exemption provisions, the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated approached the Government with a constructive proposition on this matter. I pay a tribute to the organisation for trying to produce a constructive proposition on the rural area.

Mr. Venning: What about refunding what they've paid?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will deal with that matter in a moment. The United Farmers and Graziers' submission to the Government regarding alterations in the tax scale sought a $40 000 exemption but a $25 minimum land tax on all rural properties. About 13 000 rural properties do not pay land tax at all. On examination, it was clear that the $25 minimum would apply to those properties and that it would bring in all the horticultural blocks on the Murray River, the blocks of grapegrowers of the Barossa Valley and the Southern Vales, and a few small cereal-growing properties. The Government, although appreciating that the proposition of the United Farmers and Graziers had been put forward constructively, decided that it would accede to the request for the $40 000 exemption, would apply the tax only to the excess above $40 000, but would not apply the $25 minimum tax.

Therefore, what the Government intends in this measure is much more generous to the rural sector than the proposition of the United Farmers and Graziers, but we believe it is necessary in the present rural situation. Regarding refunds, members will see from the clauses of the Bill that we are limiting the increase in tax on rural properties in this financial year to a 100 per cent increase in valuation; any excess over that figure will be credited in next year's tax. However, if the property has been sold this year that will not happen. In fact, it will mean a significant saving to many people in the District of Rocky River.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the metropolitan area?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That area will be subject to equalisation. Several of the areas that have attracted a high tax rate as the result of high valuations this year will, next year, in the case of ordinary suburban blocks (not the very expensive ones where in some cases the equalisation will mean an increase), the valuation will mean a reduction

in tax. I am referring to those areas that were subject to a revaluation this financial year.

Mr. Coumbe: You are referring to the ones revalued this year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Most of the people affected in that respect will find that the tax payable this year will be reduced. I seek leave to insert the explanation of the clauses of the Bill in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the definition of "land used for primary production". It is obviously undesirable that a land speculator who purchases land in rural areas that are ripe for urban subdivision should be able to obtain the benefit of the major statutory exemption intended for genuine primary producers by the Bill. Accordingly, the new definition provides that, where land is in a "defined rural area", land will not qualify for the exemption unless the principal business of the taxpayer consists of primary production or some related industry. Clause 4 grants a total exemption from land tax in respect of land that is used, or is intended for use, for a charitable, educational, benevolent, religious or philanthropic purpose. Clause 5 provides for the equalisation of valuation levels and provides for a statutory exemption of $40 000 on land used for primary production. Clause 6 repeals the present land tax scale and enacts a new scale in its place. Clause 7 enacts new provisions relating to the partial exemption of land from land tax.

Clause 8 amends section 12c of the principal Act, which entitles a taxpayer who holds rural land in an area ripe for urban subdivision to the benefit of rural valuation provided that if he subsequently sells the land the tax remitted during the preceding five years then becomes payable. The amendment provides that a declaration entitling a taxpayer to the concession shall not be revoked by reason of the new definition of "land used for primary production". Thus no taxpayer will be faced with a sudden demand for deferred tax by reason of the amended definition. However, where the land ceases to be land used for primary production by virtue of the new definition, no further concessions will be made under the section. Clause 9 makes a consequential amendment.

Mr. RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Administration and Probate Act, 1919-1973. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It provides for amendments to the principal Act, the Administration and Probate Act, 1919-1973, relating to several matters. The Bill makes provision for amendments designed to enable the Public Trustee Department as an operating department to pay its own way. Under these amendments any annual deficiency arising from the operation of the Public Trustee Department could be charged to an account to be kept by the Public Trustee and to be called the "Common Fund Interest Account". This account is to comprise the interest earned by investments made from the common fund, that is, the moneys held by the Public Trustee that he is not required to invest in any specific securities. Any operating deficiency may be charged to this account after the crediting of interest to each estate and trust, the moneys of which form the common fund. Such a provision exists in the corresponding legislation of the other States. Consequential to this amendment are amendments providing for any operating surplus to be carried forward in another separate account, the "Income Adjustment Account", and empowering the Public Trustee to fix varying interest rates.

It is intended that the Income Adjustment Account be applied towards previous deficits, whereas at present both operating surpluses and deficits go to the general revenue. With respect to interest rates, these are at present the same for all accounts kept by the Public Trustee. These accounts include those of mental and protected estates, moneys held for minors, moneys held pursuant to orders of courts and moneys held upon trusts subject to a life interest, all of which are held for lengthy periods, together with moneys in current deceased estates, the administration of which is, generally speaking, completed within one year. The amendment will allow funds in estates held for a longer period to receive a higher rate of interest than those held for a short period. In addition, the opportunity is being taken in this Bill to revise the money amounts specified in the principal Act so that they accord with current money values and to provide a power under the principal Act to fix fees for the services provided by the Public Trustee, the fees at present being fixed under the Fees Regulation Act, 1927.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 inserts in the interpretation section of the principal Act definitions of the "Common Fund Interest Account" and the "Income Adjustment Account" to be kept by the Public Trustee and the "Common Fund Reserve Account", which is to continue to be kept by the Treasurer. Clause 4 increases the penalty provided in section 24 of the principal Act for failure to obey a summons from the amount fixed in 1891, $200, to $1 000. Clause 5 amends section 54 of the principal Act by increasing the provision upon intestacy for the surviving spouse of a person who dies without issue from the $10 000 fixed in 1956 to $30 000. Clause 6 increases the penalty fixed in section 58 of the principal Act from $200 to $1 000. Clause 7 increases the penalty fixed in section 99 of the principal Act from $20 to $200. Clause 8 amends section 102 of the principal Act by providing for the matters previously referred to, that is, the establishment and application of the Common Fund Interest Account, and the fixing by the Public Trustee of varying interest rates. Clause 9 increases the penalty fixed in section 109 of the principal Act from $20 to $200. Clause 10 amends section 112 of the principal Act to provide for the establishment and application of the Income Adjustment Account and the fixing of fees under the principal Act.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL (VARIOUS)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

Page 3, second schedule—After the item:

"*Holidays Act Amendment Act*, 1958—Section 2—Strike out subsection (3)."

insert the item:

"*Kindergarten Union Act*, 1974-1975—Section 7 (3)—Strike out "South Australian Pre-School Education Committee" from paragraph (*a*) and insert "Childhood Services Council".

Section 11 (2)—After "appointed" insert "or elected".
Section 13—Strike out "or appointment" and insert ", appointment or election"."

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

As the Committee knows, this is merely a revision Bill in which we are seeking to make routine amendments to facilitate consolidation. The Statute Law Revision Commissioner, between when the Bill left this place and when it reached the other place, found two amendments that were required.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion.

Motion carried.

CORONERS BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2 (clause 6)—After line 26 insert new definition as follows:

"'legal practitioner' means a legal practitioner within the meaning of the Legal Practitioners Act, 1936-1972:"

No. 2. Page 2, line 33 (clause 7)—Leave out "person" and insert "legal practitioner".

No. 3. Page 3, line 1 (clause 8)—Leave out "person" and insert "legal practitioner".

No. 4. Page 7 (clause 26)—After line 6 insert new subclause (1a) as follows:

"(1a) If upon an inquest, a coroner considers that evidence given in the inquest is sufficient to put a person upon trial for an indictable offence, he may commit that person for trial and upon that committal shall have, in relation thereto, all the powers and duties that a justice has upon such committal under the Justices Act, 1921-1974."

No. 5. Page 7, line 7 (clause 26)—Leave out "A coroner" and insert "Except as provided by subsection (1a) of this section, a coroner".

Amendments Nos. 1 to 3:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 to 3 be agreed to.

They have the effect of inserting the qualification for the office of State Coroner as being that of a legal practitioner. As it was always intended to appoint a legal practitioner to this position, I accept the amendments.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. The amendments clarify what the Attorney intended, and I am pleased that he has accepted amendments moved by an Opposition member in another place.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 4 and 5 be agreed to.

These amendments were inserted in another place on the motion of the Minister, as a result of my considering the suggestion of the member for Mitcham that some power to commit for trial should be restored to the coroner. As the amendments give a limited power to commit for trial, I commend them to the Committee.

Motion carried.

CONTROL OF WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 11. Page 2778.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This short Bill makes machinery amendments regarding metric conversion and gives effect to a motion which was passed in this House in October, 1973, and which had been moved by the member for Chaffey. The Government's action highlights its concern for the preservation of the environment and natural surroundings, and we concur with the Government. Section 11 of the principal Act deals with levees and embankments to be provided before construction. Section 14 deals with the need to get the Minister's permission to carry out certain works and also deals with the effect on owners of adjacent land.

Those of us who have had experience in predominantly wet lands have seen a change in approach and in appreciation regarding improving agricultural output. Over the years, we have seen a minimising of our wild life and the effects on the ecology. The effect of the motion moved by the member for Chaffey about two years ago was that, in the opinion of this House, the substantial areas of wet lands in South Australia should be preserved for the conservation of wild life and that, wherever possible, former wet lands should be rehabilitated.

The Minister has a big responsibility under the Act and much will be gained if the legislation is administered with common sense and in the interests of the landowner and the State. In the area in which I live, by using the three-point linkage tractor, it became easy to drain swamps, and production was improved. Areas that were part and parcel of the environment gave way to areas of productivity. The short-rotation crop took the place of swamp areas. There has been a falling off in some natural fauna and flora that lived in those wet lands. The Bill highlights the effect that a private member can have in bringing business before the Parliament, and I am sure that the measure will have useful application throughout the State. I commend the Minister and the Government for introducing it.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill. As I have spent most of my life in the wet areas around Langhorne Creek, I see much merit in the measure. As the member for Victoria has said, the Act must be administered with common sense. We are going through a period during which some conservationists or people who are away from the scene are placing the environment and fauna matters before the welfare of human beings. Those people take a dislike to any action by human beings who are doing something in the interests of the State.

I support the provision that is being made for fauna to be conserved, but I should not like the Minister to go to extremes. There is a food shortage in the world today, although, through bad economic management, there is a surplus of food in Australia. I believe that, ultimately, areas around Lake Alexandrina and parts of the Murray River will have to be drained. In a dry State such as South Australia, it is a shame to see evaporation from these wet lagoons, as there could be sufficient water provided to irrigate land in order to supply a tremendous amount of food to the people of the world in the future. I support the Bill, hoping that it will be administered with common sense.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): The most important provision in the Bill relates to the environmental factors involved. The other provisions are purely machinery provisions. As the member for Victoria has said, on September 12, 1973, the member for Chaffey moved a motion in this House with regard to retaining existing wet lands in South Australia. He drew attention to the need to preserve habitats for wild life, particularly birds such as the ibis, as these birds are valuable in controlling the numbers of insects and other pests. It has been apparent that, over the past 20 or 30 years, the indiscriminate draining of wet lands and clearing of land has substantially reduced the areas available in which fauna can breed. The Minister will know that

there has been tremendous development in the South-East of what were originally wet lands. The whole of the so-called natural drainage area of the South-East was substantially affected when Drain M was completed to provide an outlet from Bool Lagoon. Large areas of wet lands lying between Dukes Highway and the Coorong have been progressively developed and cleared, no longer providing a habitat for wild life.

Fortunately there are still areas such as the old Baker Range drain, where water seems to move as far north as Log Crossing, but seldom reaches the area known as Alf Flat. The Minister and I have both seen this area of over 1 000 hectares covered with water, with aquatic sports being undertaken. No longer a wet lands area, it has been dried and cultivated. A similar situation existed along the Murray River, causing concern to the member for Chaffey. Since I have been the member for Mallee (occupying the district neighbouring Chaffey), I have been confronted by problems similar to those confronted by the member for Chaffey, with people wanting to drain what are traditionally wet lands and breeding areas for ducks, which are most selective about where they breed. If their breeding area is disturbed, they move away for good, so that that form of wild life is lost to an area.

In preserving these wet lands, I hope that some consideration will be given to the interests of local people, some of whom have an interest in wild life, while others are recognised as sportsmen who are also willing to preserve wild life, at the same time controlling it by shooting it. These people also make a substantial personal effort in assisting in developing and maintaining wild life habitats, especially those of game birds, such as duck. I hope that, when certain areas are set aside as wet land reserves, they will not be exclusively national parks. I hope some consideration will be given to developing some areas, if not all, as game reserves, as is the case, I understand, with most wet land areas being retained in Victoria and New South Wales. I congratulate the member for Chaffey on previously bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I commend the Government for taking action at this late stage to try to preserve existing wet lands in South Australia, recognising their importance and providing in the Bill that, if it is recognised that an area must be preserved, the Minister may refuse permission for further clearing and development. I support the Bill.

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

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 13. Page 2897.)

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): Last Thursday, when I sought leave to continue my remarks, I was referring to new paragraph (*d*) of section 13 (4) as follows:

of whom two shall be nominated by the Minister as being persons capable of representing the interests of local government.

The Minister and I obviously agree that local government is involved in this matter, as the provision accepts that local government should be involved. I was most interested to read in his second reading explanation what the Attorney-General had to say about this provision, as follows:

Clause 10 amends section 13 of the principal Act by providing that the two members representing local government on the committee, formerly known as the Weights and Measures Advisory Committee and continued in existence as the Trade Measurements Advisory Council, shall be appointed on the nomination of the Minister rather than of the Local Government Association. The Government considers that the association represents many councils but, until it represents certain substantial metropolitan councils that are at present not members of it, it cannot be said to be truly representative.

In South Australia there are 137 local governing bodies and, of that number, 128 are members of the Local Government Association. I take note of what the Minister has said in his second reading explanation, to which I have just referred. The Attorney-General introduced this Bill, but I consider that the Minister of Local Government would be responsible for this clause. Three times recently that Minister has accepted the opinion of a minority rather than of the majority concerning numbers in organisations. If the Minister had had his way, meetings of councils could have been determined by one person. Secondly, when it was to be determined by two or more councils that an amalgamation could occur, the Minister suggested that there should be a simple majority. Now, because some metropolitan councils are not represented on the association, the Minister has suggested that the advisory council will not be fully representative. Therefore, the association will not be able to submit a panel of names of which two persons will represent local government on the advisory council.

Recently, the Minister of Local Government said that local government would become a hollow or empty shell, but in his actions (and this is one) the Minister is contributing to that situation. I do not agree that these two representatives should be chosen by the Minister, but firmly believe that they should be chosen by the Local Government Association. Except for this clause, the Bill is acceptable, but the association is being disregarded by the Government. It seems that the Government does not have enough confidence in the executive of the Local Government Association to allow it to nominate persons, although the association would consider not members of the association but council representatives who are not members of the association. In supporting the Bill, I strongly object to clause 10.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): I should like to reply to the points raised by the member for Gouger, hopefully to change his mind, so that we do not stay in the narrow confines of local government representation that he seems to desire. First, I refer to the question of further whittling away powers of councils. Councils do not administer the weights and measures legislation today, because they opted out. In the 1967 legislation, provisions were included that gave the Minister power, under section 31, that if a council satisfied the Minister that it was no longer able to administer the Act or if it failed to comply with any request, a proclamation could be issued. That is what has happened. At the time, the Minister received many requests from councils to opt out, and the final opting out came in 1972 when, of the 137 councils then operating, a total of 104 opted out, and the remainder were on the verge of doing so. It is a tragedy, but that is not the issue in this Bill.

The honourable member has raised the point of the Local Government Association presenting a panel of five people to the Minister from which two persons are to be selected as members of the advisory council. An additional provision has been included: the association can put forward only names of elected persons to councils, and that means that full-time officials cannot be included. These people are acceptable to me, and I do not know why this situation should apply. I am extremely proud of the work that these persons have done, and I applaud the former

Minister of Local Government for appointing Bob Pash to the Road Traffic Board. I am sure no-one would criticise the appointment of Alex McClure, and I could refer to many other such appointments. I am not saying that we should provide for the appointment of full-time officials. If we want to obtain the voice of local government, for heaven's sake let it be the widest voice possible and do not restrict it to those people who are elected. That is exactly what the legislation is currently doing, and it is one of the things that this Bill seeks to rectify. It will also remove the restriction on the Local Government Association's providing a panel of names. I do not know where the member for Gouger got his figures, but I do not want to enter into any argument with him.

