HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, June 18, 1975

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

PETITION: DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. GUNN presented a petition signed by 39 parents of children of the Central Eyre Peninsula school praying that the State Government would re-examine the legislation providing for daylight saving in South Australia.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTY

Mr. CHAPMAN presented a petition signed by 305 residents of South Australia praying that the House would support the abolition of succession duty on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

TEACHER RECRUITMENT

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (June 12).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As a result of a submission that I made to the then Minister for Labour and Immigration (Mr. Clyde Cameron), he informed me by letter of June 4 that resumption of visa issue by his department for teachers recruited to South Australia had been approved. The policy of the Government will be to recruit only in those specified areas where shortages still exist in South Australia.

C.S.I.R.O.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Deputy Premier say whether a message of protest sent by the Minister for the Environment to the Prime Minister regarding the proposed transfer of Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation had the full support of State Cabinet? If it did have that support, will the Deputy Premier say what was the text of the protest? As the campaign of criticism against the proposed Commonwealth Government break-up of C.S.I.R.O. gains momentum today, it is reported that the State Minister for the Environment has forwarded a formal protest to Canberra. His criticism follows a similar protest from the Acting Minister for Science and Consumer Affairs (Dr. Cass) and a warning from the South Australian Governor (Sir Mark Oliphant) that such action could seriously damage the world-wide reputation at present enjoyed by C.S.I.R.O. Therefore, I ask whether State Cabinet endorses these criticisms and, if it does, what was the text of the State Minister's telegram to the Prime Minister.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague the Minister for the Environment has informed me that the telegram he sent was a personal one. The matter has not been discussed in Cabinet, and there is no reason why it should have been.

Mr. Gunn: An important issue like that!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: Is it going to be?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Is it not a strange reaction that one receives from Opposition members when one tells them the truth, namely, that the matter has not been discussed in Cabinet? It has not been a formal item in Cabinet and has not been discussed at this stage. However, whether it will be discussed in the future, the Leader can wait with bated breath and see.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, no, you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister sent the telegram or telex message to which the Leader has referred, and he expressed his personal point of view in that message. If the Leader wants to know what activated the Minister to do this and anything else about this matter, I am sure that he is quite capable of asking the Minister.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister for the Environment say what problems for South Australia he sees arising from the intended transfer of divisions of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, associated with mineral research and solar energy, to the Commonwealth Department of Minerals and Energy? On what basis did he act to protest at this intended transfer, and what does he expect will be the result of his protest? With the intended split up of the C.S.I.R.O., it is reported that about 500 scientists will be transferred to the Commonwealth Public Service. South Australia has well developed mineral research facilities, such as those at the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories in my own district, and significant work is being done on solar energy at Flinders University, work that is recognised by the university and all other energy authorities as being particularly appropriate in South Australia. Many people are now asking whether the announced transfer means that there will be a threat of a take-over of other activities in this State, specifically the activities of Amdel and the solar energy research work being performed so efficiently at Flinders University.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I sent a telex message late last week to the Minister for Science (Mr. Clyde Cameron), who is both a friend and colleague within my district, after there had been some suggestion that the C.S.I.R.O. would be broken up in the way that has since been announced and in light of remarks made by the Minister for Science, who was somewhat concerned that problems would result from such a split up. The telex message indicated that I, as the State Minister for the Environment, supported his argument that C.S.I.R.O. efficiency was likely to be reduced if the split up occurred. I said that I believed (and I still believe) that the activities of that organisation, especially in relation to the work it undertakes on environmental matters, can best continue to be used in the existing form. I asked in the telex message that the Minister for Science transmit my views to the Australian Minister of Environment (Dr. Cairns) so that he, too, could bear in mind the concern I felt on this matter.

WATER RATES

Mr. COUMBE: After that indication of Cabinet solidarity, I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Works on another subject.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a relief to them.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You're a funny little man.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question!

Mr. COUMBE: Is it a fact that, as reported, the Minister proposes to increase considerably the cost per kilolitre of water for the next financial year and, if it is, by how much? In addition, what effect is this increase

likely to have on newly-assessed properties, especially in the metropolitan area, including Prospect and other districts (Prospect headed the list as reported in the press), where the householders, in addition to receiving a greatly increased assessment on their properties from the Valuation Department, will now have to face an additional burden in the cost per kilolitre of water?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the honourable member has confused two issues, one of which relates to the rate equalisation scheme which the Government about six or seven months ago indicated it would enter into and to which it has given effect. The honourable member would recognise that this was done because, in an inflationary situation, undersirable features were appearing; in other words, the one-fifth of the State being valued by the Valuation Department each year happened to be hit extremely heavily with increases because of increased valuations. It was decided as a a matter of Government policy to equalise that rate across the whole State. In the first instance (and I emphasise that), it will mean that some of the impost that would have fallen on that one-fifth of the State valued this year will fall on other parts of the State, but any increase in the future will level out across the whole State. In certain areas that were subject to a steep increase last year because of increased valuation there will be a reduction, and I am sure that the honourable member is aware of that.

It was explained in a release I issued recently that the increase in the price of water was due to the cost of running the operation; that is to say, the cost of supplying water across the State increased so considerably that the deficit we normally experience of about $7 000 000 increased to $12 000 000. The increase of about 20 per cent in the price of water will only contain that deficit to $12 000 000. We are still subsidising this operation from general revenue to the tune of about $12 000 000, even though we are increasing the price of water. I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the increase in the price of water will be cast in such a way that it will mean that those who use more water will pay more. Wherever we can, we are gradually reverting to the system of payment for water as used.

Mr. Dean Brown: You've accepted that principle?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have not accepted anything as far as the honourable member is concerned.

The SPEAKER: Order!

MOTOR CYCLE KEYS

Mr. GROTH: Can the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs say whether he intends to introduce consumer protection control over the sale of motor cycle ignition keys? All Japanese motor cycles are locked by an ignition lock, and a constituent of mine recently had his motor cycle stolen. On inquiring at Pitman Yamaha about to whom the company had sold keys on that day, he found that three sets of keys had been sold. Whether or not they fitted his motor cycle is another matter, but three sets had been sold and no records kept of people to whom they had been sold; nor had any records been kept about proof of ownership of motor cycles. I believe there should be some control with respect to this matter, because, if anyone wants to steal a motor cycle, especially a Japanese motor cycle, all he has to do is select the cycle he wants, look at the serial number on the ignition lock, and then visit the Yamaha shop and buy a key.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will have the matter considered.

MESSERSCHMITT COMPANY

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the South Australian Government is willing to make facilities available at the Islington railway yards for the Messerschmitt company to experiment in an attempt to develop a satisfactory high-speed train? It was reported in the *Advertiser* earlier this week that the former Minister of Development and Mines, now to be Minister of Education (Hon. D. J. Hopgood), had visited the Messerschmitt company in Germany and inspected the various vehicles being developed. The report stated that the South Australian Government would be willing to make facilities available at Islington. I believe that the type of vehicle displayed in the *Advertiser* has a limited use, because it cannot veer more than a few degrees off a direct path, and it would have no application in a small urban community like Adelaide.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I assure the honourable member that the South Australian Government would give every assistance possible to the Messerschmitt company if the Minister who has been discussing matters with that company has brought discussions to the stage at which the company is willing to come to Australia and establish itself. Earlier discussions were undertaken, and at that time the Islington site was being considered. However, I would not expect the South Australian Government to have any control over the Islington workshops after the next 12 days, but I can assure the Messerschmitt company that we would be able to find a suitable site from land that we own so that we could give the company every encouragement it desired.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. DUNCAN: Has the Minister for the Environment noticed the appallingly high amount of pollution in the air over Adelaide in the past few days? Has he any figures on the rate of air pollution that has existed on each day during the past week? Is the Minister satisfied with the operation of the air pollution warning system and the voluntary restraints on polluting the air associated therewith and, if not, will he say what action the Government intends to take to introduce stricter controls over air pollution in and around Adelaide? In the past few days Adelaide's air has been disgustingly foul (members will have readily noticed the problem existing in the city), and this has had a serious effect on the environment in and around Adelaide. Apart from the limitation on visibility that the pollution has caused, it has had the effect of making the whole of the Adelaide region an unsatisfactory area in which to reside and work. It has also led to health difficulties for people who suffer from respiratory ailments and who have found that breathing the air over Adelaide has positively become a health hazard to them. This position, which is most unsatisfactory, has been of great detriment to the people of this city. It seems that Adelaide is now entering the big league of cities that have a serious photo-chemical smog problem. I should be grateful if the Minister could say what the Government intends to do to solve this problem.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I, too, have noticed the considerable visual pollution over Adelaide during the past two or three weeks. Members will probably be aware that this has been caused by the oft repeated weather pattern in the metropolitan area, whereby the fine days and clear sky, with the warmth of the sun on the soil during the day, create a situation in which the warm air rises during the cold night and a warm layer of air is trapped close to the ground during this weather pattern period, with little wind to disperse it. Metropolitan Adelaide is somewhat unique in having this weather pattern. I have figures, which are

taken out by the Public Health Department regularly at a set number of sites, of readings taken on the pollutant content of these areas. These figures show that, over the past three years, there has been a steady decline in the quantity of harmful pollutants in the atmosphere. Therefore, the impression of the honourable member that the position is becoming worse is not accurate; in fact, the situation is the reverse of that. I shall be happy to show to the honourable member figures that I saw some weeks ago that clearly establish the position that I have outlined. These figures show that not only are our figures well below the accepted world standard for various air pollutants but that they are also considerably below the readings of the other States in Australia. I should think that this situation has been brought about as a result of the regulations under the Health Act relating to air pollution that limit the quantity of emissions into the air from various industries. I am somewhat surprised to hear the honourable member say that he has heard of cases in which people have actually suffered discomfort as a result of the problems to which he has referred. I assure him that the problem we face in Adelaide is rather one of visual pollution, with emissions that are normally dispersed once the temperature warms up during the day, being trapped in the atmosphere. By 11 o'clock, Adelaide is generally remarkably clear. I will make the figures to which I have referred available to the honourable member so that he can establish that what I say is correct.

STORE SECURITY OFFICERS

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Attorney-General say whether department store and/or supermarket security staff have a right to apprehend people in the street, take them back into a store, and search them? An elderly woman (the mother of one of my constituents) was recently stopped by two other women who said that they were store security personnel. Despite her protests, they took the woman back into the store, where she was searched (I presume on the pretext that she had taken an item from the store).

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: How far away from the store was she stopped?

Mr. PAYNE: Some distance away in the public street. It seems to me that the general public is rather unaware of what rights are involved in this matter, so I would appreciate it if the Attorney-General could outline those rights for the benefit of the South Australian public.

The Hon. L. J. KING: A store employee who is employed on security work or, indeed, an employee of a security agency has no greater rights than has any other citizen; he is not a police officer and therefore has no statutory rights. The rights of an ordinary citizen are to arrest a person for felony if he is aware that a felony has been committed. Of course, if he is wrong he exposes himself to an action for wrongful arrest or false imprisonment. So, the security officer who detains a person against his will can justify his action only if goods have been stolen by that person. A security officer has no greater right than has any other citizen; he is distinguished from a police officer, who can arrest on reasonable suspicion of the commission of an offence. In general, a citizen is certainly not obliged to accompany a security officer if he is asked to do so: it is entirely a matter for his judgment whether he wants to go back and clear his name or whether he proceeds on his way, thus leaving the security officer to decide whether he is willing to take the risk of detaining the person he believes has committed an offence or whether to summon a police officer.

TORRENS RIVER DROWNING

Mr. GUNN: Is the Deputy Premier, as spokesman for the Government, willing to consider releasing the report compiled by two detectives from Scotland Yard following the drowning of Dr. Duncan on May 10, 1972? Further, if the Government is not willing to release it, will he say why it is not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Dean Brown: No reason?

The Hon. L. J. King: Refer back to *Hansard.*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart.

RAILWAY HOUSES

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Transport say whether he is aware that on a television programme last evening it was suggested that, if the South Australian non-metropolitan railways were taken over by the Australian National Railways Commission, those country towns whose councils were now receiving payments in lieu of rates for railway houses would not receive such payments from the South Australian Government? Further, is the Minister aware of the current position at Port Augusta and Port Pirie and, if he is, will he inform the House on the matter?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is extremely disturbing to have unfounded rumours circulating in South Australia about the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways to the Australian National Railways Commission. I did not see the programme last evening but have been told of it and have taken action to have the television channel tell the truth. The member for Hanson may laugh, because he may be doing some of the stirring; I do not know.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Torrens will keep quiet—

Mr. Coumbe: Don't make allegations.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I said, "The member for Hanson may laugh." Last week the member for Murray raised this very question in debate and was given a clear and simple reply by the Premier, but unfortunately someone opposed to the transfer has chosen to ignore the Premier's statement and is peddling further lies in relation to this matter. The fact is that the Commonwealth Railways acts, in part, in an identical way to the South Australian Railways and, indeed, the whole Government; that is, the Commonwealth Railways makes an *ex gratia* payment to the councils concerned as though the Commonwealth Railways was liable legally to pay normal council rates. The only exception to that is in certain places in Port Pirie and Port Augusta. The Commonwealth Railways not only builds but also maintains the whole of the road, kerbing, water table, and footpath at its own expense, and when this occurs the Commonwealth Railways, in addition, pays the council 60 per cent of the rate for which it otherwise would have been liable. There is no suggestion that that will not continue to apply. In fact, only a short time ago one of the legal officers from Canberra, who had also heard of this malicious story that was circulating in the Murray Bridge newspaper, telephoned to say that it was completely untrue and asked whether I would give the lie to it. I do that now.

SWANS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister for the Environment say whether he is aware that many swans in the Bool Lagoon game reserve are dying? Last weekend I saw, on the northern perimeter of the Bool Lagoon reserve, about

40 or 50 dead swans. Some of them had been dead for a long time, and others had died only recently and were in various stages of decomposition. There seems to be no suggestion of why these birds are dying, but the fact that many of them are dying gives cause for concern, and I should be pleased if the Minister would have the matter investigated.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I had not heard of this matter. Doubtless, the rangers in the area would have noticed it, and I shall be pleased to refer it to them, asking what examinations they have made of the position and what the likely cause may be. I will let the honourable member know the result.

BERRI-LOXTON ROAD

Mr. NANKIVELL: My question refers to the Berri-Loxton road, particularly that section between Bookpurnong hill and the ferry that was subjected to inundation for a considerable period during the recent high flow in the Murray River. The basis of the question is that, as a result of inspection of one of the bridges on that section of road following subsidence (I refer to the bridge over Salt Creek), it was found that, in particular, the structure of the bridge had been damaged. At present a Bailey bridge is in position as a temporary measure to allow traffic travelling between Berri and Loxton to use the ferry. Will the Minister of Transport obtain from the Highways Department a report on what it is intended should be done regarding this bridge? Is it to be reconstructed and, if it is, when is it expected that this work will be undertaken?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will get the information for the honourable member.

LABOR PARTY PROMOTION

Mr. VENNING: I address my question to the Deputy Premier. I am sorry that the Premier is not in the Chamber. Will the Deputy Premier say what sum of South Australian taxpayers' money is being used by various means to promote the Australian Labor Party Government in this State?

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member please repeat that question?

Mr. VENNING: The question is: what sum of South Australian taxpayers' money is being used by various means to promote the A.L.P. Government in this State? It has come to my notice that between $30 000 and $40 000 a day of taxpayers' money is being used to promote the A.L.P. Government in the Commonwealth sphere, so I ask what sum of money is being promoted in this way as far as the South Australian A.L.P. Government is concerned.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The question interests me. The honourable member has stated that, because he considers that the Australian Government is spending $30 000 to $40 000 a day promoting itself, the South Australian Government must be doing a similar thing, or something like it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I want to put this to the honourable member—

Mr. Dean Brown: You can't ask a question back.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not propose to ask a question of the honourable member, because I do not think he could answer it anyway.

Mr. Venning: I'm sorry the Premier isn't here.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River has asked a question. He is entitled to ask only one question at a time, and asking any further question is an infringement of Standing Orders.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member, in referring to the Australian Government, is referring to the advertisements that appear almost daily in the major State newspapers explaining the wonderful policies that are being implemented—

Mr. Venning: Answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —by the Australian Government, such as Medibank, about which his colleagues are doing their best to distort the facts—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —they are doing a service to the people of this nation, because they are explaining something which the honourable member does not like but which he will accept from July 1.

Mr. Venning: I'll have to!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: And the honourable member will like it, too, because it is a good scheme that is long overdue in this country. If the honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! All honourable members know what is required of them during Question Time under Standing Orders. Standing Orders will prevail and, if honourable members want to infringe them, they will suffer the consequences of being warned and ultimately named. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I simply explain to the honourable member that this is not a waste of between $30 000 and $40 000 as he has said. It explains what I suppose would be to the normal citizen a fairly complex situation, because something will happen on July 1 that will be of great benefit to every citizen in this country. It is only right and proper that this is done. The South Australian Government has on odd occasions seen fit to do exactly the same thing to overcome some of the distortion and untruths that have been told about this Government's actions. We make no apologies: in fact, we are definite that we will in future do the same thing, if necessary, to explain the things we are doing rather than have distortion and untruths told about this Government. At the moment it is unnecessary for us to spend anything at all, because the things that we are doing are being accepted by the people of South Australia and, try as it might, the Opposition is unable to distort them.

POTATOES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I address my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture, who, I think, is none other than the Deputy Premier and Minister of Works. Is the Government willing to institute an inquiry into the operations of the South Australian Potato Board, particularly into its actions in keeping very high the price of potatoes to the South Australian consumer? I guess that all members know that at the moment there is what is referred to in the newspaper this afternoon as a potato war going on in this State. My attention has been drawn to the fact that until recently the price of potatoes was kept extremely high.

I will quote a few sentences from a letter I have received from an interstate potato merchant (a man from Ballarat) which states:

For many months Tom the Cheap or Cincott Bros. in Ballarat have been retailing to the housewife at 3c per pound for potatoes or 15 per cent discount to hotels, motels or trade. When converted 3c per pound equals $66 a tonne. Your S.A. Potato Board has maintained since January, 1975, a recommended maximum price to the housewife for the same comparable potato of 7·14c a pound, or, when converted, $160 a tonne.

I also have another letter, which is in much the same vein, from a New South Wales merchant. This morning I checked with Mr. Ritchie, of the Central Provision Stores organisation, and he used the phrase of the South Australian Potato Board's "blatant manipulation". He said that the board had tried to rig the market in this State by stopping imports of potatoes through the control of the issuing of licences, and licensing only those merchants who would undertake not to import into this State. My concern is that apparently the price of potatoes has been kept at least twice as high (or perhaps even higher) as that for which the same potatoes are being sold in other States, where they are being dumped.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is getting beyond a brief explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The consumers in this State, therefore, are suffering.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to refer the matter raised by the honourable member to the Minister of Agriculture, because it properly lies within his province. However, I will tell the House that the situation that has been outlined by the honourable member represents an attack on an orderly marketing system that has operated in this State over many years. Although the honourable member might smile, I do not think that many of his friends on the Opposition side would be willing to raise the points he has raised this afternoon, because they realise that in the long term, or even in the fairly short term, great benefits accrue from the system which is operating and which has operated in the past, and great benefits have accrued in the past as a result of that system.

Mr. Millhouse: To whom?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To the consumer and to the producer, and the producer happens to be important in this situation.

Mr. Millhouse: What about—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This gives him the protection—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Mitcham interjects once more he will suffer the consequences.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The producer gets some protection from the system which has operated and which will, I hope, continue to operate in this State. If that is not the concern of the honourable member, let me say that it is the concern of the Government. Having said that, I will refer the matter to my colleague.

GOVERNMENT-SUBSIDISED HOSPITALS

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the local government contributions now being paid to Government-subsidised hospitals will be an obligatory contribution under Medibank? Secondly, will such local government contributions apply in areas currently being serviced by State hospitals in the same way that local government has contributed to Government-subsidised hospitals?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think it was last week that I received a deputation on this matter from the Local Government Association, and I pointed out then that it was principally a matter for the Treasurer, although I was accompanied by the Minister of Health at the deputation. The matter is being investigated and, in due course, a reply will be given to the deputation. I will also give a copy to the honourable member for his information.

NOISE POLLUTION

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, say for what reasons the South Australian Government has failed to fulfil its promises to the Governor of this State and to the South Australian public that it would introduce legislation in this session of Parliament to control the level of noise emission in urban areas? In his Speech when opening this session of Parliament His Excellency the Governor clearly stated that the Government would introduce such legislation, and the newspapers have also obviously been led to believe this. The *Advertiser* of April 18, 1974, contains a report which states that legislation had already been prepared, and the final touches were being put. I could go throught a series of five or six different headlines in the various daily newspapers which relate to this subject and which refer to promises regarding such legislation; the headlines date back to 1973. When the Government of this State deceives the Governor, the newspapers and the South Australian public it is time it stood up and justified that deceit.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to the Minister of Health.

ELECTRIFICATION OF RAILWAYS

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether it is a fact that his decision in relation to the electrification of the railways regarding the type of system (that is, either overhead or third rail) was made against the consensus of expert opinion? I understand it has been decided to have a third rail system of electrification in this State. The Minister would be well aware of many oversea countries that use this system rather than use the overhead system, which, apart from anything else, causes a great problem to the environment of the country. In parts of France that have used the overhead system the newer lines are of the third rail type. The Minister would be aware that in new electrifications in the British railway system the third rail system is being used.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The decision about an overhead catenary or a third rail system was made some time ago, although a final decision on the potential of the system is still subject to review. True, in several oversea countries I have seen the third rail system used, but others also use the overhead catenary system. Apart from the London underground railway, most of the British rail operation uses the overhead system, as the honourable member would know better than I would know. To install the third rail system would mean that most stations would have to be altered because, regrettably, many of them do not have subways by which people can enter or leave, and with island platforms passengers walk across the rails at the end of the platform. Obviously, with a third rail system, people must not be allowed to clamber over rails with a potential of 1 500 volts direct current when the rails are about 8 cm apart. That is the first consideration. The

second is that a third rail system is not successful at level crossings, because it would mean people travelling over the crossing with 1 500 volt D.C. between the rails: unless of course we are trying to defeat the Borrie report on population, and we do not want to do that. All in all, the decision was made to put in the catenary system, and I do not know where the honourable member heard of the alleged leak that I made the decision against expert advice. All the advice was that we should install the catenary type system: the difference of opinion that occurred was whether it should be a 1 500 volt D.C. or a 25 kV alternating current system. That was the variance of the views. Views were expressed for both systems, and I accepted the views as being those of experts.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You had two groups of experts!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. We did not ask a lawyer or a doctor, but we asked competent engineers, and sought opinions from around the world. The decision was made to accept A.C., but, because of the present position with the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill, which contemplates the complete physical separation in future of the urban system from the remainder of the railways system, much of the value and selling points for A.C. disappeared, because the greatest thing in favour of that system is that it is capable of providing power over long-distance runs, whereas with D.C. there must be frequent power distribution points. That situation has changed, and now that we are progressing, with only 12 days from the transfer, it could well be that we will revert to the D.C. system and, by doing so, accelerate the programme of implementation, hopefully by about nine months.

MONARTO

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Special Minister of State for Monarto closely examined the rent being charged for farm houses within the designated site of Monarto? I say clearly that this is not politicking in any shape or form, but is a matter that has been referred to by many owners. It is a firm and unbiased conviction of previous owners that, when these dwellings were on farm lands and compensation to the owners was being considered, they were regarded as old farm houses and not worth much even with the parcel of land. However, the boot is now on the other foot, and as they are to be rented to both new occupiers and to the previous farm owners as occupiers, they are suddenly worth $78 a month, which is nearly $20 a week. That fact should be plainly stated at the outset. A letter I have received states:

The house I am occupying is a five-room dwelling, portion built 27 years ago and the remainder 21 years; has a 27-year old wood stove and (in and out) cold water points. There are no conveniences worth mentioning. There is no hot water service no heating or air conditioning the bath room only has a leaky galvanised tub cold water is connected and an empty-yourself toilet is some 20 paces from the back door. The roof has a leak or two, but this was our home and we are grateful for it, but consider the rent of $78 a month too high.

The rent for these houses should be compared to rents paid for Housing Trust houses in Murray Bridge which have a bitumen road, kerb and water table, street lighting and garbage collection, and the house may be only a kilometre or so from a school. However, people living about 15 kilometres away could have to make two trips a week at 15c a kilometre to do their shopping, at a cost of about $6 a week.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is getting beyond the realms of a brief explanation.

Mr. WARDLE: As I think these various points are relevant, I ask whether the Minister has had the chance to consider closely these rents.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have had no chance to consider the matter, but I will do so. I imagine that the rent that has been assessed in each case has been related to the attributed value of the house when the property was purchased. I would hope that that was the way in which the authority proceeded. If the house, when it was purchased by the Monarto Commission, was valued at $20 000, the rent would have been appropriate to that kind of valuation, as against the kind of rent that might have been charged on a house that was valued at or purchased for $13 000 or $14 000. I will check the details for the honourable member and bring down a reply for him as soon as possible.

ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEYS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether any surveys are being undertaken of radial creeks, streams, and substreams within the metropolitan area, and of rivers throughout South Australia and, if there are not, will he have the suggestion that surveys be carried out followed up? On March 25 (as reported at page 3153 of *Hansard*) the member for Torrens received from the Minister a reply to a Question on Notice about the Torrens River. The reply stated that a committee was making investigations in relation to the environment, flooding, pollution, and recreation parks. Is the department now willing to go further and examine all the creeks, etc., in relation to pollution, their possible beautification, and the possibility of having hiking, cycling, and horse-riding tracks along the banks of streams or in reserves? I refer particularly to Sturt Creek and Brownhill Creek, which are in my district. Of course, Sturt Creek is nothing more than a concrete canal with a reasonably satisfactory reserve on both sides. I ask the Minister whether he is willing to have his department extend the present survey (or start a new survey) of the various creeks and streams in the metropolitan area, with the idea of using these areas for various recreational purposes, while at the same time overcoming difficulties connected with pollution.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: One of the environmental groups in South Australia has received from the Australian Government a grant for work to be undertaken in this direction generally. The work is not to survey creeks from the point of view of recreational activities but involves examining them generally in order to report to the Australian and State Governments on these areas. It could well be that, as a result of this study, we could follow up the honourable member's suggestion and look into the matters to which he has referred. I will refer the matter to the Recreation and Sport Department, which may also be doing some work in this field.

KANGAROO ISLAND VALUATIONS

Mr. CHAPMAN: In the absence of the Treasurer, will the Deputy Premier request the Valuer-General to determine the land tax and water rate income that would be derived from Kangaroo Island property owners if their unimproved land value were increased by 3, 4 and 5 times, and to base his calculations on the current departmental formulae used in water rating and the $40 000 property unimproved value exemption on land tax that is to apply after proclamation in 1975, and will the Minister supply me with that information? If and when the Government's ferry space rates are adjusted to be comparable with the occupied space rates applying to the State's railways, land value on Kangaroo Island will undoubtedly multiply overnight and, as I am

informed, land and other State taxes must rise accordingly. I am also informed that, whilst such realistic reductions in the shipping rates are urgent, they may initially be described by some as further subsidies to the islanders, while most recent advice suggests that the actual recovery to the State Treasury could be total, and this would ultimately relieve the South Australian taxpayers generally of that subsidy burden in future.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will discuss the matter with the Treasury. It seems to me that, in seeking this information, the honourable member has ignored the equalisation scheme which the Government will apply and which would in fact apply in any valuation, whether in relation to land tax, water rating, or whatever. Therefore, I cannot quite see the reason behind the honourable member's question. However, I will discuss the matter with the Treasury and decide whether or not the information should be supplied to the honourable member.

COUNCIL WORKS

Mr. RUSSACK: In the absence of the Minister of Local Government, can the Deputy Premier say what will be the situation in 1975-76 regarding road grants and debit order work for district councils? Councils are concerned about their financial situation in the coming year. Although inflation is increasing, over the years grants have steadily decreased. On Saturday afternoon, the Chairman of a district council who is most concerned about the matter asked me what would be the position after Christmas this year if there were a definite and drastic decrease in debit order work. Councils are finding it most difficult to plan for the future. I have statistics before me of one council whose grants have decreased considerably during the past five years. Debit order work for the council has drastically decreased from a value of $32 400 in 1970 to $10 300 last year. Can the Deputy Premier say what will be the situation in this ensuing financial year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask my colleague to bring down a considered reply for the honourable member.

OPEN-PLAN SCHOOLS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy, as Minister of Education, say what research has been undertaken by the Education Department to assess academic achievement and social development in large open-plan secondary schools, compared with the position in high schools of the conventional type?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Some studies have been undertaken on this matter, the general conclusion reached so far being that there is no significant difference in the achievement of skills in open-space schools compared with the position where the traditional situation applies but that the social development of the students is considerably greater in the open-space situation.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What sort of research has been done?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think this has been done through certain projects in the research and planning area. As I am not sure of the actual details, I will have to inquire about them. For several years, the department has emphasised basic skills in education—not in the way that some people have done by just talking about the three "R's" but in the overall context of a modern school. Several times it has been made clear to schools that the development of basic skills is absolutely fundamental.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You sent out a memorandum last week, didn't you?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member says that I sent out a memorandum last week. I did not actually do that, but the Director-General did, and he referred in that memorandum to a statement on the purposes of schools that was issued four years ago. That statement, which was issued four years ago and the re-emphasis of which has only just been publicised, deals with the purposes of schools and with the basic skills. It states:

These basic skills fall into four categories:

(1) The ability to acquire ideas through reading, listening and observing.
(2) The ability to communicate through writing and speaking.
(3) The ability to handle mathematical operations.
(4) The ability to reason logically, and to use evidence and to make individual value judgments.

This matter of the basic skills goes a little bit further than the three "R's".

Mr. Goldsworthy: That has nothing to do with the question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member was talking about academic achievement—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Research.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —in an open-space situation. I am just pointing out that the department is very much aware of this basic issue, having emphasised it any number of times in an appropriate context, but not in the context of talking about the three "R's", which could well suggest that we really ought to revert to the education system of 50 years ago.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1975)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 10. Page 3253.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I acknowledge the importance of this measure and indicate that I support it. It is a formal requirement to carry over the financial expenditure for Public Service and Government activities until the major Appropriation Bill is introduced. It is interesting to note that the sum provided in this Bill is $160 000 000, whereas a similar Bill that was introduced in March, 1974, involved a sum of $100 000 000, a difference of $60 000 000. So, there is a massive increase over the earlier figure and, lined up with the Treasurer's statement that it is for increases in salaries and wages for only two months, it is a clear indictment not only of the State Government but also of the Commonwealth Government, which has allowed inflation to escalate to the extent it has. There is an urgent need for the Government to reassess its priorities, and to ensure that value for each dollar spent is obtained and that the wanton waste that is so commonplace in many activities of this Government is brought to a halt. Yesterday the Minister of Education questioned a comment I made in the media about expenditure on school equipment. The member for Mitchell directed a Dorothy Dixer type question to the Minister about this matter and I intend to refer to it and a number of other matters that have come to my attention since. At this stage I acknowledge the formal nature of the Bill, and I support it.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I take this opportunity to highlight several areas where I disagree with present Government administration. A few moments ago I said that yesterday, as a result of a probing question brought forward for the purpose of mischief by the member for Mitchell, the Minister of Education asked me to give details of certain activities occurring in the Education Department. I have every intention of drawing those facts to the attention of the Minister; however, I want an undertaking from him that we are not to have a witch hunt and discrimination against individuals such as we have experienced on earlier occasions. I believe there are many areas of gross over-spending in the Education Department that need to be considered urgently. Last week I referred to the case where a school was forced to buy a movie camera that was not needed by it.