Mr. Russack: I got them from the Local Government Association.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The figures I am about to give came from the same source, so I am not sure how we can get over this. At present, the councils or corporations of Tea Tree Gully, Port Adelaide, Meadows, Marion, Noarlunga, Sedan, Port Pirie, Mitcham, Kensington and Norwood, and St. Peters are not members of the association. Of 136 councils, 10 are not members of the association and 126 are members. I do not include the Corporation of the Town of Colonel Light Gardens in these figures. It could be argued that a good number is represented, but out of a population of 1 069 200 people (as at June, 1972) the local government bodies that are members of the Local Government Association represent 890 550 people, whereas 278 650 people are represented by councils that are not members of the association. Therefore 26 per cent of the population of South Australia is not represented on the Local Government Association.

Mr. Venning: Whose fault is that?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not arguing about whose fault it is: I am simply stating facts, and this 26 per cent is deprived of having representation on this council.

Mr. Venning: No; 74 per cent is represented.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Bill provides for 100 per cent representation, and that is what the honourable member has to take into account. I know some members will say that the Local Government Association calls for nominations from all councils, whether or not they are members. When anyone tells me that, I ask when last a person not a member of the association won a ballot conducted by the association, and the answer is that no such person ever has, although I believe someone was runner-up recently. We want this provision so that everyone has the opportunity of being represented on this advisory council in exactly the same way as with the Building Act Advisory Committee, the Local Government Parks Examinations Committee, the Local Government Engineers Examination Committee, the Road Traffic Board, and the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board. All those bodies have local government representation not because they are appointed or nominated by the Local Government Association but because of their expert knowledge in local government. I do not believe that, as regards weights and measures, there should be anything less.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill in general but, like my colleague the member for Gouger, object to it in part. At one stage the inspection of weights and measures was done by private enterprise: for a nominal fee paid by local government, the gentlemen concerned visited local shops, etc., and made their official inspections. At that time the cost to councils was reasonable but it later increased, and eventually inspections were taken over by the Government, and that is how this legislation came about. The provisions of clause 10 will take away the rights of the Local Government Association in relation to making nominations. In his second reading explanation, the Attorney-General said:

Clause 10 amends section 13 of the principal Act by providing that the two members representing local government on the committee, formerly known as the Weights and Measures Advisory Committee and continued in existence as the Trade Measurements Advisory Council, shall be appointed on the nomination of the Minister rather than of the Local Government Association.

I do not think the Attorney-General realised the significance of what he later said, namely:

The Government considers that the association represents many councils but, until it represents certain substantial metropolitan councils that are at present not members of it, it cannot be said to be truly representative.

In the outburst by the Minister of Local Government we saw how his attitude to such matters had changed. Section 13 (4) (*d*) of the principal Act provides, in part:

of whom two shall be appointed from persons comprised in a panel of not less than five persons being elected members of a council nominated by the governing body of the Local Government Association of South Australia Incorporated.

This obviously represents a difference of opinion between the Government and the Local Government Association of South Australia, and we see an amazing double standard on the part of the Minister of Local Government. When the Minister talks about people belonging to an association or a union his views are far different from those which he expressed a few moments ago because, according to him, everything is wrong with the people connected with the Local Government Association. The Minister says that the people who organise the association are wrong and that they should consider the people whose councils do not belong to it. However, dealing with the union situation, the Minister believes that people who do not belong to a union should have no say at all. Local government is distinctly different as far as the Minister is concerned. The Minister listed the councils that are not members of the association and, for the record, in the metropolitan area they are Marion, Mitcham, Port Adelaide, Tea Tree Gully, St. Peters, Noarlunga, and Kensington and Norwood. In the country area, the Minister included for good measure the Port Pirie and Port Augusta councils. He dealt in detail with populations.

However, of the 136 councils in South Australia, 128 belong to the association. The Local Government Association has indicated that it will choose representatives from all the councils but even that is not good enough for the Minister: he wants to choose for himself. Why does he want to choose the members of the advisory council? I should like to know who the Government has lined up for this job. The Minister is against the principle that he professes to espouse as a good Socialist member of the Government, and as far as local government is concerned he is doing a complete about-face. Councils themselves should have the right to nominate a member, and the Minister should have the right to choose from those names submitted by the Local Government Association.

The council of which I was a member belongs to the association, which I believe has done much for local government in South Australia, and I believe the Minister is entirely wrong to go against the association in this regard. I should like him when he replies to tell me what is wrong with the people concerned. I will speak further about this matter during the Committee stage but, with the exception

of the obnoxious clause to which I have referred, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. RUSSACK: I move:

To strike out paragraph (*c*).

At the outset I seek your guidance on a procedural matter, Mr. Chairman. I wish to move certain amendments to clauses 4, 10 and 11 but, because the subsequent amendments are really consequential, if my first amendment is negatived I will not continue with them. Have I your permission, Mr. Chairman, to speak broadly on those amendments?

The CHAIRMAN: Permission is granted to do that.

Mr. RUSSACK: "Elected member" is defined in the principal Act as follows:

in relation to a Council means the Lord Mayor, Mayor, Chairman, alderman or councillor of that Council.

The Minister said that local government opted out of its responsibility regarding weights and measures in 1972, but I am sure it did so because of lack of finance and not because of council inefficiency. I understood that, when councils agreed to sever their responsibility in connection with weights and measures prior to 1972, they would retain the right to nominate a panel of names and that from that panel two members would be appointed by the Minister. I ask the Minister to give his impression of what members of the Executive Committee of the Local Government Association understand to be the position. The Minister has said that 74 per cent of councils have representation on the Local Government Association, and, because 26 per cent of the councils are not represented, he will not consider the 74 per cent. I heard on television during the weekend that, in one big union, decisions regarding representation are made by 1·1 per cent of the members.

Mr. Payne: That must be the United Farmers and Graziers.

Mr. RUSSACK: It is the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union. On March 13 an executive meeting of the Local Government Association carried a motion strongly opposing the deletion of its rights to appoint two nominees. If we do not accept this amendment, we will be ignoring 74 per cent of the people represented by the Local Government Association.

Mr. COUMBE: Last week the Minister stated that we should give local government more responsibility, but now he opposes an amendment that seeks to sustain the opportunity for local government to be involved in this aspect of the law. That inconsistency is another example of how the Government speaks with two voices. The Minister cannot ask us to accept that local government should be given more responsibility and then ask us to support a Bill that decimates the numbers in local government.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I oppose the amendment for the reasons which have been given in the second reading explanation and on which the Minister of Local Government has expanded. It is absurd to say that the Bill excludes 74 per cent of councils from having any part in weights and measures administration. It does nothing of the sort. As the Minister has said, the 100 per cent can be involved by the Minister's appointing representatives of local government generally. The representatives may come from councils that are members of the association or from members of councils that are not. It is not practical to look to the association as being representative of all local government, when it is not so representative. As long as it has not 100 per cent membership, it cannot be regarded as the body that can nominate representatives of local government. The only alternative is for the Minister to make appointments that are designed for local government to be represented.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment. Despite his eloquence, the Attorney was ill at ease. As the member for Gouger has said, the Local Government Association is willing to have nominations from all councils, whether or not they belong to the association; that is more than trade unions would do. However, no doubt being prompted by the Minister of Local Government, the Attorney says that he will have no part of this proposal. The Government has obviously made up its mind who will be nominated, regardless of what other people may desire. Although the Government normally supports the principle of people belonging to organisations, in this case it is opposing an association.

Mr. RUSSACK: I point out to the Attorney that we are not suggesting that 74 per cent of councils are being denied representation: we are saying that 74 per cent of councils in the State are being denied the right to have a voice in the election of members to the advisory council. Does the Attorney accept the Local Government Association as a body? Over the years it has been of great assistance in conducting local government in South Australia. There must be some difference of opinion between the Attorney and the Local Government Association. In section 13 (4) (*e*), the title "South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated" is to be changed to "Chamber of Commerce and Industry South Australia Incorporated". However, that organisation is still permitted to nominate a panel of three people from which one person will be appointed to the council. Does the Attorney suggest that all the organisations eligible to belong to the Chamber of Commerce and Industry belong to it? Yet he will accept its nomination, while refusing to give the Local Government Association the right to nominate representatives. The Attorney must have some ulterior motive for his attitude.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold, Goldsworthy, and Gunn. Noes—Messrs. McKee, McRae, and Wells.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Establishment and institution of Advisory Council."

Mr. RUSSACK: I thank you, Sir, for your assistance and, as I indicated that my first amendment would be a test case, I will not now proceed with these amendments.

Clause passed.

Clause 11—"Casual vacancies."

Mr. RUSSACK: I will not proceed with my amendment.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (12 to 26) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILISATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BOARD)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 12. Page 2830.)

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): It is amazing that this Bill has to be introduced because of an omission in previous legislation that has been introduced every year to provide for wheat stabilisation and the continuation of the operations of the Australian Wheat Board. Each year complementary legislation has to be introduced by State Governments, although that legislation is somewhat different from the Commonwealth Government's legislation referring to the same matters. Since 1955, this legislation has operated, and it is amazing that this Bill has to be introduced to include in the wheat stabilisation legislation a matter that was omitted from the legislation that was introduced before Christmas. It refers to the deductions that the Australian Wheat Board is allowed to make by way of tolls paid to the bulk handling company on behalf of those who deliver grain to that company each year. It is significant that, as a result of the operation of this legislation for many years (and the part to which we are referring today), about $26 000 000 has been subscribed by producers in this State towards providing bulk handling silo facilities and a head office for that company. Everyone realises what growers have done for their industry, and I recall the debate that took place in this House last week concerning the question of a loan to the Trades Hall.

The SPEAKER: Order! Any reference to that debate is out of order, and the honourable member cannot continue in that way.

Mr. VENNING: I am referring to what the rural industry and graingrowers have done in the past in setting up their own facilities and by paying $26 000 000 interest-free money to the bulk handling company in this State. They have helped their industry, constructed an excellent headquarters situated on South Terrace and, by their actions, demonstrated the organisation's sound administration. I support the legislation. Because of the Australian Wheat Board and the stabilisation of the wheat industry, the whole concept of grain handling in this State is second to none throughout the world.

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

WEST BEACH RECREATION RESERVE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2453.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): When explaining this legislation, the Minister said that the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act did not empower the trust to invest its surplus moneys, although the trust had available to it about $250 000. I believe that about $200 000 of this amount came from a loan raised to purchase Marineland. At the time of raising the loan and settlement for Marineland the trust had a surplus and the trustees decided that, rather than just leave the money lying in the bank, they would invest it with appropriate security, which in this case was a bank. Whilst we on this side of the House have always opposed retrospectivity in legislation in principle, on this occasion we support the Bill because the trustees have been able to benefit the trust by lodging this money at a higher rate of interest than would have been received normally. Even so, great care should be taken by semi-government bodies in the handling of moneys, particularly if it is an authority charged with the responsibility of developing an area. At page 2225 of *Hansard* (on November 26, 1974), I received replies to questions I had on notice concerning Marineland, which was built in 1969.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may refer to some issues but he cannot debate them at any length because this is only a short Bill dealing with an investment by the West Beach Trust.

Mr. BECKER: I asked when Marineland was acquired by the West Beach Trust and the answer was August 1, 1974. The amount paid was $200 509·58, the same price as the Government paid the previous owner of Marineland. We passed legislation on March 1, 1974, empowering the West Beach Trust to borrow funds to acquire Marineland. The problem has been created by the time that elapsed between the proclamation of the Act and the time of settlement. There could be many reasons for this delay and I do not believe one of them has yet been fully explained—in relation to the structural soundness of Marineland. The West Beach Trust is faced with the problem caused by the popularity of Marineland. I believe the attendance figures are slightly down from the peak of popularity, but everything is being done to promote it as a first-class tourist attraction for the area and for South Australia. I have no fear that it will not continue to be a profitable venture for the trust.

The other problem facing the trust is that, with the enlargement of the caravan park and the popularity of the par 3 golf course during the main tourist season, surplus funds build up. I believe that at present the trust has $200 000 out on short-term investment. However, the money it receives during the summer must carry the operation during the lean winter period. It is necessary for the trust to have the power to invest its funds on suitable security.

A trust organisation investing moneys should be limited to trustee investments. This Bill places the onus on the Treasurer: he must approve the type of investment that the trust makes and it is therefore in the interests of the Treasurer and of the trust that the funds be invested with reputable organisations where there is no risk because, if something did go wrong, the Treasury could find itself responsible for the deficit. From the way the Bill is worded I understand that the Treasurer is underwriting the type of investment the West Beach Trust makes.

The trust has benefited from the availability of funds it has and it has used every means to capitalise on the high interest rate available. No-one can say that that is not good sound business practice, and the composition of the trust means that we can expect the trustees to ensure that the funds will be placed on the short-term money market when such action is to the advantage of the trust. I think the trustees can be complimented on ensuring that every cent they receive will work for the ultimate development of the land placed under their control.

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

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 13. Page 2888.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): This Bill, which relates to the Libraries and Institutes Act, deals with three main amendments to that Act. The first amendment is designed specifically to facilitate and improve library services in the Mount Gambier area. No doubt the Chairman of

Committees will be pleased to see this Bill passed. It is pleasing to see that the member for Mount Gambier is now taking an interest in the Bill, because it is obvious he did not realise that it applied to his district. The first amendment allows the integration of institute libraries in the area with subsidised libraries, which were established under the Libraries Subsidies Act, 1955-1958. I understand that in Mount Gambier there is an excellent institute library that is trying to establish a subsidised library. I understand, too, that the institute library in that area cannot transfer its books to a subsidised library unless this Bill is passed, because those books cannot be used in a subsidised library. It is for that reason that the people of Mount Gambier and the Opposition fully support the amendment.

If one looks at the Institute Board of Management and the interests in the institute libraries in South Australia one sees that the Liberal members of Parliament take a tremendous interest in this area. I have attended two annual general meetings of the board of management. The only political Party ever represented at those meetings is the Liberal Party, which invariably has five or six members present. I pay a tribute to Mr. Dick Geddes, from another place, who has given so much to the institute libraries of this State.

The second amendment relates to the present financial situation of the Adelaide Circulating Library. Unfortunately, this library is in financial difficulty and, because of this embarrassing situation, is to be brought under the control of the Libraries Board to facilitate finances and to allow the library to continue under new management. I pay a tribute to the services provided by the Adelaide Circulating Library, which has provided admirable services in this State over many years and has allowed many people to read in the comfort of their homes because they could not visit the library on North Terrace. It is most unfortunate that the Adelaide Circulating Library has been put in this position, but I believe this Bill will enable the services of that library to be absorbed in a practical way.

The third amendment relates to the increase of certain penalties under the Act, especially penalties relating to damaging public property or documents belonging to the libraries. The penalty in that regard is to be increased from £20 to $200, which I find somewhat staggering. It is a huge increase, but, equally, I accept that it is important to protect valuable documents housed in these libraries. It is with those remarks, and after paying special tribute to the services carried out by the Adelaide Circulating Library in the past, that the Liberal Opposition in this place fully supports the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Regulations."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister say how the increase from £20 to $200 relates to inflation since the penalty of £20 was enacted?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): Some of these penalties were fixed at varying times in the past. The penalty to which the honourable member refers is increased from £20 to $200, which will be the maximum penalty: it is not necessarily the penalty to be paid by anyone committing an offence against the section. The previous penalty of £20 was fixed in 1939, and I do not believe that an increase from $40 to $200 over that time is excessive. There are one or two instances where the change is not as great, and the honourable member will, if he investigates the matter, find that some of the penalties have been reviewed since 1939.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 16 passed.

Clause 17—"Repeal of sections 132 to 145 of principal Act and enactment of sections in their place."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: New section 132 (3) deals with property being transferred to the State Library. Can the Minister say what property is included?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I cannot say off the cuff how many books are involved. The Adelaide Circulating Library leases accommodation that is the property of the Institute Association, so that property relates to books and to library fixtures and fittings. I can find out for the honourable member how many books are involved, but one of the problems associated with the Adelaide Circulating Library is that, because of its finances, its book stock is fairly out of date and a significant part of its book stock no longer turns over because it is no longer of any interest to book borrowers.

Mr. Dean Brown: How many staff are involved?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think that three persons are involved, and they are being absorbed into the State Library. Someone from the State Library is at present seconded to the general administration of the Adelaide Circulating Library.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister give an undertaking that any superannuation and other benefits accruing to these people will be transferred with them? I take it that no staff will be disadvantaged by the transfer.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No staff will be disadvantaged: some will enjoy a considerable advantage because they will become members of the Public Service and be entitled to rights they may not have had previously. For example, Mr. Behn, who is about to retire as Secretary of the Institutes Association of South Australia Incorporated, has entitlements less than he would have had if he had been a public servant. Generally speaking, there will be an improvement regarding the staff of the Adelaide Circulating Library. They may not stay in that library: they may be called on to undertake duties elsewhere in the State Library.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (18 to 21) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FEE)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 13. Page 2889.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. In explaining it, the Attorney said that it solved a minor problem in respect of the principal Act. Whilst I accept that, the present provision certainly caused a hornet's nest in the industry. Many people have been forced to pay a fee for action to be taken after they have left the industry. I totally support the Government's decision to remove that anomaly.

On February 25, 1975, as reported at page 2533 of *Hansard*, the member for Fisher asked a question about fees payable by people in the industry and the Attorney, in reply, said that the provision requiring $20 to be paid

by persons who had left the industry would be removed or amended, and this is done by the Bill. However, the Attorney also said:

Yesterday I discussed the whole matter with a deputation from the Real Estate Institute and all the members of that deputation agreed emphatically that there was no case for lifting the requirement as it applied to those continuing in the industry. Members of that deputation agreed entirely with the attitude of the board that the levy is required at present until the fund builds up to an adequate level.

I gathered from that that the members of the institute had been in contact with the Attorney on this point. However, I have been told that the institute was discussing with the Attorney several matters and that discussion of this relatively minor point was only incidental to the real purpose of the meeting. When members of the institute read the reply given by the Minister, although they did not oppose the effect of the statement made they could not accept that the views ascribed to them were necessarily those that had been put forward specifically at the discussion. However, I consider that the Bill will be supported by all members and will have a speedy passage. It will overcome a ridiculous situation that required that fees be paid by people who had left the industry.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The account that I gave to the House of my conversation with officers of the Real Estate Institute was entirely accurate. No officer of the institute has queried with me in any way the accuracy of what I said. I am certain that, if the institute had any quarrel with the account I gave, it would have contacted me quickly.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Bill, as it comes out of Committee, provides for the repayment of fees to people who leave the industry between the times stated. Although I accept that some retrospectivity is associated with the measure, it is reasonable that the repayments be made in the circumstances. Therefore, I support the Bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (MISCELLANEOUS METRIC CONVERSIONS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 13. Page 2890.)

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): The Opposition supports this Bill, which mainly makes metric changes in relation to distances. One alteration of which I approve is in the Water Conservation Act, in which the provision prohibiting the Minister or his agents from entering private property to effect repairs within about 45 metres is amended to specify a distance of 100 metres. This is a big improvement; it could even be 10 kilometres! Too often departmental officers enter private property without telling the owner why they have done so. The owner then contacts the member for the district and asks him to find out what this person has been doing on the property. We support the Bill.

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

COMMUNITY WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 6. Page 2739.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I move:

That all the words after the word "Bill" be struck out and the words "be withdrawn and redrafted as two Bills, one relating to community councils for social development and licensed child-care centres and the other relating to Aboriginal reserves and payment of maintenance" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes.

Dr. TONKIN: I have taken this unusual action, because the Bill refers to four main topics. The first deals with matters relating to Aboriginal reserves; the next refers to matters relating to payment and recovery of maintenance; the third relates to child care and the establishment of licensed child-care centres by the State Government; and the fourth relates to changes proposed to be made to community welfare consultative councils. Each of these matters is important, but two are causing some concern. The question of the power of the Governor to revoke a proclamation and the power of the Minister to revoke certain proclamations is entirely reasonable, and the provisions for recovery of maintenance and arrears are also necessary: no-one could quarrel with them. However, I am concerned about matters relating to child care. When the whole question of community welfare was discussed by this House in 1972, this matter caused some concern, in that child-care centres that had been under the control of councils would pass to the Community Welfare Department.

I said then, when referring to the fact that some sections of the community did not take the care they should take in supervising child-care centres, that "the excellent work done by many councils and other authorities will, I am afraid, have to pass to the department. It is a pity that this has happened". My attitude now is similar, because not only has the control passed to the department but also it is a matter of the department being entitled to establish child-care centres. The rationalisation is that the Government should take advantage of money that is available from the Commonwealth Childhood Services Council, and the Minister of Community Welfare made that point clear. Members of the Opposition believe that the Government should encourage establishing child-care centres where they do not exist. They already exist under council and voluntary organisations' sponsorship, and do a good job, but the Government should encourage the establishment of these centres, although it has no business to establish such centres in areas in which it has not tried to stimulate the formation of centres by independent bodies.

I have referred to the third matter covered by this Bill, and the fourth matter relates to changes proposed to be made to consultative councils established by the Bill when it was first introduced. This matter causes me grave concern, as it concerns many people in the community. I believe this will be a retrograde step, and will result in the ultimate withering away of community welfare consultative councils (or whatever they are to be called). I believe that councils were originally contemplated as local councils acting in a local area and being as close as possible to the point of social care and delivery, but that whole concept will be destroyed. That is why I have taken this action, because this matter should be discussed thoroughly before we make any decision. The Community Welfare Act began operating on July 1, 1972.

Every member will recall that the debate was detailed, examined the legislation most carefully, was rather protracted, but was conducted in a spirit of harmony and general agreement. We were all concerned to ensure that the new Act would pass and would operate as soon as possible. At the time, I expressed some misgivings, especially when we discussed matters relating to the establishment of community welfare centres and consultative councils, but the legislation was worth while, and it was necessary to take some steps in the dark in order to see whether consultative councils and community welfare centres would work. I believe they have worked well, and events have shown that the reservations that may have been expressed (and I expressed some of them) were without foundation. I quote one of my statements during that debate, as follows:

It is the task and objective of legislation such as this not only to set out the principles of social welfare (which I have said earlier I believe has been done very well in the Bill), but it is necessary to set out in detail the steps whereby the principles of social welfare may be put into practice. This Bill must then be examined and judged in that light. How are these objects, which we all agree are so necessary, to be achieved in our community? What effect will this legislation have on the individual, and what effect will it have on the community as a whole? Will the steps outlined in this legislation achieve the results that we all desire?

Generally, that has been the true approach. Other people expressed concern, and the Minister will recall a conference arranged by the Adult Education Department at the University of Adelaide at which he made a speech that he later delivered to this House as his second reading explanation. It was well worth his repeating it, and it was followed by a speech that I found equally as good, the speech that I made. The Town Clerk of the Adelaide City Council said that, as far as he could see, the plans for the new Community Welfare Department did not provide for local government assuming a greater role in community welfare, as recommended by the recent report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee. Indeed, he was correct. Local government has not been given the chance to participate further in community welfare activities other than by representation on consultative councils. But, generally, I found that the proposals that came out of that conference and the debate in this House were stimulating and exciting, and I believe we should be proud that we were able to establish community consultative councils that have worked as well as they were planned to work.

We should be proud that we have been able to set up an organisation that provides what the Minister has called the grass roots contact with people to whom community welfare services were to be given. All the way through the Minister's second reading explanation and the principal Act there is emphasis on the involvement of local bodies on a local basis. Section 24 (2) provides:

A community welfare centre may be used by the department, or, with the approval of the Minister, by any other department, person, agency or organisation, for the furtherance of community welfare within the locality in which the centre is established.

Section 25 provides:

The Minister may establish community welfare consultative councils in such localities throughout the State as the Minister thinks fit.

Section 27 (2) provides:

The members of a consultative council must be persons interested in the furtherance of community welfare within the local community.

Once again, the emphasis is on "local": there is a complete emphasis on local involvement. Consultative councils following the passage of this legislation were finally set up. They were established rather more rapidly than the Minister thought possible at the time. Certainly I do not think he thought they would be set up quite so successfully and, after they were set up following the guidelines laid down, there was running through the entire theme the holding of local community meetings, nominating a panel to become an advisory or steering committee, and nominating local residents to serve the local community. We had a complete acceptance and enthusiasm by members within the communities involved. I quote from a pamphlet produced by the Community Welfare Department in December, 1972, relating to consultative councils as follows:

Operation of councils: The establishment of the consultative councils is a major step in the involvement and participation of local people in the planning and provision of services which are conducive to the general welfare of their local communities. It is anticipated that they will make a very large contribution in the rationalisation of currently available services and to the development of new and relevant local programmes covering a wide range of community needs.

If I have tended to emphasise the involvement of local people in local communities, I have done so deliberately, because that was the underlying principle of this legislation: the whole principle was one of local involvement in local affairs. How have these community consultative councils worked? Generally, they have worked very well. It is difficult in the face of the legislation before us to get right the names of various councils: we seem to be changing the names around almost as rapidly as the Commonwealth Government has changed its name to the "Australian Government " and changed the name of all its departments. The consultative councils, which have worked in an advisory capacity, have conducted surveys; they have been given sums of money by the State Community Welfare Department, and they have done remarkably well, considering that some of them have been in existence for only six months.

However, disquiet is now being expressed which stems from a sense of frustration that has often been expressed to me. There is concern that the Minister of Community Welfare has the power virtually to veto the appointment of some people who are nominated to the consultative council from the panel which is drawn up by the advisory steering committee. Generally speaking, the councils have worked well: they have really been right on the spot and at the point of delivery of services in the local community.

Officers of the Community Welfare Department are to be commended for the work they have done to bring this about; they have worked remarkably hard; they have worked long hours; and they have been dedicated, going out of their way to get the scheme off the ground. I for one am proud that the scheme is off the ground, because it is doing much good although it could be doing more good than it is doing at present. Unfortunately, it cannot do better, because it is not receiving enough money. The Community Welfare Department is in exactly the same position as that of every other State Government department, inasmuch as it has to depend on general revenue finances, so we are not getting the money to put into operation the imaginative plans that have been commenced by the establishment of community consultative councils. My doubts about the establishment of community welfare centres and consultative councils have been fairly well dispelled. In fact, I will go on record now as saying that I think it was an imaginative scheme, which I am glad we supported.

Mr. Payne: You weren't always keen about it.

Dr. TONKIN: True, but it is my job to examine these matters, as it is the job of every member to examine

such proposals. If we have doubts we should voice them, because that is the only way we can effect improvements. Just after the councils were set up, there was a change of Government and the Australian Assistance Plan came to the notice of the community. This plan has been interpreted by some people as an intrusion by the Commonwealth Government into the social welfare affairs of the States. I tend to agree with that statement, but there is no doubt in my mind that the attitude of members of the Social Welfare Commission who set out the details of the Australian Assistance Plan was motivated entirely by a concern for the people of this country.

Unfortunately, the Australian Assistance Plan discussion paper No. 1 set out for debate and discussion a series of suggestions (they were only suggestions) without any real regard for what was happening in the States, especially for what had happened in South Australia, where we had already begun our own scheme. Many submissions were made to the Social Welfare Commission, which includes some distinguished South Australians. As a result of the enthusiasm that was shown we found, especially from those States where the system was not operating, that pilot schemes were being set up throughout Australia. One such scheme was set up in Adelaide. In fact, the schemes were set up in almost indecent haste, so much so that the Minister is on record expressing concern at such haste and at the possible duplication of services that might arise. I can well remember the Minister's replying to a question I asked and saying that he did not really agree with the Commonwealth Minister, but that he more or less had to do what he was told in this regard, because the Commonwealth had precedence.

Following the setting up of pilot schemes, discussion paper No. 2 of the Australian Assistance Plan was released in 1974. Although that paper showed several changes in attitude, it showed a degree of enthusiasm for the proposals in the plan. However, enthusiasm was beginning to be tempered a little in the minds of some people who read and thought deeply about it, especially in South Australia, because they wondered what effect the plan, if implemented, would have on the operation of our own community consultative councils. People were worried, and I believe I expressed a doubt at some stage in this House about the effect on the autonomy of community consultative councils.

It was obvious there was going to be an increasing degree of Government control, because not only did the State Minister have a considerable say in the degree of representation on the consultative councils but also the Commonwealth Minister was going to have a word to say, too. We have seen this pattern repeated in other items of legislation and in other spheres, on which I will not dwell, because it is becoming a familiar action of the Commonwealth Government. A Commonwealth Minister is taking a degree of control in an area that has been a State prerogative. I commend to members Australian Assistance Plan discussion paper No. 2, which I believe everyone received when it was published. I believe the plan has been devised with the community welfare of the people in mind, but discussion paper No. 2 seems to contain more of a political influence. Chapter 1, headed "The Australian Assistance Plan as an Experiment" (page 8) states:

. . . the Australian Assistance Plan will remain a national experimental programme. It is national in the sense that it will cover Australia in a network of regional councils . . .

The paper continues:

Regional councils for social development are the experimental means of implementing the national policy objectives of the Australian Assistance Plan . . . Regional councils provide the means for a much greater emphasis on the involvement of local people in planning and evaluating services for their area. But the idea of combining local decision-making and accountability to the regional public for its programmes, with financial accountability . . . is new and experimental.

Under the heading "Local Activities", the paper continues:

Regional councils may allocate their capitation grant to fund experimental projects initiated by other bodies. Although they may choose to fund existing programmes rather than engage in experiments, they have the means to foster innovatory services and projects through the capitation grant.

Chapter 2, headed "The Regional Framework", considers the area in which a regional community council for social development should apply. In part, it states:

An area must be small enough to be manageable and to enable people to participate directly in decision-making. In addition, it must be sufficiently large to be able to provide efficient services. There is only one small snag about this, and that is that what the Commonwealth department considers to be a small enough area in which to provide local involvement is not what we in South Australia would regard as a small area. Regional councils will be based on the regional divisions laid down by the Department of Urban and Regional Development. Some of the large areas accepted by DURD (and doubt is expressed in the report about this) have raised a doubt about expected participation. I believe that is a reasonable doubt. I have no doubt that, in those States where consultative councils and a decentralisation of community services are not operating, the idea of regional consultative councils is extremely good and should be supported. If in this State we revert to the regions laid down by the Department of Urban and Regional Development, we will be going backwards; we will be drawing back from the people and will reach the stage where it will be no longer local involvement by local communities but regional involvement and regional direction of local communities. I believe that there will be an increasing degree of Government control and an increasing loss of the autonomy of the local consultative councils.

Discussions took place between the Commonwealth Government and the State Governments. At this stage I mention that today I was fascinated to receive a reply to a question stating, in effect, that so many joint committees were meeting to consider matters affecting the Commonwealth Government and the State Government that the State Government could not be bothered preparing a report for me. I wonder who is running this State. However, there were discussions between the Commonwealth Government and State Ministers, and a workshop was held late last year. Representatives of consultative councils were entitled to attend that meeting. In some cases the Chairman attended, with one, two or three other representatives. A report of the proceedings was submitted to the Minister of Community Welfare in relation to proposed changes to the structure and operations of consultative councils.

Dr. Eastick: Changes already?

Dr. TONKIN: No. This all leads up to the introduction of the Bill. The workshop, for the purposes of the discussion, was presented with a document that was virtually a *fait accompli*.

Dr. Eastick: Who was the author of it?

Dr. TONKIN: I have not been able to find that out, but I suggest that it was a joint effort by our Minister and the Commonwealth Minister. It is apparent, when one reads the document, that our Minister considers that the

Commonwealth Minister will have the final say. A statement of the proposed changes is as follows:

1. The changes proposed to the meeting were as follows:
(1) A change of name to Community Councils for Social Development.