Mr. Payne: They didn't have to spend the money.

Dr. EASTICK: The school was told that the money had to be spent by a certain date or it would lose the money.

Mr. Payne: If the school didn't want it, why did it spend the money?

Dr. EASTICK: The honourable member can make his own contribution to the debate, but I ask him to go back and look at the nature of the direction given to schools and the situation that has arisen over a long time that, if a school or any Government department fails to spend available funds, it is subsequently denied such sums or is discriminated against. The article referred to yesterday was not an audio-visual aid, as was suggested by the Minister, but was an ordinary movie camera that could be used to record parts of the school's history. That is not a reasonable expenditure of funds and is against the best interests of those people in the school system who have to decide whether to purchase equipment. During the weekend I was informed that a school in the Mid North of the State had applied for assistance totalling $3 a week from the Education Department to get help to cut the grass and generally to keep the school yard tidy; instead, the school received the services of a part-time caretaker at an expenditure in excess of $2 500 a year. Such action was of advantage to the school, because the caretaker could undertake the general cleaning up of school facilities that students, teachers or the parents' organisation were normally required to do. However, the difference between $3 a week (about $150 a year) and $2 500 a year is a dramatic one. The additional sum of $2 350 could have been spent on other facilities of greater benefit to the school.

The member for Frome can cite a recent event in the field of further education where an application was made for an electric soldering iron. Detail was supplied to the department about where the soldering iron would be used and the number of students who would use it. Subsequently, a parcel containing nine electric soldering irons arrived. I suggest each honourable member could refer to examples of this type of expenditure of funds against the best interests of the school. When that matter is considered in relation to some of the infants schools in the Adelaide metropolitan area that are currently having their telephone services disconnected in an attempt to reduce costs, the magnitude of the problem can be seen to be even greater.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Where are these schools?

Dr. EASTICK: In the western suburbs (and the detail will be made available to the Minister). I can name two infants schools—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: In the District of Adelaide?

Dr. EASTICK: I said that they were in the western suburbs. I am not talking about the District of Adelaide. The information will be made available to the Minister when it is clear that there will not be discrimination or a witch hunt that causes discomfort to people who are providing information of this vital nature.

Mr. Payne: In the schools where you say they did not need the money that you say they spent, why didn't they return it?

Dr. EASTICK: Mr. Speaker, I seek your clarification on whether the contribution by the member for Mitchell is his contribution to this debate, or unnecessary prattle.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections have always been part of debate in any Parliament in the British Commonwealth of Nations and, certainly, I will not deprive the right of honourable members in this respect, but continued and persistent interjections would not be in that category and would be out of order. I call the attention of the House to that ruling.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I refer now to the failure of Ministers to provide detail and documents that they have promised to provide to this House. The matter was raised briefly yesterday, when the Premier was given an opportunity to fulfil a commitment he had made to this House and to me, as Leader, on Tuesday last week. On that occasion, when we were dealing with the case that had been put to the Commonwealth Government in respect of funds for the States over the next five years, it was clearly stated (and it is in *Hansard* at page 3245) that the document would be made available. The document was not made available on the subsequent days of sitting, namely, Wednesday and Thursday last week, and yesterday. When the matter was raised yesterday, the Premier saw fit to take the document out of his bag, but he did not make it available to me or to any other member of this House. This afternoon I have made an approach to the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier, and at present that particular document is on the desk opposite me. It is available for me to go over and pick up at this stage, but not from the hands of the Premier, who had stated that it would be available and that it was a document that members could see so that they could have a better appreciation of the approach being made to the Commonwealth Government for State funds.

The matter does not stop there. We can go back through the questions that have been asked in the present session of Parliament and find many cases where promises have been made, particularly by the Premier, to provide information, and that information has never been provided. If we look at page 2646 of *Hansard* for the current session, we find that a report was being prepared in respect of tender prices and that it would be tabled and made available. That report has never been made available. Further, we find (as reported at page 3208 of *Hansard*) that a request was made for information about a barring of the subscriber trunk dialling system in State Government departments to try to reduce the massive expenditure occurring in those departments. Whilst the request was made to the Premier originally, subsequently the Deputy Premier made a statement, because it became apparent to members of this House that there was an implication of Big Brother tactics and a suggestion that members of the Public Service were having their telephone calls (inward as well as outward) monitored. It was indicated that the details would be made available so that members would

be able to determine whether the Government had overstepped the mark and was prying into personal activities of members of the Public Service, or whether it was a quite innocuous method of detection that could not be faulted because it did not record any details that would not be in the interests of the person concerned.

Last week the Deputy Premier told me that, when the House adjourned at the end of next week, he would let me look at this document. I appreciate that it will be made available then, but what good is it to members of the Opposition or to any other person if, on looking at the document, we find areas of doubt that should be questioned and aired in the interests of the Public Service and, indeed, in the interests of the people of South Australia generally? I repeat that I appreciate that the document is still coming and that the Minister initiated the move by telling me of his intentions, but a proper scrutiny of the document, on the floor of this House, if a scrutiny is necessary, will be denied.

The action of Ministers in making promises and failing to keep them is a dereliction of their duty. Certainly, it is a method of management or government, particularly against the background of the so-called open government system that members opposite claim they are part of, that is a dereliction of the duty of Ministers to every member of this House.

Such action is part and parcel of, and quite consistent with, the type of arrogance we saw from members opposite when certain matters were raised in September of last year. Then Ministerial statements were made and questions were directed across the floor to me by members opposite, seeking detail about certain comments that had been made. We even had the Government, rightly so, appointing a Royal Commission into what was a matter of some substance, one that required a complete review, and one the facts of which were subsequently proved as a result of that Royal Commission.

Ministers in the present Government suggested that I was not a fit and proper person to be in this House, because of the nature of the claims that had been made. I hope that those who said that have read a complete transcript of proceedings before the Royal Commission and subsequent inquiries and have found that the matter was initiated not by me as Leader of the Opposition but by someone completely outside Parliament. That was not sufficient for members opposite. They had to do their own special brand of politicking.

Mr. Coumbe: Didn't they over-react!

Dr. EASTICK: They did over-react, and they have made all sorts of assertions about my integrity and the integrity of those who followed me. They said that it was a disgrace, etc. I refer members to *Hansard* of early September last year. What has been found by a Royal Commission, a Public Service Board inquiry, and subsequently by a court of appeal has been a complete vindication of the claims that were made by people in South Australia outside the Parliamentary system, this situation having been subsequently supported by a person in this House who accepted the responsibility of looking closely at the documents that were available. Not one Minister opposite of those who were Ministers at that time can escape the fact that on that occasion they panicked. They thought they could get some political gain, because they were willing to accept, without proper investigation, a single document that one of them had received. I will pursue the subject, not in respect of the person who was unfortunate enough to have been found out, but for the purpose of saying to Government Ministers that they were a disgrace on that occasion to the Government they led, and their failure publicly or in the House to retract the incriminatory statements they made about me and my colleagues does them no credit. Those matters require to be placed on record, and I have taken this opportunity of so doing.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): The first matter to which I draw members' attention is the situation which has been brought about by this Government's attitude, which is lowering moral standards in this State. I refer especially to what appeared in the *Advertiser* on February 26 and on April 24, namely, a two-page list, each containing the titles of about 460 books—so-called literature. About 1 000 books were being advertised by the Government, through the Classification of Publications Board. All this junk was set out for everyone to see, particularly the young people, about whom I am most concerned. If adults wish to read this material, I suppose they have every right to do so. I am concerned about what happens to this rubbish when it is discarded in the street, on a park bench or somewhere else, where a minor can pick it up and read it. A minor could also order any of the copies of the books that this Government freely advertises in the press, because there is an order form and a short list of the books available. These books cater to all kinds of taste, one book bearing the title *Lace and Leather Lesbians,* while there are many other titles that I have not had time to read. These books can be procured by young people. The order form, which is to be posted to the bookshop, states, "Please send me a copy of the catalogue. I am over 18 years of age." That appears on the back of the application form. How can the people who are distributing and selling these books know whether the person who has completed the order form is 18 years of age or over? Obviously, young people would be able to apply for the books, with no check being placed on them.

Another matter to which I draw members' attention relates to a report appearing in the *Sunday Mail,* dated June 15. It might be funny to the member for Stuart, but I hope that his children will not be able to get hold of some of this junk which is freely available merely on application. The Government of which he is a member is supposedly a great protector of human rights and of the people of the State. An advertisement for the Whisper Shop, North Adelaide, in that *Sunday Mail* states:

Straight or kinky, square or camp, you will find it in the Whisper Shop. Mail orders to customers. Catalogues are still available. So fill in the coupon and mail it to the Whisper Shop, North Adelaide.

The application form states:

Please send me a Whisper Shop catalogue. I am over 18 years of age.

The person ordering must give his name and address, but how can anyone at the shop, if he wants to (and I doubt whether he would want to, because all the shop is concerned about is a sale and not about corrupting the young people of the State), ascertain that the person who has applied for this filth is over 18 years of age? The Government does not really care about this matter, anyway. It is all very well for mature people (if they wish to be called such) to read this material if they desire. However, my main concern is about the corruption of young people because, after all, they are the adults of tomorrow to whom we shall be handing over.

This amounts to a breakdown of family life and of all we hold dear. I wonder just how thoroughly the Attorney-General has investigated this matter and how far he can go in tightening up the legislation, if need be, to cope with this problem. This practice is legal, but

I wonder what the Attorney-General's reactions are. He is, I understand, a family man, so I wonder what his personal outlook is on this matter. I am concerned about it, and I believe that something must be done. If the Attorney-General and the Government have not discussed this matter in Caucus, they ought to do so at their next Caucus meeting.

Another matter I raise is that of the time which a back-bencher or Opposition member must wait for replies to questions. On March 11 last, I asked the Premier a question about dental clinics. It was an important question to me but, obviously, it was not important to the Premier, because he has not seen fit to reply to it. He said that he would obtain a full report for me. I asked why the only schools that had been invited to use the facilities of the new dental clinic at Bells Road, Somerton Park, were 10 primary and infants schools in the Glenelg and Ascot Park areas. I asked why he was discriminating against private schools, particularly the Catholic schools, in my area. In my district there are smaller independent schools: Our Lady of Grace, Sacred Heart College, Woodlands, Christ the King, St. Mary's, and Westminster, and, as I explained to the Premier, many of the parents of these children are not rich. They have not been invited to send their children to this clinic or even to submit a list of the names of those children wishing to take advantage of these facilities. This is discrimination by the Government. Opposition members know what the Government thinks of private schools and know that it would strangle them out of existence. We know that the means test has been changed to a needs test, adopting the system the Swedish Government used to get rid of independent schools in that country. We know that the Government believes that independent schools are far too independent, but I believe the Government is discriminating against children who attend these smaller schools by not allowing their names to be placed on a list for attending this dental clinic, which has been erected at a cost to taxpayers for the benefit of all children in the State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): During Question Time I asked a question of the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, about the marketing of potatoes in this State, and particularly referred to the extraordinarily high price that I am led to believe is paid by consumers here compared to the price paid for comparable South Australian potatoes in other States.

Mr. Payne: You could get that information from the Parliamentary Library.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is nice of the honourable member, but perhaps he could contain his vessel in patience because there are things I want to say. From time to time in this place I have expressed considerable disquiet about the activities of the South Australian Potato Board. Occasionally, it has become a white-hot issue, long before the member for Mitchell came to this House or was interested in politics, so far as I know. I have never been satisfied with the way it proceeds. One only has to refer to Mr. Peter Fraser McEwin, who was a prime agitator in past years over this matter. Some weeks ago I was approached on recommendation by Mr. Stan Farquhar who is a merchant at Ballarat in Victoria and who told me last year that he wrote to the Leader of the Opposition about this matter but has never had any action from him.

Dr. Eastick: Would you mind repeating that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not have time; why not look in *Hansard*? Therefore, he asked for someone who could help him—

Dr. Eastick: That's a lie.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and came to me. I quote from a few letters I have received, and refer again, as I did in my question, to the telephone conversation I had this morning. I emphasise that my concern is that the consumers of this State are paying far too much for potatoes, because of the machinations of the South Australian Potato Board, and I want some inquiry into this matter to ascertain whether it cannot be put right. A letter from Mr. Farquhar, dated June 13, states in part:

Some 10 to 12 years ago my company commenced supplying South Australian potato merchants with washed and pre-packaged and dirty potatoes. These merchants only purchased potatoes from Victoria when the price was cheaper than that offering by the S.A. Potato Board, or the quality of the Victorian potato was better than that offered by the board. The merchants had the right to select quality and purchase from whatever supplier proved to be the most satisfactory. The S.A. Potato Board had to produce quality goods at a competitive price. The Victorian merchant also had to be competitive both in price and quality if he wished to sell to merchants in Adelaide. This system created fair competition between States, and gave no State an advantage or disadvantage over the other.

He goes on to state how the Potato Board brought all the merchants in South Australia under control by withdrawing their licences unless they would agree not to trade with merchants in other States. The letter continues:

That "happy" situation having been achieved—

I know something of it because of a complaint I received from a merchant—

when these merchants signed these agreements in about March last year, the board then had near complete control over the South Australian potato market. From hereon the South Australian housewife has paid an exorbitantly high price for potatoes. The potato price througout Australia dropped to a low ebb in November, 1974, but not so to the South Australian housewife. South Australian potatoes have been sold to Victorian merchants at dumping prices, and yet Mr. Reddin, Chairman of the board, has denied these charges. I have positive proof that board potatoes have been delivered to my factory in Ballarat, freight paid by the South Australian agent, and the net cost delivered to my factory was $40 a tonne. At the time these potatoes were delivered to my factory at $40 a tonne, the wholesale price of potatoes to storekeepers in Adelaide was $100 a tonne for the same comparable potato. The retail price to the housewife for this potato was $160 a tonne. The Victorian housewife was buying the same comparable potato at $66 a tonne. The South Australian housewife did not get a drop in the high price of potatoes until my potatoes were sold to chain stores in Adelaide.

That is the C.P.S. chain I referred to this afternoon. The letter continues:

The South Australian housewife was paying a recommended retail price of $230 a tonne for washed pre-packed potatoes, and yet my potatoes sold to the housewife for $140 a tonne. Mr. Reddin has accused my company of staging a potato price war. This fact is not true, but is a cover-up by Mr. Reddin to cover the inefficient operation of the S.A. Potato Board. From what I can gather, the grower price in South Australia would be comparable to the grower price in Victoria. The freight cost from Victoria to Adelaide was $15 a tonne, and yet we are able to pay this extra cartage and still give the South Australian housewife potatoes $90 a tonne cheaper. With all the hue and cry of the imported potatoes arriving in Australia from Canada and an all-time Australian grower glut of potatoes, one cannot understand why for the last five months the South Australian housewife has had to pay $230 a tonne for potatoes that my company can profitably supply for $140 a tonne.