One wonders how much the Commonwealth Minister for Urban and Regional Development (Mr. Uren) will have to do with this plan.

Mr. Coumbe: What is "social development"?

Dr. TONKIN: I think it means the same as community welfare or social welfare as applied to a specific area. The document also states:

(2) Two additional functions, namely:
(*a*) To co-operate with appropriate Australian Government and State Government authorities in planning for welfare services, development of welfare programmes, and evaluation of social policies.
(*b*) To advise the Regional Council of Social Development on welfare services programmes and policies at the local community level.

The Minister will say, "There you have your local community involvement. What is the difference between that and local representations to the Community Welfare Department?" I believe that there is more relationship between our department and consultative councils than there is between these authorities. The report continues:

(3) A change in membership to:
10 community members
2 local government representatives
2 State Government representatives
2 Australian Government representatives
1 local member of Parliament or his nominee

17

(4) Selection of the 10 community members on similar lines to those currently followed, except that the nominating committee will submit a panel of 10 names only, which will be considered by both the State Minister of Community Welfare and the Australian Minister for Social Security, either having the power to refer the panel of nominations back to the nominating committee if it is not acceptable. It was suggested that reference to a community profile prepared by departmental officers could form the basis for this selection, being used both by the nominating committee and by the respective Ministers as a basis for considering reasonably representative community members for the council.

2. In general the meeting, which was attended by some 50 representatives fro m17 existing councils and three steering committees for councils about to be established, enthusiastically supported all of the proposed changes. Changes (1), (2) and (3) were seen to considerably strengthen the councils, and change (4) meets criticisms made by a number of councils.

3. Name: "Community Councils for Social Development": There was virtually unanimous support for the proposed name change. However, some concern was expressed about the word "council" causing possible confusion with other councils and particularly local government bodies. Such confusion has already been encountered in some instances in relation to the existing consultative councils. No appropriate alternative seemed available. The meeting therefore resolved to recommend to you that a State-wide publicity campaign, similar to that held before the public meetings, should be mounted in order to clearly establish the new name and its connections with previously established consultative councils which have received considerable publicity. It was felt that the usefulness of the councils is closely related to the degree of community recognition of the councils and their functions.

4. Functions: The meeting recommended that proposed function 5 (to advise the Regional Council of Social Development on welfare services, programmes and policies at the local community level) would be improved if two-way communication between regional and community councils were emphasised, and accordingly recommended that the words "and liaise with" be inserted following the words "To advise".

Here there was an attempt to preserve the autonomy of consultative councils. The report continues:

5. Membership: The increased membership for councils was generally welcomed. However, concern was expressed that the functions and responsibilities of the representatives of the three tiers of government should be clearly specified.

This is interesting, because the number of representatives from Commonwealth Government departments, State Government departments and local councils has accounted for almost the whole increased membership, without having given any increase in the number of members from the community. The report continues:

6. Selection of community membership: The meeting recommended that the steering committee should consider nominations by referring to a profile of the region rather than according to such profile. In other words, the profile should be a broad guide, and not an unduly confining set of criteria.

I consider that to be a thoroughly good move. The report then states:

The meeting accepted that steering committee nominations should be subject to Ministerial review—

that belief is not held widely, but some people accept it—

but that, if the Minister saw fit to refer such nominations back to the steering committee, then the reasons for such referral back to the committee should be specifically explained. The meeting recommended that nominations for replacements to councils close a month after the date of the annual general meeting and two months before new members are to be appointed.

Item 7 deals with the term of office of members of the council. It was considered that the term should be four years, half the membership retiring every two years. This would make full use of the experience gained by members of the council. Item 8 deals with consultation with Government departments and the need for all departments to tell local consultative councils when plans for change affecting that area were to be drawn up. That report was prepared for the Minister of Community Welfare and, doubtless, pressure was exerted on the people who attended the workshop.

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

Dr. TONKIN: As I have said, at the workshop to which I have referred a certain amount of pressure was exerted on people attending, as it was exerted on people in the community. They have been spurred on in their efforts (if they needed that, and I doubt that they did, because most people are anxious to see the cause of community welfare advanced) by threats that they may not participate in Australian Assistance Plan funds. Those funds have been held up in order to exert pressure. The invitation is to forget every other factor and get the legislation passed as soon as possible so that we can take part as a State in the distribution of Australian Assistance Plan funds. I do not think that is a reasonable proposition at all.

It is much more important to ensure that we adopt the right system. As I have said, I believe that the plan for consultative councils, as developed by the Community Welfare Department, is the right plan. In fact, I believe it is a great credit to the department. I do not want to see that plan destroyed or made unworkable by any change which I would regard as retrograde and which was made simply because funds were available from a Commonwealth source. Following that workshop, a joint letter from the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security (Mr. Hayden) and the State Minister for Community Welfare was issued to Regional Councils for Social Development setting out basically what were the terms of the joint agreement. In

the Bill, we have before us basically the terms agreed to by the two Ministers. The letter states:

Community Councils for Social Development under the Community Welfare Act (S.A.):

1. The name, membership, functions and operation of the State Community Welfare Consultative Councils will be altered.

1.1. The councils will be renamed "Community Councils for Social Development".

1.2. Membership will be as follows:

10 persons nominated from the local community by an elected steering committee;
1 member of Parliament (State) for the district or his nominee;
2 representatives of local government authorities;
2 representatives of State Government departments;
1 representative of Australian Government departments;

16 total membership.

The term of office of a member shall be four years, half the membership retiring after two years. No member may serve consecutive terms. The community council will arrange a public meeting every year to elect a steering committee to nominate persons to fill vacancies on the council.

It seems to be an odd state of affairs that any vacancies which occur on the council (and despite which a consultative council could still function) should be filled only once a year. The letter continues:

The number of persons nominated by the steering committee will correspond with the number of vacancies on the council.

Without going into detail, I point out that the provisos outlined in the workshop agreement prevail here; we have seen them already. In other words, the Minister of Community Welfare, either on his own initiative or at the request of the Minister for Social Security, may refer the nominations back to the steering committee if it is believed that a satisfactory balance of community interests has not been achieved.

I believe that the possibility of manipulation that already exists in the principal Act (and I think it is a real one) is further compounded by this measure, which brings the Commonwealth Minister into the situation. The final decision will remain with the steering committee, following its consideration of the Minister's views. I suppose that is at least some concession, but it will take a fairly brave committee to go against a nomination recommended by the Minister. The functions of Community Councils for Social Development as referred to in the letter are those provided in the Bill. However, there is a change from what is provided in paragraph 1.3.5. of the letter, as follows:

To report upon any matter affecting the welfare of the local community referred to the community council for consideration and report by the Minister of Community Welfare or the Director-General of Community Welfare or the Regional Council for Social Development.

That last part is not referred to in the Bill. The letter continues:

1.4. Operation of Community Councils for Social Development.

1.4.1. Matters relating to the whole region will be referred to the regional council.

1.4.2. Councils will be able to appoint subcouncils and subcommittees.

1.4.3. Community councils will advise Regional Councils of Social Development on grants and the allocation of resources including the location of community development workers.

Once again, we see clearly the fact that regional consultative councils will take precedence of local councils. I do not think there is any question about that, as the threat raises itself again and again: it is woven throughout the whole fabric of the legislation. The consultative councils we have set up will take second place to regional councils; the scheme will be under Commonwealth Government supervision and control.

Mr. Coumbe: The concept of "local" goes.

Dr. TONKIN: That concept may not disappear entirely, but it is moved one step farther away from the local community. The membership of Regional Councils for Social Development is set out in the letter, and includes two representatives of Australian Government departments, two representatives of State Government departments, and two representatives of local government. In the letter, reference was made to three representatives of community welfare agencies, with a total membership of 18, but apparently some change has been made. There is power for regional councils to co-opt up to five additonal members of the community as members of the council. The real crunch comes with the following reference in the letter:

There will be between two to five community councils in each Australian Assistance Plan region in South Australia.

So, far from increasing the representation, we are in fact reducing the representation of community bodies. In extreme cases, one region takes the place of five community councils. Therefore, instead of having 60 members (five councils of 12 members each) of community councils for an area, we could find ourselves with a total of 16 people representing that area, with a fair proportion of that number being representatives of Government agencies—

Dr. Eastick: That doesn't give very close representation.

Dr. TONKIN: That gives absolutely no close representation. It means of necessity that in these extreme circumstances representation will be as far as possible removed from the local community sphere (the point of community welfare delivery). It is a grossly retrograde step, even when one looks at the best situation, in which two consultative councils are to be replaced by one regional council. Even then, the situation is far from satisfactory: there is still a move away from local community involvement. The letter continues:

The community councils within the region will nominate eight representatives to the regional council distributed between the community councils concerned and with the agreement of these community councils. In the event of an agreement not being reached, the regional councils, which will include one representative from each community council, will decide the community council/councils which will nominate an additional member or members for a stated period.

A situation will arise in which a consultative council may have only one representative on a regional council, and there will be a fight over who will get second representation. As I have said, the letter is signed by the respective Commonwealth and State Ministers. I have no doubt which body will dominate the affairs of social and community welfare planning from now on. The regional council will take its funds directly from the Australian Assistance Plan, so long as that plan continues to operate in its present form. Some doubt is being expressed in this State as well as in other States whether the plan will in fact continue. Members of the Social Welfare Commission (which did such good work in preparing Australian Assistance Plan discussion paper No. 2) are seriously disturbed about the political rivalry and in-fighting now developing between the Social Security Department and the Urban and Regional Development Department.

The Community Welfare Department of this State would like the funds so that it can carry through the plan which was imaginatively prepared in 1972 and which we debated in this House. Obviously, the department is not getting those funds and, for that reason, it cannot put its plans into

operation. Obviously, it has asked for the funds, and obviously the Minister has asked for the funds, but these have been refused by the Commonwealth Government. This has had the effect of grossly restricting the activities of local consultative councils, now councils for social development. Nothing I can find makes me think differently. Any body can be autonomous so long as it has funds but, if it does not have funds, it is dependent and not autonomous.

It is obvious that the funds will come from the Australian Assistance Plan, the Commonwealth Social Security Department, or the Commonwealth Urban and Regional Development Department, but it does not matter what is the source: the funds will come through the regional councils. In these councils, having a large proportion of departmental officers and with the State Minister screening the local council members and the Commonwealth Minister having the final say as to membership, there will be far too heavy an emphasis on bureaucracy and administration, rather than an emphasis on the people who really matter—the people who deserve to receive the community assistance. People who are on the delivery end may not be represented at all. This was one of the major points debated when the legislation first came into the House.

Mr. Payne: What about the eight specified?

Dr. TONKIN: The honourable member has not woken up to this point. One person or possibly two persons from each consultative council will be members of the regional council; that is all. This is in contrast to the wide spectrum of representation from the community which was provided for in the original legislation. The regional council will be the administrative body. It is a step backwards. All consultative councils and the local Community Welfare Department will be overridden. These bodies will wither on the vine because the regional councils will take all the nourishment by way of Commonwealth funds, and the State bodies will be starved. It is rather significant that the Urban and Regional Development Department regions are being applied in respect of the Australian Assistance Plan and the regional councils. When I think back to some proposals made a year or two ago, whereby State Governments and State Parliaments were to be replaced by greater council regions, I cannot help wondering what is the purpose behind this plan.

Many council members have suggested to me that the funds normally available to local government will gradually but surely be channelled through regional councils and spent in local government areas through those regional councils. The community welfare of this State and of other States is being used as a vehicle to justify the taking over of more and more local government functions. I am not surprised that local councils are concerned. The passage of this Bill will result in excessive bureaucracy, loss of autonomy for local community councils, a serious reduction in representation from local areas, and a moving away from the excellent concept built up in South Australia through the efforts of the Community Welfare Department. Instead, we will have this new scheme, which is being put up by the Commonwealth Government, which is not as efficient and not as closely in touch with local communities.

The motives for the introduction of this measure are decidedly suspect. The whole matter is the subject of political in-fighting, and I do not think this matter should be subject to political in-fighting. I would like to thank the many members of community consultative councils who have spoken to me over the last few days and expressed their views. I understand that someone has been telephoning them and saying that I seem to be opposing the Bill and that they had better talk to me. If anyone has done that, I thank him, because I am grateful for the interest shown. The matter is beginning to be thoroughly ventilated, whereas I think only one side of the question had been ventilated previously. Consideration of this matter should be delayed until we know where we stand with the Social Security Department, the Urban and Regional Development Department and the Australian Assistance Plan, so that we can see where they are going. We do not know at present.

We should find out what members of community consultative councils really think, in the light of the discussions taking place about the threat to their autonomy. The Minister will advance the argument that, if we delay, we will not be able to participate in the hand-out of Australian Assistance Plan funds if we do not change. This strikes me as a "be in it mate" attitude. If the Commonwealth Government sincerely wishes to advance the cause of community welfare in this State and throughout Australia it will not wait until political conditions are complied with. The Minister knows this full well. He has made his attitude pretty clear. Twenty community councils have been successfully established throughout the State and are working. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

However, as regional councils under the Australian Assistance Plan are established in South Australia the consultative councils will accept additional functions and responsibilities relating to the regional councils.

This is a lot of double talk. The Minister really means that the consultative councils will be asked to advise the regional councils but, in fact, their own autonomy will be whittled away more and more. In his second reading explanation the Minister also said:

In addition to their existing functions, the community councils will advise the regional councils for social development on grants and the allocation of resources, including the location of community development workers funded under the Australian Assistance Plan.

"Advise" is the word. I think that that is all they will do. The final decision will remain with the regional councils.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What is wrong with that?

Dr. TONKIN: There is no need to consider this matter now, and consequently I am moving that the Bill be split. We should deal with the matters that ought to be dealt with and get them off the Notice Paper. The Minister's attitude will be shown clearly through his response to my suggestions. If he wants to preserve the results of all the work that has gone into one of the most forward-looking steps that this State has taken, involving people at local level in community welfare, the Minister will delay this part of the Bill until it is further ventilated in the community. If he is not willing to do that, the Opposition will at least move to do it. I am not speaking from anything other than a deep concern for the community welfare of the people of this State. The scheme we have is well worth supporting. Of course, it is difficult for the Minister. He has made that clear on other occasions. Last year, I asked the Minister the following question:

Will the Minister take further action to persuade the Minister for Social Security to reconsider his decision to continue with the Australian Assistance Plan in South Australia that is in competition with the State community welfare services?

In reply, the Minister said:

As I said, there is a price we have to pay for a federal system, and part of the price is that at times I will not agree with a Commonwealth Minister.

He also said:

The Australian Assistance Plan is a matter for Commonwealth Government policy and results from Commonwealth

law, and the Commonwealth Government will implement it in the way it thinks proper. I can make representations, and have done so, as to my view and that of the South Australian Government on how the plan should be implemented in South Australia; however, the final decision, whether I agree with it or not, rests with the Commonwealth Government.

I express my grave concern at the effects that this Bill will have on the standard of community welfare care delivered in this community, and for that reason I have moved that it be dealt with in the way I have outlined to delay that part of the Bill. If it is not, the Opposition will oppose the Bill.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Community Welfare): I think the opposition to this Bill expressed by the member for Bragg on behalf of his Party is completely misconceived and based on a misunderstanding of the purpose of the Bill, what it seeks to achieve, and what it provides. Previously, I have explained in the House the relationship between the system of community councils developed under the Community Welfare Act of South Australia and the Australian Assistance Plan. Because of what the honourable member has said, I think it necessary to repeat some of the things I have previously explained.

Community consultative councils, as they exist under the Community Welfare Act of South Australia, are the creatures of State law. They derive their existence from a South Australian Act of Parliament, and their functions and purposes are set out in that Act. Substantially, their purpose is to act as advisers to the South Australian Minister of Community Welfare. Under this amending Bill that situation will continue. The Community Welfare Act of South Australia will continue to exist; the powers and functions of the Minister as determined under that Act will remain the same; community consultative councils will continue to exist under the new name of community councils for social development; and they will continue to fulfil the same functions as they have had under the existing Act, with some additional functions provided for in the Bill.