I have other letters from other producers to the same effect, one from Gillespie's Products of Guildford, N.S.W.,

stating that the price of South Australian potatoes is the same in Sydney as it is in Adelaide, even though freight has to be paid between here and there. Another letter from S. Doust & Son of Dorrigo, N.S.W., dated May 30, states:

In reference to the South Australian Potato Board marketing policy in New South Wales, I would like to point out that, as far as we are concerned, it would appear that the above board is on most occasions, using the State of New South Wales as a dumping ground. On many occasions it has come to our notice that South Australian potatoes are being sold for less in Northern New South Wales and Southern Queensland than they are in their home State.

The letter continues to give an example of this, and then states:

It would appear to me that the South Australian housewife is subsidising the housewife in New South Wales and Queensland, and it amazes me why the South Australian Housewives Association has not done anything about this matter.

I think the association has complained from time to time. Another letter, dated June 10, from Southern Tablelands Potatoes Proprietary Limited states in part:

It is obvious that consumers in South Australia are subsidising this form of marketing by paying relatively high prices in their own State, whereas South Australian potatoes have been sold in New South Wales at ridiculously low prices.

The final paragraph of the letter that I quoted earlier states:

I think now if you read Mr. Reddin's comments in the *News* of June 3, 1975, wherein he states, "The whole industry has co-operated and there was not one price change or fluctuation this year until this week, and this will be an all-time record," positive proof that had not Victorian potatoes entered South Australia the housewife would still be paying $94 a tonne in excess of the Victorian housewife.

In reply to my question this afternoon, the Deputy Premier came in like the tide (as he normally does) and talked about orderly marketing, the rights of the grower, and so on. It is strange that a Labor man who relies so strongly on the metropolitan vote should emphasise those things before he emphasises the rights of the consumer. All of us consume potatoes. The fact is, as I am informed, that we are paying far more for potatoes than we need be paying, and this is owing not to orderly marketing, so-called, unless it is orderly marketing gone mad, but to a blatant manipulation (and I use the phrase used to me this morning) by the Potato Board of the prices of potatoes. I want to know why this is being done, how it is being done, and whether there are benefits to anyone from it, because there does not seem to be much benefit to the consumer, who—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —is, I should have thought, the major interest—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —to which we should direct our concern.

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

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I direct the attention of members to the situation that applies in this State with regard to country mental health services. I think that members will agree that mental health services have undergone a tremendous change in the past 20 years. The walls of Glenside have come down, the closed nature of mental institutions giving way as far as possible to an open situation. Yet, despite these tremendous advances, people in the country are still being severely disadvantaged. The emphasis is now on acute treatment of the initial psychiatric disease, followed by quite a lengthy period of out-patient treatment, including group therapy and other clinical treatment. It is then followed by rehabilitation, which is often undertaken by bodies such as Recovery. Here, once the professional has finished his work in treating a patient and bringing him back into the community, Recovery helps to rehabilitate the patient, assisting him to take his full place in the community.

In South Australia, we have an unusual situation. Most of the population lives in a main city area with a small, but none the less important, group of towns in the north of the State around the gulf (the so-called Iron Triangle). There is another area in the Riverland, and another in the South-East. Because of this situation, people living there find themselves severely handicapped when it comes to the treatment of mental illness, not so much because of the treatment available but with regard to their rehabilitation and recovery back into the community. I believe this is a most serious matter. Having gone through the stage of acute breakdown, where most patients in country areas have to be transferred to Adelaide, and having been treated in Adelaide and seen as out-patients there, these patients face difficulty in relation to the aim of getting them back into the community as soon as possible, and I believe this aspect is markedly affected by the fact that the patients are away from the very community that they aim to get back into. They are away from the support they need from their friends and family at that time.

They must still attend out-patient sessions in Adelaide, yet in many cases they are divorced from the community where the support lies. Clearly, the recovery of patients such as these from country areas is significantly affected and delayed. Their return to the community as citizens useful to themselves, their family, and the community generally is significantly delayed by this lack of facilities. I believe that one visiting psychiatrist a month, as is the case in one of the larger country areas of the State, is not enough. Facilities should be provided for permanent psychiatric acute treatment, at least at those three major centres to which I have referred, and possibly at other country centres as well. Once acute treatment is completed, patients should be able to obtain more regular out-patient treatment and more regular group sessions under skilled guidance in their own local community area as close as possible to the centre of that local community. I believe that the moneys that might be expended in providing that psychiatric help could well be saved many times over by the return of those people to the community as healthy, well-balanced individuals.

We cannot do much about the situation at present, but I believe it is a matter we should be examining in an effort to provide the necessary services. We can be remarkably proud of the mental health services in this State. However, I believe we are falling down by not making the services widely available to country areas. I hope this situation will be dealt with as soon as possible. It would be wrong of me if I did not take this opportunity to congratulate the members of Recovery for the work they are doing in helping to rehabilitate people and return them to the community as soon as possible. I hope the difficulties to which I have referred will be relieved soon. I for one will certainly do all I can to stimulate that sort of service, for I believe country people deserve it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I wish to take up in this grievance debate the subject I raised during Question Time today: the introduction of noise legislation in South

Australia. During Question Time, I pointed out that the Government had plainly given an undertaking to the South Australian people that it would introduce such legislation this session. We know that the current session will end probably next Tuesday, so it is obvious that no such legislation will be introduced this session, and it will have no hope of passing the House in the time left. During Question Time, I accused the Government of deceiving the Governor, the South Australian newspapers, and the public. I did that because, in his address at the beginning of this session, the Governor specifically stated that the Government would introduce noise legislation. Now, at the end of the session, such legislation has not been introduced.

I will now refer to several newspaper reports on the matter. Over two years ago, in the *Advertiser* of April 12, 1973, a report stated that the Government was planning wider noise control. The report pointed out how the Government was currently preparing legislation, hoping to introduce a Bill to control noise levels. In a feature article by Stewart Cockburn in the *Advertiser* of April 18, 1974, it was stated that the Bill relating to noise levels was getting its final touches. That was over 12 months ago. Mr. Cockburn wrote that article in good faith on information received from the Government, believing that that was the situation. Now, 12 months later and one session of Parliament later, we find that we still do not have such legislation. In the *Advertiser* of September 18, 1974, there was a report that the Minister for the Environment had given an undertaking to the House that such legislation would be introduced in the current session. I point out that the Government has deceived the Governor, the newspapers, and the public. It is time the Government explained why it has carried out this deception. South Australia could learn much from noise legislation currently being used in England. That legislation was introduced more than a year ago and contains some important aspects. In a city such as London, and in most other large cities (and Adelaide would be included as a large city), the general noise level is increasing by 1 decibel a year, which is an incredible increase if it is taken over, say, a 10-year period. Furthermore, it has been ascertained in England that noise levels are already so great that, in some cases, permanent or temporary loss of hearing is occurring. If that is the situation in large cities in other parts of the world it is probably the case here, and it should be investigated and remedied as soon as possible.

So often, because we cannot physically see the noise problem, we as a community tend to push it aside. I believe that is a reason why the Government has failed to introduce legislation dealing with this matter; instead, the Government has put other financial matters and its gifts to the community ahead of other more important problems, such as noise pollution. English legislation is based on solving the noise problem by first ensuring that it does not continue to increase by 1 decibel a year. Authorities in England are trying to ensure that the noise level has reached a ceiling, and that they will stop it at that level. Having stopped it at that level, they will try to reduce it in significant areas by what they describe as the best practicable means. That is a general statement but is used much in United Kingdom legislation. A booklet entitled *Neighbourhood Noise*, produced by the Noise Advisory Council in England, states:

For the same reasons—

and the council is talking about the best practicable means—

we do not think it practicable or reasonable to require any more stringent standard to be applied to the abatement of noise nuisance. However, if our proposals are accepted, the court, in requiring the use of the best practicable means to abate nuisance, will be doing no more than enforcing a general duty declared in the Act. We believe that this knowledge will have the effect of causing magistrates to take a somewhat more stringent view of what constitutes best practicable means where nuisance is proven; and that as a result the concern expressed by some local authorities on this point will increasingly be seen to be unfounded.

The point is that a magistrate and the legislation point out to people that, where practicable, they must reduce noise levels. It means that a contractor at a construction site must list the sort of noisy construction equipment he is likely to use on the site. He submits that information to the local authority, which examines the information and tries to work out exactly what sort of noise level will be emitted from the construction site, and, if the noise level is likely to be too high, in consultation with the contractor, the authority tries to reduce the noise level by perhaps reducing the number of noisy machines being used at any one time. It was interesting, too, to see what some of the noise measurements in England produced. It was found that from about 18 metres from the edge of a busy motorway carrying many heavy vehicles travelling at speeds up to about 100 kilometres an hour (a situation we could find on the Hills freeway) the decibel level reading was about 80 dba, which is the method used by the Noise Advisory Council. It is commonly regarded that the maximum possible level should be 90 dba, because beyond that level people are likely to experience a temporary hearing loss.

For a nuisance level, however, the noise level should not be higher than about 50 dba to 60 dba, depending on the time of day. During the evening the level should be down to about 40 dba; otherwise, people's sleep will be interrupted. The council also measured noise in other areas such as that emitted by aircraft and from industrial premises, and found that about 9 metres from a factory using a forge hammer the reading was 85 dba, which is a high and significant level. In South Australia there is considerable concern in residential areas about noise levels coming principally from vehicles travelling on roads, from air-conditioners and from loud music. An interesting figure from the English findings and research indicates that extremely high noise levels are experienced at discotheques and especially at pop music festivals. At one pop music festival a reading of 116 dba was taken about 90 metres from the source of the music. If a person were exposed to that noise level for some time, surely temporary or permanent hearing loss could be experienced. Perhaps a pop festival is not as important as a discotheque, where employees are expected to work from six to eight hours a day in extremely noisy conditions and where, invariably, the noise levels exceed 100 dba.

The Noise Advisory Committee in England believed that, where the noise level exceeded 100 dba, a serious threat of temporary or permanent loss of hearing existed regarding employees and employers. In such circumstances the community should be concerned, and the Government should legislate to make sure such a situation does not continue. Legislation to control noise levels is urgently needed, so I again plead with the Government to introduce it as soon as possible along similar lines to existing English legislation.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I have had several inquiries from constituents in my district about the amount of money available through the Rural Industry Assistance Act in South Australia. Two constituents have expressed concern because, following an application to the department and the rejection of their application by that organisation

for assistance to buy additional land, they resubmitted their applications to their respective banking authorities and obtained the funds. I am concerned that a Government department was set up to assist in debt reconstruction and to assist farm build-up where it is desirable to do so, yet, in order to qualify, the applicant must have tried all sources of financial assistance, and only as a result of failing to obtain assistance from those sources can he approach the department for assistance. I appreciate and agree with the criteria laid down in this regard, and realise that the department is there not to lend money in competition with free-enterprise banks but specifically to assist an industry where applicants are in trouble and cannot readily equip themselves with carry-on funds. On the surface, there seems to have been a breakdown in those cases.

Recently I have tried to obtain information about the operation of the Rural Industries Assistance Authority, and I am pleased on this occasion to be able to have that information recorded and to bring to the notice of members who are interested some detail that has been involved in this department since the commencement of operation of the Rural Industries Assistance Act in June, 1971. For the years from 1971 to June 30, 1974, 826 applications have been made for debt reconstruction. Of the number 326 have been approved, 482 have been declined, 15 have been withdrawn, and 3 are awaiting consideration.

An amount of $7 031 295 was approved, and $6 608 087 has already been advanced to applicants in that period. In the same period, 378 applicants sought funds for farm build-up. Of the number, 221 applications have been approved, 123 have been declined, 19 have been withdrawn, and 15 are pending consideration. The farm build-up figure approved by the department is $8 581 742, and in that period $7 723 253 has been advanced to the successful applicants.

Another function of the Rural Industries Assistance Authority that members may not be aware of is the opportunity for applicants to be rehabilitated in houses if they prove to be unable to carry on their business on the rural property and if for other purposes they wish to be housed or rehabilitated on another site. It is pleasing that during 1974-75 the department has received 11 applications for such housing rehabilitation and has approved all those applications. In the financial year 1974-75 a slightly different picture emerges. In that period 111 applications have been processed and only 16 of those have been approved. It is alarming that 81 applications for debt reconstruction in this period have been rejected.

In the same period there have been 172 applications for farm build-up so far. Of these, 135 have been processed, 70 have been approved, and 65 have been rejected. A total of $2 807 536 has been approved for farm build-up and $407 231 has been approved for debt reconstruction. That gives a total of $3 214 767, which is the larger part of the $3 400 000 available for the current period. I am pleased to have the opportunity to have these details recorded, and I am pleased that an officer of the department has made them available.

The final point I wish to make is that another Commonwealth department dealing with housing and construction in this State receives and processes applications for war service homes. Members will recall that about three years ago a soldier settler on Kangaroo Island, Jim Berryman, was dislodged in rather an unfortunate atmosphere from his soldier settler unit. A long history of events led to his removal from the property, and I have not the time now to bring details before the House. However, I am concerned that the department administering the war service homes scheme cannot rehabilitate that settler, despite the gruelling time through which he and his wife have gone since they were settled under the war service land settlement scheme.

Not only has he been dislodged from his property but now, after having secured a clear account with the Lands Department in South Australia, he has applied for a house through the only avenues that he knows to be available to him, and his application has been rejected. This is disturbing, because in the criteria laid down by the department administering housing, information is required from the Lands Department of the State concerned, and the Lands Department in South Australia is not willing, apparently, to provide a necessary clearance to enable this former soldier settler to qualify for a house.

I consider that this whole matter is quite unsavoury and unfair and that that soldier settler, Jim Berryman, has been victimised, as has seemed to be the case throughout his career and since his return from service on behalf of Australia. He was a soldier who went away, came home, set out to establish himself as a farmer, was knocked down at every reasonable step he took to rehabilitate himself after the Second World War, was dislodged from his property, and now at this late stage of his life (he is in his 60's) he and his wife have been unable to obtain a home.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to raise two matters relating to my district. One of my complaints is a matter of much concern to my constituents. Nearly two-thirds of the total number of unsewered houses in the Adelaide metropolitan area are situated in the District of Fisher. The Minister of Works has claimed in a statement to the press that the amount of money to be spent in that district in 1974-75 will be more than the $490 000 originally stated and that it would be nearer to $700 000.

That sum is insignificant and bears no true relationship to the amount of money that the Commonwealth Government has made available for sewerage facilities in this State. The amount that has been made available by the Commonwealth Government is $5 700 000, whereas last year it made available $1 600 000. The Minister has stated that his department has not the money to carry out any more work and that he is running to a programme that was established four or more years ago. He has not upgraded that programme to any, significant extent, even though the Commonwealth Government has made money available to help to achieve that objective. The people of Monalta put a proposition to the Minister that they were willing to go the scheme alone privately. It would have cost $300 000 to install the scheme in that area. They were willing to pay the interest on the money until the State Government, regardless of what political Party might be in office, had the money to pay the capital. That was nearly a year ago, but the present Government chose to throw that offer aside. The scheme would not have cost the Government one cent in the initial stages, but in the future it would be asked to pay the capital. The cost of that project today has escalated to about $400 000, or about a 25 per cent increase. That money has been virtually wasted, because the community would have paid the interest and the Government some time in the future would have had to pay the principal. The interest would have been the same sum for each house as the normal sewerage rate.

The only burden, if any, on the department would have been the actual picking up of the waste material at the

trunk mains, which already exist in the lower areas of the estate, and transporting it by pipeline to the treatment works, but that would not have cost a significant sum. If the Government (and I am sure that a Liberal Government would be willing to accept the principle) was willing to accept the principle, the problems of getting sewerage projects for the urban communities under way could be solved tomorrow. I understand that the projects cannot be completed. However, we could say to other communities, "You get the design done and get the engineers on the job. Find out what it will cost and, as you are willing to pay the interest as your sewerage rate, when we have the finance we will pay the balance." Every new subdivision nowadays must have sewerage provided. There is no need to panic about the future as regards new subdivisions, because all we have to do is catch up the leeway. While the people in the Hills area are waiting for the normal facilities that are provided in virtually every other part of the metropolitan area, the Engineering and Water Supply Department is using its equipment for construction work on the Christie Beach rail line and is forgetting about the health, general living standards, and quality of life of people in a significant section of the metropolitan area.

I do not know whether Government members, the Minister, or the Premier (as Treasurer) has a say in money matters and the way in which money shall be spent. I do not know whether they realise what real stench comes from effluent from septic tanks that flows in the streets and gutters. The main creek through Hawthorndene flows throughout the year with effluent. Children play in it, and it is up against the kindergarten and schools. Everywhere one goes from Coromandel Valley West down into the Hills areas such as Bellevue Heights, Belair and Monalta, one suffers the stench because the Government is not willing to accept the scheme which was feasible, which was not costly, and which placed no immediate burden on the State's finances. The scheme was simply rejected and, to me, that was plain stupidity. A community that is willing to accept some responsibilities and get a project off the ground should be supported. This shows a total lack of understanding of what the real quality of life is by a Government that claims that it would like to improve the quality of life for all citizens.

Another matter I will raise deals with schools and kindergartens. Bellevue Heights urgently needs a primary school. The people there are willing to accept Demac construction. Likewise, the upgrading of the school at Coromandel Valley has been promised for years. However, the Minister has decided to build a school at Coromandel Valley South, between Flagstaff Hill and Coromandel Valley. I say, without attacking the Minister or his department, "Let's forget what has gone on, the conflict and other matters in the immediate past." I ask him to take immediate action at the level I put to him recently, namely, to transfer the thinking regarding Coromandel Valley South and the concept of that school to Coromandel Valley, and use at Coromandel Valley the buildings and material available for Coromandel Valley South. That would take up the leeway until a school was built at Flagstaff Hill.

People at Coromandel Valley South are willing to accept that the school at Flagstaff Hill, which is in the Mawson District, must be built. The school will be a solid construction building, but they will accept a Demac school as an alternative if it helps the State's finances, because Demac costs only about 60 per cent of the cost of an equivalent school in solid construction. I hope that the department will move to Demac construction if we can make a 30 per cent or 40 per cent saving on school buildings. We want more school buildings—not glorified buildings but practical buildings in which teachers can operate and educate children in a practical manner. I make the plea on behalf of Coromandel Valley people that the Minister act immediately and forget the concept of Coromandel Valley South, which is not necessary now. Let us get Coromandel Valley upgraded for the benefit of a community that lacks the facility at present.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I raise a matter of concern to the people of this State, namely, the easy way in which people in this State can purchase and have available to them firearms. I have received complaints about this matter and I am sure that other members have, too. We see weapons displayed in supermarkets and departmental stores, and they are available to anyone who walks in and pays the ticket price. We see high-powered weapons all around the countryside, particularly the high-powered military rifle, the ·303, which has the extensive range of about 5 kilometres. These weapons get into the hands of inexperienced shooters—people without due regard for the safety and wellbeing of the community. This kind of firearm is available to the community at large, bringing a great danger to the countryside and to its people.

This matter was highlighted at the weekend in an article in the *Sunday Mail* by Max Harris headed "Death in the supermarkets". I think Mr. Harris did a service to the community by bringing this matter to the notice of the public of South Australia and, indeed, of that part of western Victoria where the *Sunday Mail* enjoys a large circulation. Mr. Harris, in his article, drew the attention of his readers by saying that, in looking at a window display, he was interested to see a group of young people looking at the display. His article states:

> It was a window display of guns of every shape, size and price . . . with telescopic sights and all kinds of smart gadgetry. The sort of display of lethal weaponry that could have sent Lee Harvey Oswald berserk.

Verbiage of that nature has to be used in order to bring the matter to the notice of Parliament and others, so that legislation can be introduced to control the outlet of firearms. Mr. Harris asks what is being done to protect the public against gun mania, a social disorder that is infamous in the United States, where more deaths are caused by the use of guns than by automobile accidents. All country members know of public utilities and road signs being battered by indiscriminate shooters, and this form of vandalism demands that there should be legislation to control the availability to the public of firearms, irrespective of whether such firearms are extremely lethal or whether it is a ·22 rifle used by so many people.

Section 6 and 7 of the Act specify who is allowed to hold a gun licence. At a recent meeting of the Field and Game Association strong action was suggested. Indeed, in your district, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a large consignment of high-powered rifles was being sold cheaply. I have seen the same thing in departmental stores in my district, and I hope the Minister will consider, when drawing up the Governor's Speech to open the next session of Parliament, introducing legislation to control the outlet of firearms. Mr. Harris suggests that a gun should not be sold to anyone unless he can produce documentary evidence of associate or training membership of an accredited sporting club, and also points out that restrictions would not interfere with the freedom of the sporting gun enthusiast. He also suggests that persons connected with the outlet for the firearm should also give instructions in its use, and I cannot emphasise this aspect too forcibly. Mr. Harris suggests that a gun should be registered

annually for a reasonable fee, and that efforts should be made to prevent guns from being left and forgotten in dangerous places. He also suggests that, as dog licences have to be renewed each year (and dogs are not dangerous), why not gun licences? Amnesties have been introduced for firearms, but I believe that, although the legislation contains a provision that firearms should be registered, it is not sufficiently policed. If the law cannot be policed it should be amended, and this responsibility lies with the Government. We have become a mobile society because of the motor car, and many people are able to move around in the community. We observe the reckless use of firearms, and I hope that the Minister will discuss this matter in Cabinet and have details of an amendment included in the Governor's Speech that will open the next session of Parliament.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): First, I refer to the Royal Commission that was set up following press statements by some people and a course of action taken by the Leader of the Opposition to have a matter investigated. The Leader referred to statements made by the Minister for the Environment reported in *Hansard* in about September in which the Minister gave undertakings in relation to information that Mr. Taliangis had made available to him. Obviously, that information was not 100 per cent correct, and it would be in the best interest of members and of Westminster-style Government if the Minister corrected the record so that he could correct once and for all the incorrect information he gave to the House. I do not say that in a personal way, but it would be a proper course to take.

The other matter to which I refer concerns the National Parks and Wildlife Division. I believe in responsible conservation and agree that areas of the State should be set aside as national parks. However, some areas that have been declared national parks are not the most suitable sites for such parks, and should be relinquished and more suitable areas used. Recently, a controversy occurred in my district about the actions of a district council, which was involved in roadworks, knocking down trees in a national park. The matter was reported in the local press, and whoever gave that information to the press did the National Parks and Wildlife Division a great disservice, because in my opinion the information was misleading.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: In what way?

Mr. GUNN: The first information in the press stated that much mallee had been knocked down, and that was not correct.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: No mallee!

Mr. GUNN: There was some, but when I read the report in the press it implied that tens of acres of trees had been knocked down, whereas in fact no more than about two acres (·8 ha) of mallee trees had been knocked down.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It didn't say 10 acres, did it?

Mr. GUNN: No, but it gave the impression that these people had virtually moved in with a Caterpillar D8 chain and swiped down a large area, and that is not correct, I make the point that I think that the council was obviously in the wrong; there is no argument about that. However; I believe that it would do the cause of the National Parks and Wildlife Division some good if it were a little more prudent, because I believe it is now held in great ridicule in this area of my district because of the action it took on this occasion. I do not say this as a personal attack on the department or its officers, as I think they discharge their duties to the best of their ability and in what they believe are the best interests of the department. However, I believe they should perhaps look at the situation a little more realistically and then some of the problems that have previously occurred will not arise again. Several of my constituents have said to me, "What is wrong with these people?" They are amused to think that such foolish reports should be placed in the press, when these people are actually aware of what happened. When I contacted the Minister about the matter, he was most charitable and understanding, and I compliment him for that.

Mr. Coumbe: There must be something wrong with him.

Mr. GUNN: I always like to be fair; I do not want to be uncharitable towards the Minister. Most country towns in South Australia are suffering a chronic housing shortage. One of the promises of this Government and the present Commonwealth Government was that they would take positive action to deal with the housing crisis in this country. Apparently the position is the same in the housing field as it was in relation to solving the problem of the education crisis in this State. As soon as the Hon. Hugh Hudson became Minister of Education, the crisis in education ended. The vicious campaign launched against Mrs. Steele in this State and Mr. Fraser in the Commonwealth sphere when he was Minister for Education and Science ceased with the election in this State of the Hon. Hugh Hudson as Minister, and of Mr. Beazley in the Commonwealth sphere.

The situation faced in many country towns, particularly on Eyre Peninsula, is that virtually no houses are available at present. The Housing Trust is apparently unable to meet even a reasonable demand. I sincerely hope that when the Treasurer brings down his financial papers in the next few months he pays special attention to problems in relation to country housing, so that young people in country towns will be able to purchase houses or obtain rental accommodation. Unless this is forthcoming, we will not be able to have a proper policy of decentralisation. We cannot hold young people in country towns if they are unable to obtain reasonably satisfactory housing at a reasonable cost. At this stage, the Housing Trust is one of the few groups that can provide housing at a reasonable cost. Because of the shocking financial policies of the Whitlam Socialist Labor Government, housing is now virtually out of the reach of the average citizen. This scandalous situation should be dealt with, as it will be when the Whitlam Government is defeated at the first opportunity, and when the Eastick Government is elected in this State.

The taxation system in this State should be reviewed. It is high time that we had a full public inquiry into taxes levied and, in addition, into charges made by State Government departments. This can be achieved only if the State Government institutes an inquiry, with the powers of a Royal Commission, so that members of the public can come forward and present their case openly. I understand that the Treasurer has set up in his department an inquiry into taxation, inviting certain interested groups to make submissions. That is not the best way to deal with this situation. Why has this inquiry not been advertised and the average John Citizen given the right to come forward? Many people believe that the current system of taxation on investment discriminates against them. Taxation, particularly in the area of capital taxation, is not in the interests of future development, as it retards growth and initiative, and has a serious effect on country people particularly. In this connection, I refer mainly to State succession duties, land tax, and water rates. If

these taxes were reviewed, that would certainly be a step in the right direction. The emphasis must be changed from capital taxation to some other forms of taxation that are fair, just and equitable. The system operating now certainly does not correspond to those three criteria.

I entirely agree with the member for Victoria that many people in the community who own firearms discharge them in a way that leaves much to be desired. We should have some control over the sale and distribution of high-powered rifles, such as those of ·303 calibre to which the honourable member referred. However, I do not believe we should legislate to prevent citizens of the State from owning ·22 rifles. I believe that it should be the right of every citizen who so desires to own a single-shot or repeater ·22 rifle. That should be his right.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Including anyone who might have some mental problem?

Mr. GUNN: Let me finish. In a free, democratic society, people should have this right. They should be compelled to register rifles, and I am not opposed to their being licensed, but I do oppose—

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Yesterday, the Minister of Mines and Energy again sought to preach to the Opposition, as is his common wont. He said that he hoped that the Opposition would not be identified with the backlash against education spending, as Senator Guilfoyle had been in the Commonwealth sphere. The Minister has publicly stated recently that it would be a tragedy if there were any cut at all in the recommendations of expenditure of the schools commission, or if there were a cut-back in relation to the recommendations of the commission that inquired into the needs of technical and further education. That is a most convenient political stance for the Minister to take, because he does not happen to be the Commonwealth Treasurer. I shall be extremely surprised if the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. W. Hayden) does not in fact advocate some cuts across the board in relation to the education vote. The simple fact is that Mr. Hayden is now largely talking like a Liberal Treasurer, because he has been forced into that position.

Of course, the economic realities of the situation are that the Commonwealth Government and this Government have, for some time, lived well beyond their means. They have sought to spend, in many areas of governmental spending, money that they just do not have. Fortunately for it, the State Government has previously been able to blast the Commonwealth Government (especially when a Liberal Commonwealth Government has been in office), claiming that the Commonwealth was being parsimonious. On all public occasions, this Government has been able to put pressure on the Commonwealth Government to raise more finance for some of its lavish schemes. Although we have had a change at the Commonwealth Government level, the demands still continue. I point out that the Opposition will continue to probe Government spending, whether in education or in any other sphere. If we believe that money is being wasted and that people are not getting value for money (as I do not believe they are in the area of education), we will continue to say so.

The Minister makes these announcements about a backlash against education expenditure, but the backlash will come when members of the general public, the taxpayers of the country, are convinced that they are not getting value for money. Many of them are convinced of that fact right now. They realise this by examining what is happening on the local scene with regard to education. The Leader and other members have referred to this matter. The role of the Opposition is to probe what the Government is doing, and we will continue to do that. However, I do not believe we do this by the disgraceful method to which the member for Eyre referred and which was adopted by members opposite, who discredited the efforts of the Education Department and the then Minister of Education in the period before members opposite were elected to Government. We heard all this nonsense about a crisis in education but, under probing and questioning of Ministers in the House, it turned out that the crisis was really one of morale. If anyone contributed to that crisis it was the Minister of Education, who is moving further afield, and his colleagues occupying the Government front bench. The Minister should stop preaching at us and should support his arguments with hard, cold facts. In some circles the Minister is an economist of some note; however, the facts of life suggest that economists cannot agree. Probably the most heated debates on the economy of this country, indeed on the economy of this State, are those that occur between economists. Such was certainly the case recently on *Monday Conference*.

I do not give any more weight to what the Minister of Education in this State says than I give to any other economist with similar or greater qualifications. One backs one's judgment, and I am convinced, as I believe most members of the public are convinced, that much of the money being spent on education and on other Government projects is being wasted. We are facing a crisis in this country of far greater magnitude than anything that was inflamed by the efforts of the Government when it was in Opposition. We have a crisis in employment, and a crisis resulting from inflation in Australia. If the pronouncements of the Minister of Education are to be taken literally and followed through, I believe nothing will be achieved in coming to terms with inflation. The Minister said it would be a tragedy if there was any cut in Government spending in these areas; however, I believe it would be a greater tragedy if inflation were to continue at its present rate or to increase in severity, as is being predicted will happen by many economists and other people. It would be a greater long-term tragedy for this nation than that there be some pruning of Government expenditure, including cuts in education expenditure.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you referring to teachers' salaries or to spending on schools?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps we should just hold the line. A current proposition for the Education Department is that it should decentralise into nine regions, having already decentralised into five regions. My experience on the Public Accounts Committee indicates that the decision by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to decentralise its activities was a highly expensive operation. Before the Education Department completely decentralises and the decision is implemented, I should like to see a cost-benefit analysis carried out. In decentralising the department into nine regions, we are reaching the stage where we have too many chiefs in education to look after the Indians. A weakness of the Swedish education system is that there is a veritable army to oversee the efforts of a school population that is about the same as it is in South Australia. Sweden has almost twice the number of administrators that we have in South Australia, but we are moving in that direction. Decentralisation of administration is an admirable concept, but before we launch into

it, as did the Engineering and Water Supply Department, let us look at what it is going to cost, weigh up the situation and then make a decision.

We have a crisis in Government, especially at the Commonwealth level, but it occurs also at State Government level. How is this for the quote of the week? Referring to the disastrous situation regarding the Commonwealth Government's attitude to the wine industry, I quote:

Yesterday, a brandy producer opened his confidential files to show me a letter written to him on May 27 by the managing director of one of Australia's biggest wineries. "Quite frankly," the letter began, "I think we have been grossly and probably deliberately misled all the way through in both section 31A (of the Taxation Act) and the brandy situation. I would have no confidence whatsoever any more in the integrity of any member of the existing Government because of this industry's experiences. That being so, I must have serious doubts whether our 'soft' line has been right. I am more inclined to feel that their dishonesty should be exposed to the fullest extent and their ability to make decisions ridiculed at every opportunity. The most important part of our group, and I am sure yours, is its people. But I have very serious doubts whether the present Federal Government has any thought for the future welfare of the people it supposedly represents."