There will be no change in the South Australian Government's programme of community welfare: its implementation will remain the same, and the part played in it by community councils will remain exactly the same. All this talk from the member for Bragg about community councils being replaced (I think that was the expression he used more than once) by regional councils so that as many as five, he said, would be replaced by one regional council, simply involves a misreading of the Bill. No such thing will happen: on the contrary, so far from the situation depicted by the member for Bragg in which the advisory functions would be removed from the local community to some larger region, the true position is that the number of community councils will be increased.

Our planning is that they will be increased to as many as 30, so that, instead of representing larger areas, they will each represent smaller areas and will be brought closer to the local community. I am convinced that community councils function best when the area they serve is smallest. It becomes a matter of economics to a large degree as to how small one can make the area for which they are responsible. I make perfectly clear that which is clear on a reading of the Bill, but which the member for Bragg did not seem to understand: that there is no question of the absorption of existing councils by regional councils, and no question of replacements. The South Australian community welfare programme will continue to operate in precisely the same way as it has operated in the past. One spin-off of the new arrangement will be that the number of community councils will be increased, the area served by them will be smaller, and their contact with the local community will be so much greater. The problem that this Bill seeks to solve is the relationship between the Australian Assistance Plan and the State programme, because side by side with the community welfare programme in South Australia there exists a Commonwealth programme initiated by the Commonwealth Government and described, as the honourable member has said, in the working papers of the Social Welfare Commission, as the Australian Assistance Plan, which is based essentially on a regional system.

It is intended that regions will be those of the Urban and Regional Development Department, and that Commonwealth funds for social welfare will be disbursed on the recommendations of regional councils. That system can exist side by side with the South Australian system but independent of it; indeed, at present that is very much the position. The two interim regional councils in South Australia are operating under the Commonwealth scheme. They will make recommendations to the Commonwealth Government, which will approve expenditure that will be disbursed through these councils. That is the present position, and it would be a possible way to continue. The Commonwealth programme can be developed side by side with, but independently of, the State programme.

Mr. Coumbe: But you recently expressed fears of possible overlapping.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, because I think that, if it happened, the danger would not only be that there would be overlapping but they would be pulling in different directions, as the regional councils' policy and objectives could differ from those under the State programme. Consequently, arrangements that are embodied in the Bill are the result of an attempt to overcome that situation. Let us make no mistake about this: if the Bill is rejected, it will not have the consequence of the Australian Assistance Plan going away. The Commonwealth Government will not say, "Oh! the member for Bragg in South Australia does not like our plan, so we will take it away". The Commonwealth Government will not do that.

Since December, 1972, that Government for the first time has entered in a significant way into the area of social welfare, and I welcome that move. It is something that is capable of bringing great benefits to the people of Australia, including those in South Australia, and so long as I am Minister of Community Welfare I will ensure, as far as I can, that those benefits are not denied to South Australians by some obtuse attitude of not co-operating with Commonwealth authorities. The Commonwealth Government has its responsibilities, and it has taken up the task of providing funds for social welfare in this country. The State Government, too, has a responsibility, part of which is to enter into co-operative arrangements with the Commonwealth authority to see that South Australians get the benefit of Commonwealth funds provided for the purpose.

The question we are deciding this evening is not whether the Australian Assistance Plan and Commonwealth involvement in social welfare is to disappear or not. That decision will not be taken here. What we are deciding this evening is whether the people of South Australia are to get the benefit of Commonwealth policies.

Let us dispose of a few matters that have been raised by the member for Bragg. He tried to say that the Commonwealth Minister would somehow have a controlling interest, to use his expression. I do not want to suggest that the honourable member has misrepresented the situation, but

I find it a little difficult to understand how anyone of ordinary intelligence reading the Bill, which provides that the Commonwealth Minister shall have one representative on a consultative council of 16, can derive from that provision the concept that the Commonwealth Minister has under this Bill a controlling interest in community councils. Of course, that is absolute nonsense. The Commonwealth Minister will have only one member on the community council. The member for Bragg, if he had read the Bill, would know perfectly well that there is no question whatever of a controlling interest by the Commonwealth Minister.

Mr. Coumbe: What indication are we to believe?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Just read the letter and apply your mind carefully to it. Forget about the member for Bragg, because he has misunderstood everything about the Bill so far. The member for Torrens wishes to understand what it is all about, so I suggest that he forget what the member for Bragg has said and apply his natural intelligence to what I am saying and to the Bill, because then he will reach some interesting conclusions. The member for Bragg does not understand what the Bill is about, or he does not choose to tell the House what he understands it is all about.

This situation, which is an important matter for this Parliament to decide, concerns the relationship between the Australian Assistance Plan and the South Australian programme for community welfare. Clearly, it involves to my mind the need for an understanding between the two Governments. It is for that reason that the negotiations between the Commonwealth Minister and me were undertaken. Those negotiations extended over a considerable time, and there was a careful evaluation of the attitudes between the two programmes and the way they could be brought together.

I pay a tribute to the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Hayden), who has brought to this matter a conciliatory spirit of understanding and an earnest desire to see that the Commonwealth funds work for the Commonwealth programme in South Australia and that they work in harmony with the system already established here. Mr. Hayden was the first to appreciate that there was an advantage to the Commonwealth programme in South Australia that did not exist in other States, because here in South Australia we had developed the decentralising community-based system to which the member for Bragg has referred, a system that has not been developed in other States. So the Commonwealth Minister and we in South Australia were able to devise arrangements by which we could marry the concepts of the two schemes.

What it involved was this. Under the Commonwealth scheme, the bodies through which the funds are channelled are the regional councils; under our scheme the programme is implemented through the consultative councils, so that what seemed to us to be the obvious way of marrying the two schemes was to make the community councils the community base of the regional councils for Commonwealth purposes and leave completely untouched the State programme.

The regional councils have no part in the State programme. That programme involves a relationship between the State Minister, the State department, and the community councils, and it will continue to do in the future. Such councils are now called consultative councils; but when the Bill is passed they will be called community councils for social development. Therefore, I am using the neutral term "community councils" for that reason. Arrangements have been entered into, and it is foreseen that, as regards the State programme, there is no change, and the relationship between the community councils, State department, and the Minister remains precisely the same. As regards the Commonwealth programme, instead of having regional councils that are separate from and independent of the community councils, the community base will be found in the community councils that are established under the State Act. So, of the 18 members of the regional council, eight will be community representatives elected by the State community councils.

In addition, regional councils will have the right to co-opt another five community members. The idea behind that was the view taken by the existing regional councils of South Australia that there was a need, with areas as large as these regions, for community representatives who might be expected to look at the overall picture and not merely look at it as representatives of a council from a smaller district for State purposes. So, this was a reconciliation of the idea of the larger region with the idea of the smaller district, which is at the basis of the State scheme. However, let me emphasise that, as regards this Act and as regards this State Parliament, we are merely refashioning the community councils. We are not in control of the composition of regional councils. This is part of the Commonwealth Minister's modifying his ideas in relation to regional councils. We agreed to modify our ideas in relation to community councils, and I think that the final result, looked at sensibly, produces an excellent relationship between the two schemes, because the problem that was developed is that not only were there two programmes operating side by side but there was a real danger that they might tend to go in different directions if there was no interaction between them.

In addition, members of the community who involved themselves in community welfare were becoming confused about the two programmes and where they were leading. What was obviously needed was the involvement of the State community councils in the regional councils for Commonwealth purposes for the purposes of the Australian Assistance Plan. Therefore, it is wrong to suppose, as the member for Bragg supposed, that somehow regarding State community welfare policies the emphasis will shift from community councils to regional councils. Indeed, the reverse applies because regional councils play no part whatever in the State programme. In the State programme there will be more community councils each serving a smaller area. What it has done is to influence the Commonwealth programme to a degree, so that a Commonwealth regional council, instead of merely being chosen by meetings called for the purpose of selecting regional councils, will now be based, as regards community representation, substantially on State councils.

There is therefore no question of diminution of local involvement, as was suggested by the member for Bragg. On the contrary, a much greater local involvement will be seen. Similarly, there is no question of increased Government control. That phrase was used, without explanation, by the member for Bragg. However, the position regarding the State Act is exactly the same as the relationship between the State Minister, the State Government, and the community council. That is as far as the Act is concerned.

The member for Bragg made a point about the way community councils are now chosen and will be chosen in future. The Act now provides that members shall be appointed by the Minister and that procedure will continue under the new arrangements, the only difference being that the number will be 10 instead of eight. However, the practical arrangements that have existed in the past have

been that a steering committee, chosen by the public meeting, has selected a panel of 12 from whom I, as State Minister, have selected eight. Personally, I have found that a very satisfactory arrangement and, had it been left to me, I would have perpetuated it. It has been the means by which I, as Minister, have been able to achieve balance finally on community interests, and I think it has been a practical way of achieving that situation. I have had situations where I have felt the need for it because the names submitted by the steering committee clearly have omitted some community interest, such as that of a migrant group.

The arrangement has proved useful, but I can understand how a Commonwealth Minister, considering machinery that ultimately would be the model for other States as well as this State, could feel a certain unwillingness to give a power of veto to a State Minister, when the councils being appointed are the constituent elements of regional councils that are part of his plan. The Commonwealth Minister took the view that the community appointments to the council should not be subject to any Ministerial vetting, and I accept that.

Of course, that view accords with the view held by many community councils. Naturally enough, they do not always see merit in the Minister's having the final say in the appointment of community councils, and I understand that attitude and respect those people for it. Therefore, the Commonwealth Minister's view and the view of many other people coincide.

In future, under this amending legislation, there will be 10 community members from community councils, and the steering committee will choose all of them. The Minister has the right to send the matter back for reconsideration, and I have agreed with the Commonwealth Minister (as I state in the letter) that, if he is not pleased about the matter, he can request me to send it back and I can make up my mind on what I do about it. However, because these councils now are constituent parts of the regional councils Commonwealth plan, if a Minister feels there is not an adequate balance on the council chosen by the steering committee, he may ask the steering committee to reconsider it. If the committee reconsiders and decides that it wants to abide by its original ideas, both Ministers are willing to abide by that decision.

Mr. Coumbe: Does the Bill deal with that procedure?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No. The Bill does not deal with the machinery at all, nor did the original Act. This Act merely provides that the members shall be chosen by the Minister of Community Welfare, and I consider that that must be so. If we try to write into the Bill all the machinery about having steering committees and how they are elected, and so on, we shall give a degree of rigidity to this Bill that is undesirable. I do not think we have yet reached the stage of doing that. Some day we may be able to write that into the legislation, but we need much more knowledge of how community councils and regional councils work before we start writing in precise provisions about members.

For the present the Act will continue to provide that members shall be appointed by the Minister, and all the arrangements that have existed in the past as regards the steering committee have been merely a matter of practical arrangement. A convention has been laid down, and the new convention is the one set out in the letter. The member for Bragg also said that the regional council would take precedence of the community council, but it will not do that. Regarding the State programme, the regional council is not involved. The community councils are the only community bodies recognised in State law and the only community bodies with which the State Minister deals.

Obviously, what happens in relation to the Commonwealth Government programme is that the regional councils take precedence because they are the bodies set up under the Australian Assistance Plan, so the Australian Assistance Plan will operate through the regional councils, because that is Commonwealth Government policy. The State programme will operate through the State community councils. The advantage to be derived from the arrangements made and ratified in this Bill is that now the community councils will become constituent elements of the regional councils, so we achieve an intermarriage of the two and solve this problem of tensions between the two programmes and, more particularly, the problem of tensions involving the people from the community who are involved in the two programmes.

Mr. Coumbe: How many existing councils are likely to be in a region in, say, the metropolitan area?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The maximum number will be five and the minimum two: it will range between two and five. Work is being done at present in redrawing the boundaries of community councils. There will ultimately be a total of 11 regional councils and 30 community councils. In conclusion, I emphasize that I consider it important for us to remember the matter that we are considering in relation to this Bill. We are not considering the merits or demerits of the Australian Assistance Plan. Personally, I favour that plan, but I do not say that I would have necessarily tailored it precisely in the way it exists at present. I think that, like all other experimental programmes, it will undergo substantial changes over the years.

Mr. Coumbe: What we are really considering is the splitting of the Bill.

The Hon. L. J. KING: That is the amendment to my motion. We are considering the second reading of the Bill, and one aspect of that is the amendment moved by the member for Bragg, which seeks to split the Bill to delay or defeat the implementation of the Australian Assistance Plan. We are debating whether we should adopt those proposals or reject them. We are not deciding whether the Australian Assistance Plan in its present form is the ideal plan. We are not deciding whether we would have adopted it in that way or whether we would have done something else about it.

The Australian Assistance Plan is the Commonwealth Government plan on social welfare, and I personally welcome it, whether or not I would have framed it in the same way as that in which it exists at present. It is a substantial contribution to the well-being of the people of this country, and the people connected with community councils to whom I have spoken understand that and are anxious to be involved in the plan. All the proposals before the House have been discussed.

Community councils have made representations to the Commonwealth Minister and to me and they are anxious to be involved in the plan, as they should be, because it is the national plan for social welfare. Let us remember what we are doing. If we reject these arrangements, we do not make the Australian Assistance Plan go away: all we do is destroy the painstaking efforts that have been made by the Commonwealth Minister, by me, by both Commonwealth and State departments, by community councils, and by the regional councils to build up this marriage between the two concepts, and we cut ourselves off from the national scheme and the national funds that will be disbursed through that scheme. That would be absolute folly, and if we did it we

would link ourselves with those obscurantists, of whom unfortunately there are a few in this country, who would cut off their nose if only they could spite the Canberra face. No State Leader with any self-respect or concern for the people of his State could possibly be associated with that sort of attitude.

Let me remind members of something else. The people of this State to whom we refer in a social welfare connotation are the people of the State in the greatest need. We are talking about social welfare clients. Can we not forget this centralist-State wrangle for long enough to take some practical measures to get these available funds to the clients—the people who need the money and assistance?

How can we go out and face people in need and say, "You could have got assistance and funds from the Commonwealth Government but we are not going to have these Canberra people interfering in our affairs. We will not have a bar of that; we'll throw the whole thing out, because to accept it would involve co-operation with those dreadful people in Canberra"? That sort of attitude is absolutely irresponsible: it is utterly callous. Let us understand what we are doing. The Commonwealth Minister and his Government entered into these negotiations in the spirit of attempting to achieve a marriage between the two systems; we adopted a similar attitude. The Commonwealth abandoned its initial concept of what regional councils would be. Originally its concept was that meetings would be called to elect regional councils directly.

The Commonwealth was to have its own system of regional councils, independent of the State instrumentality. When the Commonwealth abandoned that concept, there was some opposition from people for whom positions had been created in regional councils and who did not like the idea of being involved with State community councils. Some initial resistance having been overcome, everyone has reached the point of agreement that the best thing for the people of the State, particularly the social welfare clients, is to get the matter settled and to develop a spirit of co-operation between the two schemes to ensure that the people of the State who need assistance get it with a minimum of delay. To divide the Bill with the object of delaying or defeating the provisions that relate to co-operation with the Australian Assistance Plan would, I believe, be callous and irresponsible folly.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Mathwin, McAnaney, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold, Goldsworthy, and Gunn. Noes—Messrs. McKee, McRae, and Wells.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Mathwin, McAnaney, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dunstan, McKee, McRae, and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Arnold, Goldsworthy, Gunn, and Nankivell.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Membership of community councils."

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

To strike out new subsection (4) and insert the following new subsection:

(4) One member of a community council must be an officer of the department.

It has been represented to me that it would be much better if, instead of two members of the Public Service, there should be one who is a member of the Community Welfare Department.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Community Welfare): After consideration by the Commonwealth Minister, it was thought it would give community councils a broader outlook if State Government officers on the council were not confined in their interest to the Community Welfare Department. That is not my view, because I considered that one Government representative was sufficient, but, as the Commonwealth Minister made concessions in the composition of regional councils, I considered this a small concession to make in return. If the programme is to be implemented, it is necessary for the terms of the arrangement to be carried out, including those inserted at the instance of the Commonwealth Minister.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I support the amendment, because the clause also relates to the intrusion of the Commonwealth Government into State Government affairs. In relation to the Premier's financial philosophy, I quote from a statement he made when a member of the Opposition and when speaking on the general problem of finance.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That matter has nothing to do with the amendment, and the honourable member must confine himself to this clause.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is closely related, because of the intrusion of the Commonwealth Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That is not the question before the Chair.