There are other examples of the integrity of the Australian Labor Government being called into serious doubt. These matters are approaching crisis dimensions; the economy of the country is in a crisis situation that is far greater than existed before the election of this pace-setting Labor Government. The matters to which I have referred are vitally important to the nation as well as to the State, so for the Minister of Education to preach to us in a pious fashion and say, "I hope the Opposition won't be identified with this backlash against education spending." is simply arrant nonsense.

Mr. Harrison: Are you advocating, as shadow Minister of Education, a cut in the finance available to education in this State?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If I were the Commonwealth Treasurer and was faced with making a decision in order to come to terms with inflation and had no option but to cut Government spending (which I believe is an option open to the Commonwealth Government), and one of those cuts in expenditure had to be in education, I would make it and make no apology for doing so. However, as I am not the Commonwealth Treasurer and am not in possession of all the facts, I am not in a position to make a firm judgment, nor, indeed, is this economist we have here masquerading as the Minister.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Two matters that concern me relate to the future of young people in South Australia and their opportunity for employment. The latest available figures to the end of April, 1975, indicate that the total registered number of unemployed was 23 776. Included in that figure is a category "juniors under 21", and they total 9 671; and it is estimated that about 2 110 of them are 1974 school leavers. Under present economic conditions, the problem arises in this country, especially in South Australia, concerning employment opportunities for young people. Last Thursday (June 12) I asked the Attorney-General a question about law students and their prospects of obtaining articles once they have completed their course at Adelaide University. In a detailed reply the Attorney did not dispute any of the figures or possibilities I put forward, and admitted graduates are having some difficulty in obtaining articles in the legal profession and that that situation could be put down to some degree to the present economic conditions.

When a student graduates from Law School he must either obtain articles with a practising solicitor or attend a special school, which is to be established, to do an 8½-month course. If a law graduate can obtain articles with a practising solicitor he can earn $70·40 a week for the first six months and $79·20 thereafter. Generally that rate applies for the next six months and is then reviewed. Under the proposed 8½-month course, the graduate will receive a tertiary allowance of $31 a week and must still then obtain employment with a solicitor. He will be virtually doing the practical side of his law studies. He will have been admitted, but he must work under the supervision of a solicitor for probably at least 12 months.

All we are doing at present is putting off the evil situation that has occurred. Unfortunately, on one hand, many students want to study law but cannot obtain admission to the course, while on the other hand those who are successful are having difficulty in being placed in a profession. An Adelaide solicitor has given me figures on the matter. I cannot verify them, but the Attorney-General has a copy of them. The solicitor claims that in 1953, when the population of South Australia was about 760 000, the number of practising certificates held by lawyers was 319. In that year, the ratio of lawyers to people in the State was one to every 2 300. In 1970, when the population was 1 100 000, the number of certificates held was 479, giving a ratio of one to 2 400 people. In 1974, with the population at 1 200 000 and the number of certificates 642, the ratio was one to 1 800.

It is seen that the ratio of lawyers to population is increasing and, if we establish a law school in 1977 at Flinders University, if we continue the course started by the Law Society under which a practical course lasting five years can be undertaken, and if we are to churn out the number of law graduates at the present rate, the ratio of lawyers to population will grow dramatically. The other point is whether it will be economical for these people to practise. We have this position in the legal profession, but what is happening in all the other areas in relation to the thousands of students who are attending our universities and obtaining higher education? What is their opportunity for employment in the future?

I am extremely concerned about the problem. The State Government has not done much to help the position. Normally, it takes in 10 articled clerks a year, but this year it has taken in six and there is no likelihood of an increase in that number next year. Of six law graduates left from last year, one is working as a builder's labourer on a building site in the city and two others are involved in a concert tour in the Mid-North of the State. I shudder to think what is happening to the others. The problem is that not all the graduates from the past year have been able to be absorbed in the profession, and students are trying to obtain articles.

Irrespective of the Government's and the Law Society's plans to have the students placed, we have three unfortunate tiers of young people in the community. We will always be seeking labourers, we will always be seeking white-collar employees (clerks, salesmen, and so on), and then we have the professionals. If we continue the present rate of pushing through the number of professionals or academics and if they cannot obtain employment in their field, they will come back to the clerical situation, perhaps putting the people who normally would be in that area into the

labouring section. As a result, those who were not able to be educated beyond the ages of 14 years, 15 years, or 16 years and would normally fall into the labouring category would not be able to find employment. That is the dilemma facing the Government at present in South Australia, and nothing is being done to solve the problem.

The other point I want to raise is in relation to the State Library. Here again, young people are concerned at the change in the system operating at the library. A person can now borrow a book for 28 days, instead of 14 days as applied previously. A book can be reserved for payment of 10c but a person cannot be told when the book is likely to be available. There is a new system of filming the borrower's card, and I understand that it will be two or three years before the system will be fully computerised and the arrangement will be sorted out. Students are being disadvantaged. They cannot obtain books when they want them. The borrower has a longer time in which to return the book, and students who want to do projects or use a book for other purposes cannot get it. Furthermore, the library is proposing to change the time when it closes on Saturday from 9.30 p.m. to 5 p.m. All these things make young people wonder where they are headed under the present Government. The position is not good enough, and Opposition members, on being given the opportunity and being returned to Government, would rectify the position.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Issue and application of $160 000 000."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I ask the Deputy Premier whether there has been an assessment of the wage structure applying to the Public Service that would suggest that the 60 per cent increase from $100 000 000 to $160 000 000 will be adequate for the Public Service during 1975-76. It is not a matter of conjecture. The Treasurer said that this massive increase had come about because of the vast increase in the escalation of wages and salaries, but there were increases in the sum put before us in 1974, which proved inadequate. Obviously, the Government has undertaken an assessment regarding its likely responsibilities during 1975-76. I seek information from the Deputy Premier regarding the likely adequacy of the provision that has been made, more particularly of the projection of cash flow throughout 1975-76 of known or anticipated increases in wages and salaries.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): The sum is not only for wage and salary increases; an increase in the number of officers and services provided by the Government has caused some of the increase. Although I am unable to say unequivocally that an examination has taken place, I am certain that the Under Treasurer would not present the figure to the Treasurer without some investigation of the requirements during these two months. Undoubtedly, the details will be set out in the Budget when it is brought down later this year. I think it is customary that the Budget speech contain the details of this matter and indicate what the future projections for salary and wage increases will be. True, there was a short-fall in the predictions for last year; I suppose that was inevitable, because certain imponderables are involved in budgeting. I will ask the Treasury what investigation has taken place and will give the Leader any further detail I am able to obtain.

Dr. EASTICK: I accept what the Deputy Premier has said, and I will be pleased to accept the documentation that is made available. The Premier was unable to provide a reply to a Question on Notice on Tuesday last week regarding the size of the Public Service and the number of employees at June 30, 1974, December 31, 1974, and May 31, 1975. He said that material would be run through the computer on Wednesday, June 11, and that, as soon as the material was available, it would be brought to the House so that we could see what increase had taken place in the service. Inquiry from the department reveals that that document was made available to be brought down and tabled or to be given in reply to me on June 11. However, the document was not tabled, and no information was given me on the following day. A notice of motion was placed on yesterday's Notice Paper seeking the information which had been promised but which was not forthcoming.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You got the reply yesterday.

Dr. EASTICK: Only yesterday, yet it was sent down by the officers and was to be given to me last Wednesday. The document shows that there had been an increase in the service between June 30, 1974, and December 31, 1974, and a further increase up to May 31, 1975. In answer to a question asked yesterday, percentages were given showing that the percentage increase in 1974-75 had been lower than the percentage increase in 1973-74, for which we can be thankful, although there was still a large increase in the size of the Public Service. Can the Deputy Premier say what action the Government has taken or contemplates taking in respect of overall Public Service employment during 1975-76? Also, have any steps been taken recently which will impinge on the activities of the service over the next 12 months and which will reduce or hold the size of the service? I am trying to determine whether the 60 per cent increase will be used to create a sizeable increase in the service.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader is mistaken if he believes that the additional 60 per cent is to cater for a 60 per cent increase in Government activity during this period. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said that this expenditure over the two-month period would be based on current levels of expenditure. That must indicate that there will not be a tremendous upsurge in Government activity. In, I think, January or February this year an instruction was issued from the Premier's Department to all departments to cut back on the employment of additional public servants and on the creation of new positions, and it was stated that no new positions would be created unless it could be shown by the Minister that there was an absolute requirement. That instruction applied until about April or May, when we were better able to see what our financial position was. The position was then eased slightly, and no doubt this has had a bearing on the Leader's point that there was a smaller increase in the Public Service. It is still a Government requirement as a matter of policy that only those positions that the Minister can show need to be filled will be filled, with a view to keeping down expenditure as much as we can.

Mr. COUMBE: In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer used the expression "essential services to the public which the public is demanding". That is a broad statement and, as we are considering a sum of $160 000 000, the Commitee is entitled to have the expression explained. As copies of the Corbett report have been circulated, I would be interested to learn from the Deputy Premier, in view of what he said about control over the expansion of the Public Service, how far the recommendations contained

in the report are likely to be adopted by the Government, especially regarding the rearrangement of departments, and when we can expect a report from the committee the Government has set up to assess the Corbett report.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot elaborate on what the Treasurer said about demands for services, but I think he was referring in general terms to the fact that there is a constant demand on the Government for improved services in any area in which the Government is involved. The honourable member would be aware that departments are always putting pressure on Ministers for additional staff, and the Treasurer would be stating that this demand for additional services is constant and not something new. The Corbett report has been referred to a committee that will report to Cabinet, I think, at the end of June. It will recommend to the Government what parts of the Corbett report should be adopted, but the report is not influencing the policy to which I have referred previously. That policy still stands and was being implemented before we received the Corbett report, which has given us no cause to take any other action.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SEX DISCRIMINATION)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 17. Page 3421.)

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): Although the member for Torrens said that the Opposition completely supported the principles put forward in this Bill, he claimed the Government had gone about achieving the desired results in a clumsy way. I hope to show that there is no substance in that claim. The honourable member referred several times to the fact that there was no reference in the Bill to a total wage or a minimum wage. These matters seem to be of more concern to him than is the major purpose of the Bill, which is to ensure that, as far as possible, awards do not contain any discrimination in conditions of employment between the sexes.

The removal of the living wage concept, with which the member for Torrens has agreed, will enable the State Industrial Commission to follow more readily the decisions in national wage cases made by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. In fact, since 1946 employees under State awards have received the same increases in the basic wage, and in later years in the total wage, as have been decided upon in respect of persons employed under Federal awards in national wage cases. However, since the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission abandoned the basic wage concept and expressed the wages contained in its awards as a total wage, it has been necessary to divide artificially that increase to employees under State awards between the living wage and margins.

There is no reference in the Conciliation and Arbitration Act of the Commonwealth Parliament to either the terms "total wage" or "minimum wage". The Commonwealth commission has decided to award a minimum wage to ensure that employees subject to its awards are paid not less than that amount. It has also decided to express wage rates in its awards as total wages. Neither of these two decisions has been by the direction of, or required by, the legislation. This Bill will give the South Australian Industrial Commission the same freedom to determine a minimum wage and a total wage without being required by legislation to do so. In other words the legislation as drafted will give the Industrial Commission complete discretion as to how to determine any industrial matter without being required to divide artificially its award wages into two parts, or without being restricted by the legislation as to how it will apply equal pay.

I agree with the member for Torrens that unnecessary and undesirable litigation should be avoided by having clear legislation. The amendments made by this Bill will result in clear legislation, and the Industrial Commission will be given the unfettered right to determine its own principles, just as the Commonwealth Concilation and Arbitration Commission has that power. I cannot agree that alterations made by clause 3, removing from the Industrial Commission the present power to disqualify for employment persons of either sex, could result in unnecessary litigation. The member for Torrens referred to three awards—the metal industry award, wine and spirit award and dry cleaners award. The reference in the wine and spirit award is a prohibition of the employment of any male person under the age of 16 years. When this Bill becomes law, it will no longer be possible for a new award to make a provision of that nature, but the commission will have power to prohibit the employment of any person, say, under the age of 16 years.

Similarly, the dry cleaners award provides that no female under 18 years may be employed on certain machines. Again it will not be possible under any new award to prohibit the employment of persons of one sex under a certain age from certain work, but the commission will have power to decide that persons under a certain age may not be employed in certain types of work. There is no substance in the suggestion made by the member for Torrens that the whole question of the proportion of juniors to tradesmen could be in jeopardy, as the commission will still have power to determine the age, qualification, or status of employees, and the mode, terms and conditions of their employment. It will however be necessary in future for the proportion of juniors to tradesmen to be expressed without any reference to the sex of the juniors or the tradesmen concerned.

In referring to the repeal of section 37 of the Act, the member for Torrens correctly stated that, when he was Minister, he signed certificates recommending increases in the living wage. However, no such certificate has been given since 1968, because increases in national wage cases have since then been on a percentage basis. Section 37 has been an alternative method of declaring a living wage to the normal provisions of section 35. As there is to be no longer a living wage, section 37 becomes inappropriate.

With the repeal of sections 35, 37, 38 and 39 the only section left in Division III of Part II of the Act will be section 36, which is headed "Alteration of Awards". This is the heading that clause 2 proposes be inserted in Division III. Clause 36 refers to changes in awards or other remuneration payable generally to employees subject to its awards. The proposed new heading contained in the Bill is therefore appropriate. Clause 8 proposes to repeal section 38 of the Act, which sets out the way in which increases in wages consequent upon increases in the living wage are to be calculated. This includes wages of juniors and those of persons employed on an annual salary. It is intended to repeal this section because there is no similar provision in the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act, and in the absence of such a section the Full

Industrial Commission will be free to determine on each occasion the way in which changes in award rates made pursuant to section 36 of the Act will be calculated, just as the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission is free to determine the way in which these changes can be calculated. In any case, a section similar to present section 38 is neither necessary nor appropriate in respect of increases awarded on a percentage basis. The same percentage increase will apply however the award is expressed.

The intention of new section 35, which is inserted by clause 6 of the Bill, is to ensure that, between the time the amending Act comes into operation and the time when all awards and agreements can be varied to prescribe wages as total wages, the present living wages are preserved in those awards and agreements that do not include total rates but provide for margins to be paid "above the living wage for the time being in force". Although there are no awards that apply in Whyalla and Iron Knob that do not at present specify the amount of the living wage, it has been found that there is one industrial agreement that does so. To ensure that the purpose of the Bill is observed, namely, that present award wages are not affected in any way by this Bill, I will move an amendment to clause 6 of this Bill to include specific reference to the 50c a week differential at Whyalla and Iron Knob. I thank the member for Torrens for drawing that matter to my attention.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. COUMBE: I listened with considerable interest to the Minister's reply in which he referred to various points I raised yesterday. I am pleased that he acknowledges that some aspects of this clause are worth considering. I think that these matters should be clarified for the courts, as there are some areas of doubt that may be translated into awards one day. With regard to discrimination, it is important that, in future, we will not refer to "males" or "females" being prohibited from doing certain work: we will use the word "persons". That matter may need some clarification. I accept what the Minister has said about these matters. Of course, on a previous occasion the member for Bragg brought up this matter of discrimination, and we must consider the report of the Select Committee that considered the matter on that occasion. I am pleased that the Minister has acknowledged that there were problems and has cleared up my doubts in respect of this clause.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 passed.

Clause 6—"References to living wage in awards, etc."

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that, if the honourable Minister's amendment to include a new subsection (2) is accepted, it will not be necessary for him to move an amendment to include "(1)" before the present provision in new section 35. That alteration will be made as a clerical amendment.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

In new section 35, after "shall", to insert "subject to subsection (2) of this section,".

Mr. COUMBE: So that we can consider a subsequent amendment, I agree to this amendment.

Amendment carried.

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

In new section 35 to insert the following new subsection:

(2) In the application of subsection (1) of this section to an adult person employed within a five mile radius of the post office at Iron Knob or the chief post office at Whyalla, the amounts referred to in paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) in subsection (1) of this section shall be increased by 50 cents.

This matter was raised by the member for Torrens to avoid any possibility of depriving workers in the Iron Knob and Whyalla area of the 50c. As I said in my reply to the second reading debate, only one agreement operating at Whyalla will be affected. By inserting this new subsection, any workers working under this agreement will certainly not be deprived of the 50c. The question may be asked why we have retained in the amendment the reference to "five miles" instead of referring to kilometres. As the decision made in this case in 1949 referred to "five miles", I think it only proper that we do not alter that wording; if we altered it, we might cut out someone from receiving the 50c. It is strange that the sum of 50c has not been altered since 1949, which is a long time ago.

Mr. COUMBE: I accept the Minister's explanation and agree to the amendment. Is it likely in future in the award to which he referred or in any other award relating to any other part of the State that variation or differential will be considered in the way that Whyalla and Iron Knob have been considered in this case? Will the present legislation make it impossible for this to be awarded, if necessary?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There is no other area at present where this applies. I believe that this legislation does not in any way prevent applications being made for other areas in South Australia. I say clearly that that is my opinion, but the court will have to decide this; we cannot possibly lay down all the guidelines. If an application by a union came before the court, I am confident that it would be competent to hear it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Repeal of ss. 37, 38 and 39 of principal Act."

Mr. COUMBE: This clause repeals three important sections of the Act, one of which enables the principle of wage indexation, if adopted in the Commonwealth sphere, to be adopted in South Australia, at least on a quarterly basis. Under present legislation there is no qualification or restriction for a determination to be made in fewer than three months, because present legislation provides for not less than six months, and that provision is being struck out. Is the Minister happy with the repeal of this provision?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes. The provision has been designed to cater for movements in the consumer price index, and I am confident that the situation is clear and will allow the principle to operate. If one examines the first point contained in the principles of wage examination set out by Mr. Justice Moore, I believe one gets the best example of what occurs. The Commissioner said:

The Commission will adjust its award wages and salaries each quarter in relation to the most recent movement of the six-capitals C.P.I. unless it is persuaded to the contrary by those seeking to oppose the adjustment.

I believe that is consistent with what happens in the Commonwealth sphere and that it will allow an automatic flow-on in South Australia.

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister adopting as a guideline some of the eight points laid down by Mr. Justice Moore in his decision, which I regard as a rather historical

decision? I would certainly adopt the eight points, because they cogently affect the whole industrial economy of this State and the question of applications to the courts.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I want to make the position clear that I am not accepting, nor is the Government accepting, all of the eight points for wage indexation. The Government has not made a policy decision on this matter, and it will not do so until the Premier returns from the Premiers' Conference. Regarding the flow-on situation, that is the principle being adopted.

Mr. RODDA: The Premiers' Conference to which the Minister refers is a historical milestone in the economy of this country. I presume from what the Minister has said that he expects there to be a conference of Australian Ministers of Labour and Industry, because indexation is a matter that requires consistency if there is to be a flow-on across Australia.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I, with heads of my department, will attend a conference of Ministers of Labour and Industry in Sydney on July 1 at which this matter will be discussed. I understand that no State Government has yet applied the wage indexation principles laid down by Mr. Justice Moore.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister said that a decision to adopt the eight points laid down by Mr. Justice Moore would await the outcome of the current Premiers' Conference. If that is so, will the Minister explain what he means?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: For the purpose of discussion and to formulate policy, it is a matter of convenience to wait until the Premiers' Conference has ended.

Clause passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Repeal of s. 78 of principal Act."

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister explain the position that will obtain under section 78, which deals with equal pay applications? Presently, the Full Commission has the right to determine cases dealing with equal pay. As I understand the situation, a single commissioner (as is the case in the Commonwealth sphere) will in future be able to hear and determine these matters. Can the Minister also say whether section 101 will come into force so that there will be a right of appeal by either party or on motion from a single commissioner or single judge to the Full Commission?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member is perfectly correct in saying that a single commissioner will by the passing of this Bill be able to make decisions in equal pay cases, a power that was vested previously in the Full Commission. In the Commonwealth sphere a single commissioner has that right, so we are following that example. Under the referral provisions of section 101 either party can ask for a referral of the matter to the Full Commission to set down guidelines, or the commissioner can refer the matter if he is doubtful how to proceed. Employers or employee representatives can ask for a referral and a commissioner on his own motion can also refer a matter if he is not satisfied with the way it is proceeding. I therefore believe there is adequate protection in the clause.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (REGULATIONS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 12. Page 3364.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the concept of this Bill and the object that the Minister is trying to achieve, but its retrospectivity concerns me considerably. The object of the Bill is to cover a conflict that seems to arise where regulations clash with the interim development control that a council may have or that the State Planning Authority wishes to put into operation. Unfortunately, the Minister has made the operation of the Bill retrospective.

Any of us would be aware of the case in which Mr. Justice Wells has given judgment and which involved the Myer organisation and its Queenstown property. We may also be aware of the Becker case, on which, some professional people in the legal field have told me, this Bill will have no effect. Those people have told me that that case could be affected in other situations of which we are unaware at present. For that reason, later I should like to move a contingent notice of motion.

The whole Bill is fixed around regulations. Section 36 of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1973, comes under Part IV, dealing with the implementation of authorised development plans. In particular, that section refers to planning regulations. As the Minister is trying to amend the provisions in relation to planning regulations, we have the opportunity to discuss the problems that we have in our community with planning regulations.

Doubtless, people involved in trying to create allotments through subdivision have real problems. These people want to vary allotments: in other words, they want to obtain Government approval, local government approval, or the approval of a Government department. We have for many hours debated the fact that plans take two or three years to get through the bureaucratic system, and we have had assurances that that system would be changed and the process speeded up. Unfortunately, there has been little variation in the time taken to deal with plans.

I will give the Minister examples in that regard and tell him of some of the injustices that occur under this system. We really need a Select Committee to consider the whole concept of planning regulations, and we have the opportunity to deal with this under the amending legislation, because it has an effect on interim control and on all the planning regulations that are supposed to be operating within the State. I will deal now with some areas where we fall down because of misunderstanding by the bureaucracy of the cost of delays.

I will give one example involving a property in Nairne, which I think is in the District of Murray. That property was subdivided more than 90 years ago into about 80 allotments. When the owner went to the State Planning Authority and said that he would like to vary the subdivision to cut out the cross streets (not to increase the number of allotments but to create *culs-de-sac* and widen roadways across the general slope involved in the subdivision), the State Planning Authority told him that it would not agree to that proposal.

I honestly think that the authority thought that the man could not go on with it, and it was a method of slowing down the proposal, because it was outside the areas that the department normally would like subdivided. However, as I have said, the area had been subdivided almost a century ago. The owner went on with the proposal as originally planned and as it had been thought it should

be subdivided that long ago. He was then told that he needed a water supply. He applied to the Engineering and Water Supply Department for that, and that department put an absolutely ridiculous value on installing a water supply.

The owner was a determined kind of person, so he put down a bore, putting in his own pumping plant and tank, and now he can sell water at 40c for 1 000gall. (about 4 550 litres), which is cheaper than is charged by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and still show a profit. The water is of good quality: it has not in it the rocks that some of our metropolitan supply has. The example I have given was one of a man being humbugged, but he has gone on with the matter. Now we have cross streets and dangerous intersections because he was humbugged.

Another example of problems in this field is that of a man in the Hills, adjacent to Sheoak Road, where some people believed that development would take place as an arterial road. The man concerned received his assessment of the value of this property and had to pay about $400 in land tax. He decided that that was a high price and that he would find out how that value of the property had been arrived at. He was told that the property was subdivisible. He was concerned, as an average working man, about having to pay that land tax, with council rates and other fees, so he asked that it be subdivided. After going through all the channels, he was told that the subdivision was not acceptable and that there was no way in which he could subdivide it. He was then told that the Highways Department would buy it because it might need it to widen the road in future. Then he was told that the Highways Department did not have the money with which to buy it, so the Land Commission stepped in to buy it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must link up his remarks with the Bill. I have pointed out many times in this House previously that, when an amendment to an Act is introduced, we discuss only the amendment before the House. It does not open up the whole Bill for discussion or debate. The honourable member must bring his remarks back to the Bill, which is only a short measure and which is much to the point.

Mr. EVANS: You are correct, Mr. Speaker: the amendment is short.

The SPEAKER: And it is much to the point, too.

Mr. EVANS: In his second reading explanation, the Minister states:

If, as appears to be the case, these editorial amendments are sufficient to throw the validity of the regulations into doubt, there must be many planning regulations, in addition to those promulgated for the Port Adelaide area, whose validity could be questioned. Mr. Justice Wells further decided that interim development control under Part V of the principal Act cannot subsist concurrently with planning regulations.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member once again that, in discussing a Bill or an amendment before the House, he must not discuss the Minister's second reading explanation, which is only an explanation. When the honourable member refers to the clause he has read out, which refers to the judgment of the court in a specific case, it does not open up an avenue for discussion or debate.

Mr. EVANS: If the Bill is not passed by this House or by another place, it could mean, according to the Minister and others, that the whole of the planning regulations throughout the State could be invalid where interim control is given to a council. The Stirling District Council has interim control, and the piece of land to which I was referring falls within that category in the Stirling council area: I am pointing out the problem whereby planning regulations are interpreted by the department, even though interim control exists. I was referring to a property on Sheoak Road, where a person had been told by one department that, under the planning regulations and section 36, Part IV of the Act, his property was subdivisible, whereas when he applied to the appropriate authority he found that it was not subdivisible. That is unjust. The Minister needs to be conscious of that kind of problem that exists for people in that situation.

The planning regulations require the State Planning Authority, under this section to be amended by the Bill, to inform the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Mines Department, the Highways Department, and the local government body that there is an application for a variation of land use or the creation of allotments in a certain area. The kind of information we are getting back now with form A approvals is nothing but a joke in some areas, but I will leave that aspect to be covered by the member for Murray later this evening. One example I can give is that of property owners who were told to tell (this comes mainly from a local council) intending purchasers of the allotments of a bush fire risk. As they are scrub blocks in a natural state, surely any person in his right mind would know that in that kind of environment there is always a bush fire risk. That is the extreme to which we are going under the zoning regulations.

The time it takes to feed that information through gives one the feeling that it is only to slow down the processes. I will leave that aspect and move on to the planning regulations as they apply to the inner metropolitan area, if I can call it that, on the plains area. One finds that even fewer allotments are being created now, the latest figures issued last week showing that there is still a decline. The reason is that the regulations place many obligations on the department, whereas there is no obligation in the regulations for the local council, the E. & W.S. Department or the Mines Department to inform the State Planning Authority of its opinion promptly. They can delay it as long as they like.

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

Mr. EVANS: I had been making the point that regulations under section 36 seem to make the administration process through Government departments and related bodies a slow process. For that reason we should consider the overall situation, because this Bill refers specifically to interim control, whether with the council or the State Planning Authority, and to the regulations that will operate under the Act. The Bill provides for a retrospectivity to which I object, and I understand why this provision is included: otherwise something detrimental to the environment or quality of life may take place. However, I am concerned that, if this provision is included, a person at present operating inside the law may find himself placed outside it. Two propositions come to mind: the case of the land of Lady Becker (to which I cannot refer because it is *sub judice*) and that of the Myer land at Queenstown. No doubt Myers were placed in an impossible situation, but other similar examples of disadvantages occurring, of which we have no knowledge, may result from this retrospectivity provision.

People in the legal profession have expressed the opinion that this Bill should be considered by a Select Committee

to ensure that representatives of councils, the State Planning Authority, developers, and the Land Commission could give evidence that may improve the regulations and expedite planning procedures under sound control to enable desirable planning and community development. The Bill is not sufficiently explicit to cover both judgments given in the Supreme Court. It covers only case No. 1017/73, and case No. 1963/73 has also been drawn to the Minister's attention. I acknowledge that the Minister has accepted that there is an error, and that an amendment will be made at a later stage. I support the concept and the objects that the Minister is trying to achieve, but a Select Committee could do much to help the Minister and his department in relation to the regulations, if the Government would be willing for it to be appointed. I support the Bill at this stage.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I do not intend to oppose the measure, and that is virtually stating that I support it. I hope the Minister will be amenable to the attempt to be made later to have a Select Committee appointed.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about a Select Committee before the House.

Mr. WARDLE: When the member for Fisher was speaking in this debate, the Minister was sensitive to the suggestion about the time factor. I am pleased that the Minister is much happier about that aspect now, and I hope that he will not have to worry about it any longer. Retrospectivity is not something that pleases me, because, if the legislation cannot contain a situation, people should not be hindered by hindsight. It is facing a situation that should have been covered but, because of oversight or a situation developing for which provision had not been made, the necessary amendments were not included in legislation. The person whom we are trying to catch by retrospective legislation usually has had much experience and uses it to avoid any problems. I am sure that, basically, members do not agree to retrospective legislation.

Our experience in planning has been successful to a degree, but has caused much heartburn among councils. In his second reading explanation the Minister cited regulations that could be questioned, and the whole matter of interim development, whilst it may have taken charge of situations in some areas, has been a disappointment in other areas and has left a hopeless feeling in councils in this regard. Many councils consider that they have no control over their destiny, and I believe there has been a lack of understanding and thorough communication. I find scores of cases in which councils have agreed to certain development, but applications for subdivision are consistently refused. If there is to be a refusal, it should be accompanied by an adequate explanation. People on the spot should give a full and complete explanation why the application was not successful.

While I was away, I discovered how much local planning was done in council areas. I realise that the position in local government at present is that councils are not able to provide $10 000 or $12 000 a year or more to pay a planner; this is one area in which councils need more finance. However, I believe that planning, like charity, begins at home. Provided the person concerned has suitable qualifications and experience, no-one understands local conditions better than the representative at the local government level, as planning begins in the council area in question. Much of the dissatisfaction with regard to the State Planning Office has arisen from the type of dictatorship that applies from without: rigid rules and controls are imposed from without that locals do not understand or appreciate. There has been a breakdown in the dissemination of information, so that these matters are not readily understood.

This position applies with regard to what is required of subdividers. In my area, a man has been permitted to erect 12 flats on ·5 hectares. The plans that have been sent to him by the State Planning Office (and it is suggested that he use these plans in future, rather than the plans he sent to the department) virtually place a used car lot in front of the subdivision, because that is where the carports have been placed—right on the road frontage. This man's plan had located the carports down the side of the allotment; they were nicely distributed, as it were, around the rear of the premises so that the new building could be seen at the front. However, the recommendation was that the carports should be placed across the front of the block, giving the impression of a used car lot. This will not enhance the value of the property or add to the value of surrounding properties, and attractive dwellings are springing up in this area.