Amendment negatived.

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

To strike out new subsection (6).

New subsection (6) refers to one member of the community council being a representative of the Government of the Commonwealth nominated by the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security. I was far from being completely sold on the Minister's explanation when he replied to this debate. However, his assurances, which he asserted with some frequency, were that, as far as this Bill was concerned, the Community Welfare Department and the State consultative councils, which would be community councils, were absolutely and utterly divorced from the Commonwealth Government, the Australian Assistance Plan, the Department of Social Security, or anything in any way related to the Commonwealth Government. If that is so, and if that is what he believes, I challenge him to accept my amendment.

Let us see whether the Minister really means what he says, because that is what he did say. He must now say exactly where he stands on this matter, because he cannot have it both ways; he has to make up his own mind now. Is this Bill divorced from the Commonwealth *in toto*, as the Minister asserts that it is and, if it is, will he accept my amendment or will he not accept it and show that his assertions are worth nothing?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am not certain whether the honourable member does not listen or whether he does not try to understand and has his own motives for making that sort of statement. I did not say anything as silly as that community councils have nothing to do with the programme of the Commonwealth Government. The whole purpose is to make them constituent elements of regional councils, which are part of the Australian Assistance Plan; that is what the Bill is about. What I did say is that the State programme will be implemented, as it always has been implemented, through community councils, and that regional councils have nothing to do with the State programme. That is completely different from what the honourable member has said. He either has not listened to what I said or he has seen fit to claim that I said something that I did not say.

Obviously, community councils under this system are constituent elements of the regional councils; they have their own life as part and parcel of the State programme and as the instruments through which the State programme is implemented. In addition, in relation to the Commonwealth programme, they are constituent elements, to a great extent, of the regional councils. It is because of their involvement with the Commonwealth programme that the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security has a member on the community council: just as the State Government has two members, the Commonwealth Minister has one. It would be absurd to have community councils, which are constituent elements of a regional council through which a Commonwealth programme is implemented, but to exclude the Commonwealth Minister from having even one representative out of the 16 representatives on the community council.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: We are now dealing with the intrusion of the Commonwealth Government, so I should like to return to the extract from *Hansard* to which I was about to refer. I believe it is extremely pertinent in considering our Government's attitude towards the relationship between this State and the Commonwealth Government. The extract is of a speech made in this Chamber by the Premier, and is as follows:

The only successful answer—

and he is talking about Commonwealth-State relations—

to the whole problem is that Australia shall have one enlarged sovereign Parliament with a central administration in some things and a decentralised administration through a county system subject to the Parliament. Then local government would be far closer to the people.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Previously, I spoke to the honourable member on the same matter. We are dealing with new subsection (6), which provides that one member of the community council must be a representative of the Commonwealth Government and nominated by the Minister for Social Security. That is the provision which we are discussing at present, and I ask the honourable member for Davenport to confine his remarks to it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I believe the comments relate exactly to that area. I know it is unpalatable for the Government of this State, because the Premier—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will be the judge of whether or not it is appropriate. I rule the honourable member's remarks out of order. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. However, as I was saying, this State Government likes to have the Commonwealth Government intruding into its affairs.

Dr. Tonkin: It invites them.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, as it has done in this matter. Members cannot disagree with that, because it is here in black and white. A Commonwealth Government nominee will be a member of the council.

The Hon. L. J. King: He's an invited intruder; that's interesting.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is correct. He is an invited intruder because he is invited by a Government, but he is an intruder as far as the people of South Australia are concerned. South Australians, like people from most other States, have indicated clearly that they do not wish to have a centralised Government in Australia that controls all Government actions. It is therefore time that the Dunstan Government stopped trying to hoodwink the people of this State by making out that it is protecting their rights. No other person has done more to erode the rights of South Australia than has our own Premier. Now the Minister of Community Welfare is assisting the Premier in those actions. It is for that reason that I referred to the extract from *Hansard*: it indicates the Premier's true attitude.

From time to time the Premier is featured on the front page of our daily newspaper, parading and pretending to protect the rights of this State. However, he is merely performing and trying to score votes by dissociating himself from the Australian Labor Government. The truth is that in this place, away from the public, the Premier is willing to sell the assets of the State (the administration and the power of this State) to the Australian Government. It is for that reason that the Opposition supports the amendment and opposes the original clause.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold, Chapman, Goldsworthy, and Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Dunstan, McKee, McRae, and Wells.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Establishment of homes and centres."

Dr. TONKIN: I should be interested to hear from the Minister about the Government's plans for establishing child-care centres and about the long-term view that he is taking on this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This is an important aspect of our child-care policies, because at present we are faced with continually increasing costs of child care, and the commercially-operated centres have been forced to increase fees to a level where parents, especially those in the lower income bracket, have found it difficult to meet the charges. The

Australian Government has allocated a considerable amount of money to assist with the establishment and operation of early childhood services, including child-care centres and family day care programmes. The Australian Government's programme is designed to provide a comprehensive and integrated system of early childhood care, with priority being given to the more needy socio-economic areas.

Although some local government bodies and voluntary groups have been granted Commonwealth funds to establish child-care centres, it is apparent that, if full advantage is to be taken of funds available from the Commonwealth, some family day care programmes and child-care centres will need to be established and operated by the Community Welfare Department. Planning for child-care services in this State is being co-ordinated through the Childhood Services Council with a view to fully integrated services being established. Appropriate State departments, including Community Welfare, Education and Health, are represented on the council, and a great deal of joint planning has taken place; for example, family day care programmes organised by the Community Welfare Department will operate in conjunction with pre-schools established by the Education Department or the Kindergarten Union.

In some locations it is planned that child-care centres of the Community Welfare Department will be integrated with pre-schools conducted by either the Education Department or the Kindergarten Union. These joint projects indicate a degree of emphasis being placed on the need for comprehensive and integrated services to meet the needs of children and their parents throughout the State.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (15 to 26) and title passed.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Community Welfare) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I record my disappointment that we are considering this Bill at the third reading stage. I hoped that the matter would be delayed until we were absolutely certain about the matters being debated. The reason for the Opposition's attitude is its concern that the work that has been done by the Community Welfare Department in this State in setting up consultative councils ultimately will be lost because of what I regard as the intrusion of the Australian Assistance Plan in connection with regional councils. It is a shame that the Minister has not been willing to allow this matter to be discussed more thoroughly before we agree to the Bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MAJOR ROADS)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The principal object of this Bill is to provide the necessary legislative basis for the implementation of the Government's well publicised scheme for a major and minor roads system in this State. Members will have heard much in the last few days on the subject, and so I do not propose to dwell at length on the various advantages and disadvantages of such a system. The majority of States in Australia have now adopted, or are in the process of adopting, similar schemes to the one intended for South Australia, and for this reason alone I believe that we must, in our turn, conform with the apparent national concept of major and minor roads. The obvious advantages will be the facilitation of the traffic flow on main roads and the probable avoidance of accidents at minor intersections. All intersections and junctions will eventually be properly sign-posted or marked, thus removing some of the possibility of human error.

Whilst the Bill imposes a clear and stringent obligation on a driver on a minor road to give way to a vehicle on a major road, it cannot be emphasised too carefully that the driver on the major road is still obliged, by virtue of sections 45, 45a and 46 of the principal Act, to drive carefully and with due consideration for other persons on the road. This Bill does not give such a driver *carte blanche* totally to disregard persons coming from a minor road: he is still under a duty to avoid an accident when it is in his power to do so. This Bill also seeks to place the same duty on drivers approaching a "stop" line as that when approaching a "stop" sign. There have been several occasions when a prosecution has failed because a "stop" sign which a driver failed to obey was not visible at the time or had been knocked over. I commend this Bill to members as a measure that is urgently needed for greater road safety in this State.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 supplies the necessary definitions of "stop" line and "give way" line, both such lines having effect independently of any erected sign. The definition of "give way" line covers the proposed road markings that will indicate major roads (a broken white line, or lines, across the whole of the mouth of an intersecting or joining minor road). The definition of "traffic control device" is widened to include "stop" lines and "give way" lines.

Clause 3 provides that a driver coming to a "stop" sign, a "give way" sign, a "stop" line or a "give way" line shall give way to all vehicles in the intersection (with one exception that is set out in new subsection (1b)). A driver who is not governed by any such sign or line shall give way to his right, unless the vehicle on his right is required by a sign or line to give way. New subsection (1a) provides that a drive referred to in subsection (1), other than a driver at a roundabout, need not give way to a turning driver referred to in new subsection (1b). New subsection (1b) provides that a driver turning to the right at an intersection or junction must give way to oncoming traffic, unless he is on a major road, and the oncoming traffic is on a minor road.

Clause 4 removes any reference to right-hand turns at intersections and junctions, as this is now covered by section 63 of the Act as amended by the previous clause. Section 72 now refers only to right-hand turns into private property and U turns. Clause 5 imposes an obligation on a driver to stop his vehicle at a "stop" line. New subsection (3b), however, provides that this obligation to stop is not imposed where lights are operating, or at a pedestrian crossing. The other relevant provisions of the principal Act cover these situations adequately, and this new subsection does not derogate from those provisions. Another desirable effect of this amendment is that drivers will be required to stop at an intersection at which the traffic lights have failed. Clause 6 is a consequential amendment.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Marine Act, 1936-1973. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This short Bill is intended to provide the means for excluding certain types of vessel from the operation of the manning provisions contained in Part IIIA of the principal Act, the Marine Act, 1936-1973. The proposal arises from enactment of the Boating Act, 1974, and the likely effect of that Act on the manning requirements that would be determined by the State Manning Committee for commercial vessels such as houseboats which are hired out without a driver being supplied by the hirer. It is considered that the committee probably would not be able to require anything less than a driver's licence as required by the Boating Act in respect of non-commercial vessels for persons operating such vessels.

Accordingly, it is proposed that the design and construction of such vessels continue to be required to be annually inspected by officers of the Marine and Harbors Department but that, in order to avoid the impact of licensing requirements on this growing sector of the tourist industry, such vessels be exempted from Part IIIA of the principal Act and instead subject to more adaptable controls on their operation prescribed by regulations under the principal Act. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 14 of the principal Act to empower regulations relating to the operation of such vessels. Clause 3 amends section 26d of the principal Act to exclude classes of vessel prescribed by regulation.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act, 1946, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This short Bill, which has only one operative clause, clause 3, abolishes the special fund entitled the "Leigh Creek Coal Fund" established in 1946 by section 43h of the principal Act. Originally sales of Leigh Creek coal were handled through the Public Stores Department but in that year the operation of the coal field was vested in the newly created Electricity Trust of South Australia. The philosophy behind the establishment of a separate fund to finance this aspect of the trust's operations was that profits from coal sales should not go to the trust but should be reserved for future coal field financing.

However, since that time all of the coal mined at Leigh Creek has been used by the trust, and the operation of the coal field has become an integral part of the operations of the trust. Accordingly, there seems now no warrant for preserving this financial separation, and clause 3 of the Bill proposes: (*a*) the abolition of the fund, with practical effect from July 1 next; and (*b*) the transfer of the assets and liabilities of the fund to the trust to be dealt with or satisfied by it.

Mr. ALLEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SALARY)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Members will recall that, during the autumn sitting of the session of Parliament last concluded, a Bill to amend the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended, was enacted into law. This measure (*a*) increased the salary of His Excellency the Governor; and (*b*) somewhat modified the method by which the movements in the annual expenses allowance payable to His Excellency would correspond with movements in the cost of living as indicated by the consumer price index. It is in relation to the matter mentioned in paragraph (*b*) that some difficulty has occurred. At present the principal Act, as amended, provides that the base figure for the calculation of the expense allowance will be $19 700. However, the Government intended at the time that, from this base figure, which was the actual allowance for the financial year 1973-74, the allowance for the financial year 1974-75 would be calculated.

In the nature of things, with the increased cost of living, this 1974-75 figure should be rather more than $19 700. In the event, this intention was not given effect to in the Bill enacted in 1974. Accordingly, the Bill corrects this situation by providing a base of $22 600 for the financial year 1974-75, this being the figure, had the new adjusting formula been operating in relation to the financial year, 1973-74, that would have been the figure produced by the application of that formula. The Bill also provides that, in the financial years subsequent to the 1974-75 financial year, this figure of $22 600 will rise or fall in a manner dictated by movements in the consumer price index.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DECLARED SCHEMES)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act, 1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This short Bill is intended to cover the situation which has arisen in connection with certain people now employed by the Government under the terms of the Public Service Act who, previously, were contributing to "declared schemes" within the meaning of the principal Act. As the Act stands at present, persons who contribute to

declared schemes may not become contributors to the Superannuation Fund. If the amendments proposed are enacted, it will be possible for such persons, once they are no longer liable to contribute to a declared scheme, to be able to contribute to the Superannuation Fund.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts a new section 6a in the principal Act which provides that, when a person shows that he is not liable to contribute in respect of a declared scheme and is not able to receive any further benefit from such a scheme, that person may become an employee within the meaning of the principal Act and thus be entitled to contribute to the Superannuation Fund. Clause 3 provides that, where a person subsequent to becoming a contributor becomes liable to contribute in respect of a declared scheme, he will thereupon cease to be a contributor to the fund and be entitled to refund of his contributions without any further benefit. This is consistent with the general philosophy of the principal Act in relation to declared schemes; that is, that no person shall be capable of becoming a contributor to two schemes.

Clause 4 provides, in effect, that a former contributor to a declared scheme who has received a benefit from that declared scheme may be obliged to pay all or part of that benefit to the Superannuation Fund. In consideration of that payment, a number of "contribution months" may be attributed to him. The effect of this proposal will be to place the new contributor in the same position, as regards benefits from the fund, as he would have been had he, at the material time, been a contributor to the fund. Clause 5 amends section 49 of the principal Act and provides for attribution of contribution months to take place on the recommendation of the board. This amendment is in aid of the proposals contained in clause 4.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dog Fence Act, 1946-1969. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It proposes amendments to the principal Act, the Dog Fence Act, 1946-1969, consequential on the repeal of the Vermin Act, 1931-1967. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 is formal. Clause 4 amends the definition section of the principal Act and, in addition to amending certain definitions so that they reflect those in the new measure relating to vertebrate pests, inserts a definition of "local dog fence board". Local dog fence boards, as was explained in the explanation of the Vertebrate Pests Bill, 1975, are intended to replace certain of the vermin boards established under the Vermin Act, 1931-1967, whose principal function for some time has been maintenance of the dog fence.

Clause 5 provides for the enactment of a new section 20a, empowering the Dog Fence Board to carry out works relating to the alteration of the site of the dog fence, subject to satisfactory arrangements for repayment of the cost involved. The Dog Fence Board under section 32a of the principal Act may obtain finance from the Treasurer to carry out such works. Clause 6 amends section 21 of the principal Act and is consequential on the repeal of the Vermin Act, 1931-1967. Clause 7 amends section 23 of the principal Act and is also a consequential amendment. Clause 8 makes some metric amendments to section 24 of the principal Act, and at paragraph (*c*) ensures that any payments under new section 20a towards the cost of altering the site of the dog fence may be set off against payments to the owner of the part of the dog fence concerned. Clause 9 is a consequential amendment.

Clause 10 repeals sections 25, 26 and 27 of the principal Act and provides for the enactment of new sections 25 and 26. New section 25 continues the present rating, but will enable the Dog Fence Board to determine the lands that are to be ratable. This change is proposed because the Dog Fence Board considers that parts of the existing area of ratable land can no longer be regarded as threatened by dingo predation and should not be subject to the rate. At the same time, it is proposed to raise the minimum amount of rate payable by any person to a figure that reflects the cost of collecting the rate from each ratepayer. New section 26 provides for the imposition of a special rate on landholders within the areas of the local dog fence boards which corresponds to the rate imposed under the Vermin Act, 1931-1967, for the purposes of the vermin boards established under that Act.

Clauses 11 and 12 are consequential on new section 26. Clause 13 provides for the enactment of a new Part IVa relating to local dog fence boards. New section 35a provides for the establishment of such boards by proclamation made on the recommendation of the Dog Fence Board. New section 35b provides for the transfer of the property, rights, duties, obligations and liabilities of vermin boards in existence immediately before the repeal of the Vermin Act, 1931-1967, to the local dog fence boards established in their place. New sections 35c and 35d provide for the variation or abolition of local boards by further proclamation and the effect at law of any proclamation made under this new Part. Clauses 14 and 15 are consequential amendments.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (VARIOUS)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Justices Act, 1921-1975. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This short Bill makes three disparate amendments to the principal Act. These amendments can best be explained in the consideration of the clauses of the Bill. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 is intended to deal with a doubt raised by Her Honour Justice Mitchell in *Samuels v. Nield* last month. Her Honour doubted that section 62ba in its present form was sufficient to allow the admission of certain relevant material as evidence on an *ex parte* disposition of an offence under that section. The amendment is intended to put this matter beyond doubt.

Clause 4 amends section 106 of the principal Act by providing that written statements of witnesses in preliminary hearings shall be verified by an appropriate declaration in the form set out in paragraph (*a*) of this clause in lieu of an affidavit. Proposed new subclause (9) of this clause provides a condign penalty in the event of a false declaration.

In addition, paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) are intended to ensure that, if a witness who has already submitted a statement is called to give oral evidence, he will be examined and then be subject to cross-examination in the ordinary manner. As the principal Act stands at present, the witness is, on being called, immediately exposed to cross-examination. Clause 5 is a formal drafting amendment intended to remove a duplication of section numbers.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWN PROCEEDINGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Crown Proceedings Act, 1972. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill is consequential upon the amendments made to the Local and District Criminal Courts Act in 1974. Those amendments established a special small claims jurisdiction in the local court. In order that the citizens of the State should have free personal access to the court on an egalitarian basis, and should not suffer disadvantages through their lack of legal knowledge and expertise, restrictions are imposed by that legislation on rights of legal representation unless all parties to the proceedings desire such representation. In consequence of these restrictions, it was necessary to provide for representation of bodies corporate by officers or employees who do not possess legal qualifications. The question arises whether these provisions are applicable to the Crown. There is, in fact, authority for the proposition that they do so apply because, by common law, the Crown is a corporation sole.

It could be further argued, if the Crown desired to do so (which it does not), that the Crown is, by virtue of the constitutional immunity of the Crown, not bound by restrictions on representation imposed by the new legislation, and hence can appear and be represented in proceedings in any manner that it thinks fit. However, the question has been raised whether the Crown can be represented in small claims proceedings in the same manner as other bodies corporate. The purpose of this Bill is to put this matter beyond doubt. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for representation of the Crown in the manner that I have previously explained.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PROPERTY)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Highways Act, 1926, as amended. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move.

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This short Bill deals with two quite disparate matters. Accordingly, the Bill can perhaps best be explained by an exposition of its clauses. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2, which amends section 20 of the principal Act, is put forward in the interests of administrative efficiency. In its present form, this section at subsection (1) (*a*) prevents the Commissioner from selling or leasing any real property vested in him unless he has obtained the consent of the Governor. In the ordinary course of events, no-one could quarrel with such a provision. However, in the present circumstances of the road-widening programme, many properties are acquired as and when they become available and then leased back to the owners or others for comparatively short terms until the road-widening programme actually commences. About 600 of these transactions have taken place in a single year. For these reasons the amendment proposes that the formal consent of the Governor will not be necessary for short-term leases of up to six years. If this amendment is agreed to, the delay attendant on placing these formal matters before Executive Council will be avoided.

Clause 3 amends section 26 of the principal Act and has the effect of somewhat enlarging the circumstances where the Commissioner can close or restrict traffic on a road. A closure or restriction can, if this amendment is agreed to, be effected when the passage of vehicles or vehicles of a class would be likely to damage the road. An obvious example of the need for such a power is in, say, the immediate post flood period in the Far North. Clause 4 is a drafting amendment to section 27b and is intended to clarify the meaning of this section. The word "such" proposed to be removed is, in the light of the whole section, somewhat misleading.

Mr. WARDLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

IMPOUNDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Impounding Act, 1920-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It increases the fees and penalties under the Impounding Act, 1920, as amended, and effects the necessary decimal conversions. The fees under this Act have not been increased since 1962 and are now quite inadequate. The increases are necessary to offset expenses incurred by local councils in impounding straying stock. In some instances at least, the impounding fees are insufficient to cover the actual costs incurred. Penalties for offences under this Act have also been increased to bring them more in line with contemporary penalties. In most cases the increase is that of 400 per cent. However, where present fees are of the order of 10c or less, the increase may be slightly higher to obtain a more realistic figure.

Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 to 19 amend the principal Act by increasing the penalties for the several offences. Clause 20 amends section 47 of the principal Act to increase the jurisdictional limit of justices under the Act to $160. Clause 21 repeals and re-enacts the fourth schedule to the principal Act in the same form and increases the fees payable under it. Clauses 22 and 23 similarly repeal and re-enact the fifth and sixth schedules.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

WEST BEACH RECREATION RESERVE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RUNDLE STREET MALL BILL

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. G. T. Virgo: That the report be noted.

(Continued from March 13. Page 2891.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): Last Thursday I said that the Select Committee's report was very important and that the Government desired to adjourn proceedings to enable members to study the report so that they could better appreciate what took place. I hope members have been able to study the report. Accordingly, I shall deal briefly with it. Paragraph 3 of the Select Committee's report states:

On the evidence placed before it, your committee is satisfied that there is general agreement between all of the parties concerned.

It has been a very long, hard road to reach that point, but probably the time and effort put in is justified when we can now, with some degree of pride, make such a pronouncement. The term "general agreement" has been used in this context: one or two aspects were subject to question by the witnesses. Those aspects are dealt with in the Select Committee's report, but it is important to note that the Select Committee has not recommended that any of those points, with the exception of that dealing with finance, be altered. In relation to the amount paid, there seems to be some fixation, particularly in the minds of the Rundle Street Traders Association, that the funds that it provides should be disbursed only by decision of that association's rate-paying group. If one took that attitude through to its logical conclusion, one would find that the whole system of local government would rapidly grind to a halt. The Select Committee was not disposed to accept that viewpoint, nor was it disposed to accept the viewpoint that there ought to be two committees functioning: one in connection with trading hours and one in connection with hours outside trading hours.

The Select Committee satisfied itself, with the assistance of the Parliamentary Counsel, that the Rundle Street mall committee to be established under the legislation will be capable of establishing subcommittees. Those subcommittees could consist of various people, according to their task. It would not be unreasonable for there to be a subcommittee dealing with problems associated with operations during trading hours and another subcommittee dealing with problems and activities outside trading hours. The Select Committee did not see that those two functions ought to be allowed to remain separate; rather, they should be brought together. The Select Committee thought that there should be only one decision-making body. If we have two separate committees we will create chaos. Rarely, if ever, do separate committees work in harmony and rarely do their activities dovetail.

We believe that the original basis of representation, with two representatives from the traders, two from the Government, and two from council, is the ideal. For this reason such a proposal is made. The fact that this steering committee has been able to bring the mall committee to this point clearly indicates the success of the composition of that committee. I have a very high regard for the committee and for what it has achieved. Only two points put forward received the sympathy of the Select Committee to the point that it recommended any alteration to the Bill. However, I make plain that the Select Committee fully considered everything put before it but it was not persuaded that the legislation should be changed, except in two respects.

G. and R. Wills and Company Limited drew attention to the fact that the map in a schedule to the Bill contained an error. The Select Committee has therefore in paragraph 12 of its report drawn attention to this and recommended that there be a new schedule attached to the Bill dealing with the error: there is a street shown that, in fact, does not exist.

The other alteration relates to finance. There is only one area of finance where the Select Committee was persuaded that the Bill erred; that was on the question of the funds that the mall committee would raise from time to time through the letting of leases. The Select Committee believed that the moneys derived in this way by the mall committee should become the property of the mall committee for spending within the framework of the mall committee's activities. We have therefore recommended amendments to clauses 11 and 26 to provide that all moneys paid by way of fees and charges be retained by the committee.

The Select Committee had a difficult task, which it tackled realistically. We have now brought the question of the Rundle Street mall yet another stage further. As a result of the activities of the committee, I hope we will very soon see the mall in operation. Already arrangements are in hand for some of the preliminary works, and arrangements are being made to remove bus services and to repair sewer connections in preparation for the mall. I hope that this Parliament will not dally unnecessarily on this matter, so that we may get the mall operative as soon as possible. I certainly hope that it will be operative in this calendar year, so that it can benefit all the people of this State. My attention has been drawn to a column in last Sunday week's *Advertiser* on Possum's Page, a page that I normally do not read.

Dr. Eastick: The *Advertiser* on Sunday!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope the Leader will tell some of his colleagues that the children writing in that column have said, "Please give us the mall as quickly as possible." I commend the report of the Select Committee to the House.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I again indicate my support for the concept of a mall in Rundle Street, and I agree with the Minister's statement that this is an important report because it will alter irrevocably the concept and appearance of Rundle Street. I believe the success of a mall is bound up with its success as a market place or a commercial centre. I have seen malls, plazas, and pedestrian walk-ways in other parts of Australia and in other countries, and this important concept must be accepted. Many cultural and other after-hour activities will be able to take place to the benefit of the community and, to some extent, to all the people of the State. I agree with the Minister's comment that one main committee should oversee the whole operation of the mall, but suitable subcommittees may be set up under the umbrella of the main committee.

Two questions were raised to the Select Committee: the matter of transport, and the provision of taxi-cab space. Mr. Thompson (Assistant Director of Planning, State

Planning Office) told the committee that additional taxi-cab space had been provided for standing and pick-up, and this provision will be of benefit to many people who use taxi-cabs. Also, no traffic will pass across Rundle Street in future. The by-law-making provision will allow pick-up and delivery trucks to operate for some time in the morning, and there will be provision for emergency vehicles to operate. Buses will be diverted into Grenfell Street and North Terrace, so that, as less parking space will be available in those areas, it will be necessary to construct vehicle parking space at the Foys building site. The Select Committee was satisfied, on the evidence given to it, that underground services could be provided, with a start being made on this work in April.

The question of constructing the mall was raised in the earlier debate: should it be constructed as a whole or piece-meal? From the material I have read and the evidence given to the committee, I am adamant that, if the mall is to be a success, the job must be done as one. Placing a few pot plants around and not constructing the paving would not be a success. The recommended paving will allow access to underground services, if required, and the Fire Brigade will require additional fire hydrants to be installed. The mall will cost money, and now provision is made for the cost to be shared among the State Government, the City Council, and ratepayers. The steering committee has done an excellent job, but some studies have not yet been completed—for instance, the Hannaford report. I give full credit to the members of the steering committee who have given freely of their time in order to bring this Bill to the stage at which we can consider the mall as a viable proposition and have it operating to the advantage of Adelaide. We must discuss the question of finance. Clause 8, referring to the borrowing power of council, provides:

In addition to the borrowing powers elsewhere conferred on it, the council may, from time to time, without further or other authority or consent borrow such amounts of money not exceeding in the aggregate $600 000 for the purposes of undertaking and providing the works.

The significant figure is $600 000. Clause 13 provides:

(1) Where the Treasurer is satisfied that the council has expended moneys for the purposes of the works, the Treasurer may, from time to time, but subject to subsection (2) of this section pay to the council by way of grant an amount equal to one-third of the amount so expended.

(2) Subsection (1) of this section shall not authorise the payment to the council of a grant or grants exceeding in the aggregate $300 000.

The total sum, therefore, is to be $900 000. Let me be pragmatic about the situation, because I have some doubts whether this project can be completed for this sum. I understand, however, that provision has been made for some leeway in that estimate. I should have preferred that the whole programme be broken into three equal parts the same as grants by the Government are to be provided under clause 13 (1). If the project does cost over $900 000 (and I have a lingering doubt that it probably will) an amending Bill will have to be introduced. Of course, there is precedent for that action in the Morphett Street Bridge Act, which went before a Select Committee and was amended later to cater for escalating costs.

The matter of finance was raised by other witnesses, too. In fact, it was raised in this place during an earlier debate on this matter. Council will have the right, in the designated area, to levy a special rate which, in any financial year shall not exceed 5c in the $1 on the assessed value of the ratable property. The designated area is set out in the schedule to the Bill. Roughly, it is the rectangle bounded by North Terrace, King William Street, Grenfell Street, and Pulteney Street. So it can be seen that it covers a fairly large area. That area is subject to a special rate, which can be levied up to a maximum of 5c in the $1 above the ordinary rate. When one looks at the map contained in the schedule, one sees that the designated area forms part of the Hindmarsh Ward, which is one of the six wards of the Adelaide City Council. Evidence given indicates that 42 per cent of the total rate revenue of the council comes from that ward. The area about which we are talking is only part of the Hindmarsh ward, but I suggest that much of the money collected comes from the designated area.

Certain comments have been made regarding the committee that is to administer the mall. It was suggested by the Retail Traders Association that, as its members had no equity in the matter, they should not be liable for capital payments. According to figures submitted by that association, the retail traders in the area, the Government, and council will each be required to spend $34 740 for interest and repayment costs. The balance of the 5c in the $1 levy, which will be charged to traders, will amount to $141 760, so the traders' total will be $176 500, with the Government and the council each contributing $34 740. So, the traders' payments will represent 71·75 per cent of the total cost, and the Government and council will each contribute 14·12 per cent. In other words, the traders' contribution will be over five times that of the Government or of the council, or 2·5 times their combined total. That gives a total annual figure of $245 980.

It was further submitted in evidence (it was fully canvassed, so I will not speak at length about it) by Mr. Glowrey of the Myer organisation, speaking on behalf of the Retail Traders Association, just what the traders (and I use the term generically) could be up for in a year. The question was raised about the 5c in the $1 rate. But on that score I believe we must consider clause 9 (4), which provides:

The council may in respect of any financial year remit in whole or in part the special rate provided for by this section.

That means any ratepayers, perhaps a dentist, or even Scots Church, on the perimeter who may not receive any advantage from Rundle Street trading. It is for that reason that provision is made for a sliding scale. Clause 9 (7) provides:

Subsection (6) of this section shall not authorise or permit any part of the revenue referred to therein to provide for the repayment with interest of more than half of the moneys borrowed by the council pursuant to section 8 of this Act.

We are now considering the adoption of the report and the amendments suggested by the Minister so that funds raised in this area will be kept within the control of the mall committee. The Select Committee was not unanimous on the composition of the Rundle Street Mall Committee. One viewpoint was put forward by the Minister and there was another, which I shall not canvass at length at this stage but will refer to in Committee. There are one or two other matters I should like to develop but, because of the time, I will restrict my remarks. I support the concept of this project and hope that all parties will work together. I hope that ratepayers in the area designated, other than those represented by the Retail Traders Association, will participate in and work with the mall committee for the future benefit of the entire mall and the designated area.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—"By-laws."

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

In subclause (1) (*b*) to strike out ", disposition".

This amendment is linked with a later amendment that I intend to move to clause 26. The amendment makes sense. It is provided that moneys raised and collected by the committee through fees and charges shall remain in the committee's coffers.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 12 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—"Composition of the committee."

Mr. COUMBE: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "six" and insert "seven".

One committee should have the overriding authority and the power to set up subcommittees. The member for Glenelg and I, as members of the Select Committee, desired to have this alteration recommended by the committee, but a majority of members of the committee desired that the provision stay as it is in the Bill.

Representatives of the Rundle Street traders suggested that there should be a committee of seven, one to be nominated by the Minister, two to be nominated by the council, and four to be representative of the traders involved in operating the mall. I do not propose that: I desire a committee of seven, two to be nominated by the Minister, two to be nominated by the council, two to be nominated by the Retail Traders Association, and one to be a person carrying on business or employed in a business carried on from ratable property.

Mr. Arland (Town Clerk of the Adelaide City Council) stated before the Select Committee that the council would support a greater number of trader members on the committee; the reason being that, if the Rundle Street mall was to be a success, there must be a major involvement by the traders. Mr. Judell, who conducts a fashion shop in Rundle Street, also supported the alteration in the composition of the committee to provide for more trader representation. We must realise that the mall must be a success as a market place, and I am merely suggesting an increase in the number of members of the committee from six to seven.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It will come as no surprise to the member for Torrens to hear that I do not support the amendment. The Retail Traders Association, after seeing the Bill, sent me a document dealing with several matters, one of which was the rearrangement of the composition of this committee. The association proposed that the committee should comprise one person appointed by the Minister, two persons appointed on the nomination of the council, three persons nominated by the association, and one person who would be a person carrying on business or employed in a business carried on from a ratable property.

The Government appointed a steering committee a long time ago, and that comprised equal representation from the areas where we considered that there was most concern. The Government is concerned because of the impact on tourists and the people of this State; the council is concerned about the well being of people using the streets in its area; and the traders have a vested interest in the matter. If the amendment was carried, of the seven members on the committee two would be nominated by the Retail Traders Association, one would be sympathetic to the association, giving them three. Then the two appointed by the City Council could be members of the association, giving the association five members and the mall would be in the hands of the association.

Mr. Coumbe: I'm not suggesting that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO. That could happen under the amendment. Indeed, under the Bill as at present drafted, we could have a majority of committee members who were either members of, or were sympathetic to, the Retail Traders Association. I hope this will not occur. Frankly, I believe the Bill should be passed in its present form, as I believe it provides the balance desired for a successful mall. I ask members to support the Bill as it stands.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment. Unfortunately, the amendment deals with the only aspect about which members of the Select Committee disagreed. The Minister said that all members of the committee in question could be members of the Retail Traders Association.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I didn't say that; I said that five out of seven members could be either members of or sympathetic to that association.

Mr. MATHWIN: That proves that the Minister has no confidence in the Adelaide City Council. In evidence before the Select Committee, the Town Clerk (Mr. Arland) said (as reported at page 22) that the council would support having extra members from the Retail Traders Association.

Amendment negatived; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 17 to 25 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (INSPECTIONS)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SIMMONS (Peake): I welcome this chance to air a couple of grievances. First, it grieves me greatly that the legislation to deal with noise pollution is not to be introduced until the June sitting. Noise is one of the most insidious forms of pollution in this modern technical society. I strongly support what was said about this matter in previous adjournment debates by the members for Tea Tree Gully and Gilles.

My main grievance concerns another attack with regard to the people's health. I refer to the attitude of the medical profession towards pensioners and the Australian Government's Medibank scheme, which was designed to close serious gaps in the health services offered in this community. The medical profession, once an honourable profession, is rapidly losing much of its public esteem because of its unprincipled refusal to co-operate in providing health services for less fortunate members of this community.

I am willing to admit that there are still dedicated and public spirited members of the medical profession, but the profession as a whole is gaining the image of being concerned mainly with private pelf, not with public health. I will give an example of a case in my district that shows a miserable attitude on the part of a medical

practitioner. An elderly pensioner moved into my district about a year ago from another part of the metropolitan area. When she was seriously ill one evening, the family sent for the nearest local doctor. In fact, a *locum tenens* came to see her. This young fellow attended her satisfactorily, getting her to sign the form on which a claim is made on the pensioner medical scheme.

However, she subsequently found out that this group of doctors would not co-operate under the pensioner medical scheme. Since then she has been continually dunned for the cost of this call. I recognise that it is open to doctors to opt out of the pensioner medical scheme; they cannot be criticised for anything they do that is within their legal rights. However, I suggest that, when a person in need in all good faith calls a doctor and when the doctor's agent attends in the belief that the pensioner medical scheme will adequately cover the matter, that firm of doctors should be willing to forward the form to the Australian Government and should not dun the pensioner for the cost of this service.

My main concern is about the attitude of doctors towards the Medibank scheme. Today's *News* has an interesting report about this attitude. To give an indication of the attitude of doctors, I will quote the following paragraphs:

Yesterday in Canberra the Federal President of the Australian Medical Association (Dr. Keith Jones) asked doctors to seek cash payments from patients. A spokesman for the A.M.A. in Sydney said doctors were acting in the public interest in trying to disrupt the introduction of Medibank. This would overload the Health Insurance Commission with patients' demands for cash and the Medibank scheme would be disrupted.

He is a candid scoundrel. The report continues:

Dr. Jones said the object of seeking cash was ultimately to embarrass the Health Insurance Commission. The A.M.A. advised doctors not to bulk-bill the Health Insurance Commission for Medibank payments.

That is the attitude of the Federal President of the A.M.A., as reported in today's *News*. Referring to the position in Adelaide, the report quotes the State President of the A.M.A. as saying:

We are justified in fighting the scheme because the economy cannot afford it.

What sort of arrogance is it on the part of a mob of quacks to pass that sort of judgment on a scheme which has twice been endorsed by the Australian public and which has been thoroughly costed by people experienced in financial matters, if not in medical matters! I think he gave the real reason for the medical profession's opposition to the scheme. The report states:

Dr. Cowling said the cash payment move was an attempt by doctors to prevent the Commonwealth Government from controlling their incomes.

That is getting close to the bone. The report continues:

It should not be interpreted as an attempt to overload the Medibank system with extra work caused by patients demanding reimbursement for cash payments.

A week ago I watched Dr. Cowling on a television programme taking part in the unprincipled campaign by his members against the scheme. He put forward a horrific list of delays that people could expect in receiving hospital treatment for operations, and said that a wait of up to six years could be possible for a hernia operation in a public hospital. A week ago, in reply to a Question on Notice asked by the member for Bragg, the Minister of Health said that the waiting time for a hernia operation was 12 months at Royal Adelaide Hospital and three to four months at Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is not six years.

At the time of this television interview, I spoke to a person connected with Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and he said he knew of a person who had had this operation two weeks after being accepted. On these details, one can judge the credibility of the State President of the A.M.A. Dr. Jones has said that the object is to interrupt the Medibank scheme, but Dr. Cowling has said that he and his colleagues do not intend to do that. It came as no surprise to me when I was informed at dinner this evening that Dr. Cowling was the endorsed Liberal Party candidate against Dr. Richie Gun in the District of Kingston at the next election. Obviously, he has started his political campaign, and the Liberal Party has chosen a candidate worthy of its principles. A report in the *Advertiser* of June 9, 1972, referring to the Canadian health scheme, on which the Medibank scheme is based, states:

Eleven years ago this July, Saskatchewan's 900 doctors went on strike over what they thought would be bad medicine for Canada. The strike—over Canada's first all-inclusive compulsory medical care plan—lasted 23 days. There were compromises but it is acknowledged now that the doctors "bombed." Today everyone well or sick in Canada is happy and the theme is "You won't go poor in Canada paying medical bills."

The report continues:

Canadian doctors are no longer antagonistic to Government medical schemes. Now they have less paper work and are assured their bills will be paid first time out. Fees are set, too. The Government pay schedule in Ontario, for instance, allows $6 for a surgery visit and $15 for a check-up. There are other scales for other services. About 90 per cent of the doctors in Ontario are in the plan. This means they bill the Government direct. Those out of the plan bill the patient, and the patient gets up to 90 per cent reimbursement from the Government plan.

The report also states:

Unlike the Saskatchewan doctors' predictions back in the early 1960's, the standard of medicine in Canada has not suffered. There is little Government interference, if any, and the doctors work closely with the Government but still remain their own masters. And as for the ordinary citizen, he knows that when he is sick or needs an operation all he has to do is present his medical plan number, and that's the only thing that he will have to take out of his pocket.

I was visiting Ontario on June 9 last year, two years after that article was published, and stayed with a friend with whom I discussed the scheme and its problems. He said there were some minor problems at first, but now everyone was happy. The doctors were happy, and all the unprincipled rubbish being suggested by the medical profession in Australia at present did not operate in Canada. I close by quoting the editorial in today's *News*, which states:

The Medibank row hits a new low today with the A.M.A. decision to instruct doctors to try to wreck the system as soon as possible after July 1. Now the emphasis must be on making Medibank work, not on desperate last-ditch obstructionism. That means a new spirit of compromise that recognises, over all else, the welfare of the patient.

I support that statement.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I draw to the attention of members the Government's complete disregard for the safety of schoolchildren and the effect of pollution on my constituents. I refer to the ill-conceived plan of the Minister of Transport to establish a bus depot on about 6 hectares of rural land at Morphettville—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It isn't rural land.

Mr. MATHWIN: —that cost more than $1 000 000. This plan will convert a peaceful area into one with a 24-hour industry, which is noisy and polluting. In considering the safety aspect, we must realise that this depot will be close

to Glengowrie High School with 1 400 students, Morphettville Park Primary School, Ascot Park Primary School and to a lesser extent, Westminster College. Many children attending these schools ride bicycles. A new swimming centre to be established adjacent to this depot will attract students of all schools in the south-west area. The Road Safety Instruction Centre is situated almost opposite the suggested bus depot, as is the Australian Army camp at Warradale.

In the Army camp are located cadets, the 3 General Hospital, 41 Supply Battalion, Third Field Squadron of Engineers (vehicle and engineer stores), and the Adelaide Workshop Company, which services every Army vehicle in South Australia. Vehicles are brought from Murray Bridge, Gladstone and Port Wakefield to be serviced. Immediately behind the suggested bus depot are two drive-in theatres, which encourage much traffic. One can imagine the situation if Army troops were on manoeuvres and the shows at the drive-in theatres had ended, with buses travelling in and out of the depot, all at the same time. My concern is the effect that this depot, which will accommodate 250 buses, will have on residents of this area.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Where do you suggest we put it?

Mr. MATHWIN: I will tell the Minister, and I am surprised that he did not think of it. Most normal industries close at a specific time, but a bus depot would be a 24-hour industry for seven days a week. Mechanics in the depot would work in three shifts, and cleaners would start at 11 p.m. and work throughout the evening. Obviously, the mechanics will cause some noise, and the overflow of water used by the cleaners no doubt will flow into Sturt Creek and pollute the water that flows into the Patawalonga Basin in my colleague's district. In addition, exhaust fumes will be emitted by 250 buses, and that is unpleasant and unnecessary; as far as I am concerned it is a hazard to my constituents. Employees working at the terminal will have to park their cars nearby; I presume they will park them at the terminal and that their cars will overflow on to Morphett Road which, I am sure the Minister will agree, is in a poor state of repair. Morphett Road should be widened; in fact, more needs to be done than merely widening it. More land must be acquired. I assume that will come from the Australian Government's Warradale Army camp area. Private property will also have to be acquired on Morphett Road for road-widening purposes.

Has the Minister considered, or have his advisers told him (that is if he listens to them, and I doubt whether he does in these matters) what will happen if and when the railway fly-over is completed at the Oaklands crossing? The rate at which work on the Marion crossing is proceeding suggests that it could be many years before the Oaklands crossing is completed. Nevertheless, I presume that some day the Oaklands fly-over will be completed and, of course, that will create an increased traffic volume on Morphett Road. I believe that the Minister, in his own selfish way and by clever planning, has avoided a catastrophe and moved the M.T.T. bus terminal from his district, where it was to be sited. The area in question was owned by the M.T.T., but the Minister did a deal with Marion council to build the Road Safety Centre on the southern side of Oaklands Road. The Minister was able to give Marion council an area of land on which to build a swimming centre. He then looked around and said, "We can get rid of this terminal by putting it in the district of the member for Glenelg." I have no doubt about that. By having the bus terminal built on the Morphett Road site, the Minister is creating a certain menace to constituents in my district. I believe such action is disgraceful.

Mr. Coumbe: Where should it go?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister has not given a thought to residents in the area. Attending Glengowrie High School are about 1 400 students. The danger that will be created by the bus terminal will apply not only to Morphett Road and Oaklands Road but also to other roads in the area, and schoolchildren will be embarrassed by the traffic danger. If the Minister had asked me where the terminal should be built, I would have suggested an area at the intersection of South Road and Sturt Road, where it has been recommended that no large buildings should be erected.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Where's that?

Mr. MATHWIN: At the intersection of South Road and Sturt Road, opposite the Flinders University playing grounds.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you talking about Walsh's folly?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. I am referring to the land opposite the university and the medical centre. South Road is a six-lane highway, not a mediocre, fifth-rate road.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's untrue and you know it.

Mr. MATHWIN: South Road is a six-lane highway. If the Minister does not know that, I suggest he, accompanied by the Highways Commissioner, visit the area and count the lanes. Instead of suggesting that the terminal be built on that site, the Minister has announced it will be erected in an area serviced by a mediocre road that is in shocking condition. I believe the Minister's announcement was made with malice in his mind. Obviously, he has not considered the situation at all; otherwise he would have put this blasted thing, this catastrophe, on another site where it would not interfere with anyone. As I said, a suitable area is available on Sturt Road. As far as I am concerned, the site for the bus terminal is a colossal blunder.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you want to be invited to the opening?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister has caused great anxiety to children attending schools in the area and to their parents. In addition, he has caused much anxiety to the—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. HARRISON (Albert Park): I appreciate the opportunity to bring to the notice of the House what I consider to be the success of the installation of electoral offices in members' districts. Constituents in my district have expressed appreciation when visiting my office that I am available to see them. These offices, as members are aware, are staffed by efficient secretaries on a full-time basis under the control of the Public Buildings Department. That department supplies an acting secretary when the permanent secretary is on annual leave. The offices are equipped with first-class furnishings and are equal to offices provided by any business organisation. There is an oft-repeated statement that local government is the government closest to the people but the present Labor Government's foresight in establishing these offices, which make members' services available to constituents so they can seek advice and assistance, brings the State Government closer to the people than any other form of government.

Advice is given more speedily and complaints are remedied by direct contact with departmental officers acting on the advice of Ministers or by direct correspondence with the Ministers concerned. This service is sincerely appreciated by constituents and has relieved the pressure of business conducted in members' homes. The workmanship involved in converting my electoral office is of the highest possible standard and, having discussed this aspect with other members, I know that that high standard has been achieved in all other district offices, too. I compliment all the tradesmen involved from the Public Buildings Department. I understand that South Australia was the first State to implement this system. Members of Parliament from other States have inspected our offices, and I believe our system is now being adopted in other States. Visitors from other States and from overseas are amazed that the services of local politicians are so readily available to their constituents. Appreciation of this availability is readily expressed by migrants, especially those from the United Kingdom.

Among problems considered in my electoral office are those relating to housing and pensions, the latter matter being referred to the Commonwealth member representing the area that takes in my district. I am indeed fortunate that the Commonwealth member has an office in West Lakes and is handy to my office, and I often drive people to his office so that they are not inconvenienced. Local government problems are referred to the appropriate local government offices or to council members. One of the greatest calls on members is to act as justices of the peace in signing papers, etc., especially in connection with defaced registration discs on wrecked cars, this matter being referred to members by local crash repairers, of whom there are many on Tapley Hill Road in my district.

The establishment of new schools and the upgrading of others has greatly assisted and improved the provision of education in my district, and I am sure this applies to many other districts, too. Improved traffic signals at intersections and the marking of lanes on roads is of great assistance in preventing road accidents. Many justified complaints received regarding noise and smoke pollution have been promptly settled by the appropriate departmental officers to the satisfaction of the constituents concerned.

The Government has advanced greatly over previous Governments in the manner in which it is tackling the problems of this State, contrary to the slurs made against this Government by the Opposition. My grievance is that constituents in my district are concerned greatly about problems associated with housing, especially pensioner housing. The families of these pensioners have grown up and left home. Some pensioners are widows, who find it most difficult to transfer from a Housing Trust house into a suitable pensioner's cottage at a rent they can afford to pay. I appreciate having had the opportunity to make these comments.

Motion carried.

At 10.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 19, at 2 p.m.