When one sees the correspondence from the State Planning Office and the recommendations and instructions given, even with regard to landscaping, it seems that much independence and privacy have been lost; the privilege of working out one's own destiny seems to have disappeared. We are now being told from the central planning authority the way in which we should plant our shrubs, how they should be planted, and so on. I am convinced that many of our independent actions in this respect have been taken away. Admittedly, some people who have not travelled much or who have not had a lot of experience in planning may make what a planner would regard as a wrong decision. Such a person may not improve his property, because he may perhaps put a carport in a wrong place. Even though all developers are not planners, surely we do not have to be told by a central authority what we must do in every case. I dislike the idea of a used car lot at the front of a block of land on which eight or 12 flats are to be erected, with the new building at the rear of the block; I do not think that is necessarily a helpful planning suggestion. If the owner has a plan that can enhance the value of the area greatly (and in the case to which I have referred I believe the owner had such a plan), that plan should be acceptable.

There is a great need for much better understanding in planning in South Australia. Interim control was introduced without local government having much knowledge about what it would do to its authority. Councils have not received the degree of co-operation which I believe they should have received and which they deserved. I do not know how many schools have been conducted by the central planning authority in country areas and the metropolitan area in an effort to bring together clerks, engineers, health inspectors, and others who are responsible for administering local government affairs. How many schools have been run in an effort to try to get the message through to these people to impress on them that it is a matter of co-ordination and co-operation, and that planning will be developed and not forced on local government? I stress these points. I am not certain what the Minister or the department has in mind, if anything, with regard to a better understanding after the interim control period has been completed. I believe that from that point onwards some action is important and necessary. I support the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I endorse the remarks of the member for Murray. I probably receive as many approaches in connection with matters dealing with the

State Planning Office as I receive in connection with any other Government department, and that would represent many approaches. The scope of operation of the office encompasses the whole State. This activity is particularly noticeable in areas in the Adelaide Hills where people are seeking to build houses and cut up blocks on which to build houses. Many cases from the Barossa Valley region come to my attention. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the member for Murray that the inflexibility in relation to the operation and decisions of the State Planning Office is something that the average citizen finds hard to digest.

In my experience, the rules laid down for subdivision and so on have been rigidly applied. When this is allied to the regulations promulgated by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in respect of subdivision, the right of decision of landholders and landowners seems to be completely taken away from them. This fact causes much difficulty, heartburn, and discontent throughout the areas to which I have referred. People believe they are not being allowed to do with their own property what they wish to do. No-one can deny the necessity for planning regulations of some kind or another, but the inflexibility in the sort of detail required by these regulations must be reconsidered. The member for Murray referred to some of these fiddling details: surely local people are competent to handle matters in their areas and are competent to make wise decisions.

The Bill arises out of a conflict of authority between regulations that have been advanced by the State Planning Office and decisions made by council. It seems to me that if interim development control has been given to a council that is where the authority should lie. The Queenstown case is well known to all of us. Conflict of interest exists even in my own area where the council seems happy enough to allow subdivision to go ahead within the environs of its town where people live and where they know what is going to happen, yet approval is refused by the State Planning Office. Whom are we trying to satisfy in this argument? Are we trying to satisfy those who live in the area, those who live in the environment, or just whom are we trying to satisfy? Are we trying to satisfy the would-be tourist or someone who sits in an ivory tower in a Government department about how the environment should be developed? I agree entirely with the views expressed by the member for Murray that the views of people who actually live in the area should be of paramount importance in this argument. I am not talking about the individual who wants to create a new allotment or who wants to live in the area, although his interests of course are relevant. But surely the people who are going to be his neighbours and those who are going to live in the community (people who are represented on the council which, in many cases, has been given interim control) should have their views considered; their views should carry the most weight in those circumstances. It is the inflexibility of the rules laid down by the State Planning Office that should come under somewhat closer scrutiny than has been the case in the past. There are signs in the Engineering and Water Supply Department especially that it is making exceptions under its regulations, as is even the State Planning Office.

I made representations on behalf of a constituent who had built a house on a property owned by his father. However, he was waiting for a decision to allow him to subdivide the property, and no finance was available from the bank until permission to subdivide was granted. The young fellow, therefore, could not get bank finance. Maybe his decision to build the house was unwise, as the Minister will no doubt point out to me. I had numerous contacts with the State Planning Office and wrote letters. I was told firmly that to subdivide land in this area did not conform to the rural policy of the area, which provided that any subdivisional activity had to be a complex extension of the existing township. My constituent approached a legal practitioner who in turn approached the State Planning Office, and the decision was reversed. That decision caused me some embarrassment, because I was told firmly that permission to subdivide would be refused, which was the information that I passed on in good faith. The full ramifications of this are somewhat disturbing.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You should tell us all about it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I made representations regarding a subdivision in a watershed area in the Millbrook area, and that application was granted because the Government, which had complete control of the land, as it was leasehold, had, as a result of a decision of the Land Board, agreed to the area being subdivided into 20-acre allotments. In this case an entrepreneur, who I think did not live in the area, wanted to subdivide certain land and was allowed by a decision of the Land Board to cut it up into 20-acre allotments at a handsome profit. However, a genuine farmer who lived nearby in the same watershed area was being refused permission for his son to cut off a block to build a house.

Mr. Coumbe: Isn't that a bit different?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The principle is the same, and it caused much dissatisfaction in that locality. The Labor Party would be hard pressed to justify its action in that area. The Engineering and Water Supply Department reversed its stringent policy and allowed the person concerned to cut off a block to build a house. I do not know whether that was the result of a guilty conscience, but it happened, so a chink of light is appearing in the inflexibility that has existed for so long in the operation of these regulations by both the State Planning Office and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The member for Fisher indicated that the retrospectivity aspect of this measure does not appeal to the Opposition, and I believe that an attempt will be made during the Committee stage of the Bill to change that situation. I heard the remarks of the member for Murray but did not hear all that the member for Fisher said, although I completely agree with what he said about people who live in the environment knowing how they want the area to develop.

I have much faith in the wisdom of people and the decisions they make in connection with their own environment and community. In fact, I have far more faith in the wisdom of these people than I have in someone who, being remote from the area, makes decisions that affect people living in that area. I understand that the Government intended to introduce regulations prohibiting a person from cutting down a tree in excess of about 70 millimetres in diameter on his own property even if he planted the tree himself. If someone plants a tree to beautify his property and wishes to replant or change the landscape, surely a public servant should not have to be approached to gain permission to cut down a tree.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Where did you get this nonsense from?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It was promulgated in the House some time ago.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: When?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will check it out for the Minister. What about the proposed planning regulations relating to Kangaroo Island that were subsequently withdrawn? If the Minister cared to cast his eye over those regulations in connection with the clearing of land and the sorts of tree that could be cut down and the sorts of building that could be pulled down or allowed to stand, he would realise how stupid and restrictive some of the decisions of the State Planning Office can be. With those comments I support the Bill, but hope that the Minister notes what previous speakers have said and indeed heeds some of the points I have raised.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the intention of the Bill, but the principal Act has done more to delay house building in this State than has anything else that I know of. It is unfortunate that I must say that. The Minister is shaking his head, so perhaps he intends to do something about the position. I have spoken to him already about some of the problems in the District of Rocky River, and he has made some suggestions to me but, in fairness to him, I feel that I should not say what he has said. At any rate, a nod is as good as a wink to a blind horse, so we will see what happens in due course.

The problem that I have applies only in a progressive area of one's district. It is unfortunate that I must say this, because in the older part of the district, where not much development is going on, there is no great problem. However, in the area where the Housing Trust is particularly active, has a building programme, and must know a long time ahead the programming of its buildings, if land is not made available, the matter is bogged down, and it is difficult to get going again.

At Clare the Housing Trust is concerned with two blocks of land. The council could ask for the submission of new plans, and I have been told that it will be three months before a decision will be made. Goodness gracious me, how many houses will not be built at Clare because of that? How many people at Clare are on my back for houses? What can the member do about the position when there is a waiting list as long as his arm?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You can tell local government that it should have done something about it.

Mr. VENNING: I agree that local government should have more say in these things and should not have to refer to this bureaucratic control in Adelaide. The Minister may wobble his head, but a short time ago I attended a meeting of some of the authorities involved in this affair, and was told that the whole problem of house developing in the State was the planning set-up. How do we get through to them to make progress? How can we shortcircuit the situation? The people holding offices in this organisation are reluctant to speed up operations. It shows a lack of practicality that the old primary producer has in his ability to meet a situation or problem and do something about it.

In this bureaucratic procedure, the wheels move slowly and we must wait: we cannot expect anything to happen for a time. Eventually, three months pass and the new plan may be acceptable. I saw the area involved at Clare. It was an area additional to the Housing Trust area (it is called rural land), and there are no problems with this area for this purpose. I believe and hope that, after the comments that have been made earlier today and this evening, the Minister will realise the weakness and problems in this department.

My colleague the member for Murray quietly and thoughtfully put forward his views on the whole situation this evening. He believed that local government should have more say, and he said that it was not possible for all councils to have a town planner. That is fair enough, but councils have their weeds officers, and why not have a town planner to serve several councils and act on the spot in this regard? I consider that there is room for improvement there. Of course, I support the intention of the Bill and hope that the expected improvement will be forthcoming.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the Bill. We have a lonely Minister sitting opposite and piloting this legislation through. I hope he will have due regard to the points that have been raised by members on this side. These are not hollow pleas that are being made to the Minister. Although, as he sits lonely in his domain on the Treasury bench, obviously while his collegues are caucusing on the decision that has been taken this afternoon—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What was the decision?

Mr. RODDA: I do not know whether there has been a backdown on the railway position, but what happens will have a bearing on the legislation that we are discussing this evening. The very existence of this Act, following new country as it did, without there being any plan at all, is necessary.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It's 20 years too late.

Mr. RODDA: It is probably 136 years too late, but it is a fact and this is the point with which we are confronted. Whether it is 20 years too late or 100 years too late, I remind the Minister that that is no excuse for the inflexibility with which the people, including landholders, are confronted in this legislation. The Bill was brought about by the running fight at Port Adelaide. The Minister, in concluding his second reading explanation, stated:

> The regulations are to be deemed capable of operating in relation to the same land concurrently with interim development control. This is a retrospective amendment, and accordingly a new subsection is inserted preserving the interest of Myers in the judgment given in action No. 1017 of 1975 in the Supreme Court.

The Bill has retrospective effect on all the people about whom we have been talking. I want to raise a specific matter. I made representations, unsuccessfully, to the State Planning Office on behalf of some people. The case was quite complicated, involving a big farm land property that protruded into the town area of Naracoorte. The husband passed on and, because the people concerned were caught up with these wretched succession duties, a large parcel of the land had to be sold to pay those duties. The widow remarried. She married a man with considerable wealth and he built a house on the property on the understanding that this site could be carved off.

My colleague the member for Kavel has spoken about a similar matter. However, these people ran slap bang into the planning regulations regarding this rural land comprising about 30 hectares. The member for Kavel was getting closer to the mark. He was concerned about 8 ha, but we had to stop short at 30 ha, and the entire area comprises about 51 ha. When 30 ha was surveyed off, the balance was of insufficient size. All this trouble was caused by the filthy medium of succession duties. Now this dear lady and her husband have a house worth $42 000 that must remain in the estate. One hopes that the marriage will be a success.

There is an anomaly. There is no drainage problem in this part of the South-East, for a change. There is need for flexibility and I hope that, when these amendments are

passed, these specific cases (and I could list many of them) will receive the blessing of the Minister and his officers in a more lenient approach to the questions which are raised and which are plaguing the decisions that are forthcoming from the State Planning Office. In the main, these decisions are a direct "No". I support the Bill to the second reading and I hope that these pleas that I have made will not go unnoticed by the Minister when we make representation on some future occasion.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): Although I support the measure to the second reading stage, I want to make one or two comments about the Bill and the State Planning Authority as a whole. I am interested to note that only one Minister is in the Chamber at present, together with only a few other Government members. Obviously their attention has been turned to other matters. If they have any courage, I challenge them to put that matter to the test.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I shall be pleased to comply with your impartial ruling, Sir. This Bill and the administration of the State Planning Authority highlight the incompetence of the bureaucracy the Government has set up. If there is one Government department that has made it difficult for young people to have the opportunity of owning a block of land and their own house, it is the State Planning Authority, which is administered by a Labor Socialist Government which has no desire to allow people to own their own block of land and which has used this medium to strangle subdivision in this State.

Mr. Jennings: What!

Mr. GUNN: It is all right for the honourable member, but he would inflict on the people of the State anything to preserve his place in the House. No matter what his masters sitting here say, he gives lip service to it, whatever effect it may have on the people of this State. He is not concerned about them. He has signed the pledge, and he is bound to it. Why was the Bill introduced? The Premier, not having got his own way, went into one of his typical huffs and decided to introduce retrospective legislation. When some of the Premier's colleagues had better sense, that legislation was not proceeded with. However, the Premier made the threat. If one examines the Bill in detail, one sees that clause 2 amends section 36 of the principal Act and clearly gives the Government power to make retrospective decisions. This in itself is a dangerous course of action for any Government to adopt, because it allows the Government to turn the clock back, and that is undemocratic. We know that this Government has no regard for democratic decisions or for the rights of John Citizen.

If the Government wants to take a course of action that will assist proper planning in the State and allow the average citizen to be involved, most planning decisions should be placed in the hands of local people through local government authorities. It is all right for the Minister to shake his head, but we know that it is the aim of his Party and his Commonwealth colleagues to destroy local government as we know it today. Surely, if local people are not aware of what their fellow citizens desire, who else is in a better position to make such a judgment? I believe that local government is in a far better position to do so, because it is far more aware of the feelings of local citizens than are the people in the State Administration Centre. The people at the centre may mean well, but I do not believe that they are fully conversant with the practical realities of many of the decisions they make.

Although the Eyre plan has recently been tabled with regard to Eyre Peninsula, members of the public are unaware of the full significance of the document. The Government has not made any firm statement about whose properties will be taken over. Will all the properties listed in the document be acquired, or only parts of them? What is the time table for the implementation of the plan? The Minister may laugh and shake his head and talk to the member for Stuart, but members of the public have not been properly informed, and it is their right to be informed. It is not their right some time in the future to be told by some Government official, "Tomorrow or next week, we will take this section of your property." The plan could affect their livelihood (it could certainly affect them financially), but I do not suppose that the Minister is concerned about that or about how they can plan for the future. These people are entitled to know the true position. I assure this shabby Government which does not have the confidence of the people that, if it does not have the courage of its convictions, we will tell the people, when we take our rightful place on the other side of the Chamber, what their rights are and will legislate to ensure that they are protected so that we will not again have situations such as we have now, in which this undemocratic Government has had to resort to this type of legislation.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister referred to the Myer Queenstown development. That again highlights that, if local government in the Port Adelaide area had been permitted to exercise its proper democratic role, that large development would have taken place, and it would have been to the overall benefit of the people in that area and to the benefit of the State as a whole. This Government would not allow the democratically elected representatives of the Port Adelaide district to have their right, and it has resorted to this measure. What the Premier and his colleagues have achieved is that that valuable piece of land, which ought to be put to the use of people in Port Adelaide and elsewhere in the metropolitan area, stands idle. What will take place there? We have heard nothing from the Premier. After the announcement was made that the Myer group of companies had withdrawn from the shopping centre development programme, what happened to the site?

We have heard nothing from the Minister, only a little from the Premier, and nothing from other Government members. Why have they not made a statement? The people are entitled to know, yet the Minister sits there tight-lipped. I hope that he will tell the people what he has in mind and what the Premier has in mind, because this is too important an issue to allow the Minister and his colleagues to gloss over. If local government had had the power to make the decision, the people of this State, including those at Port Adelaide, would have benefited because the project would have gone ahead. It is interesting to note that a local government election was fought over this issue and that the candidates who were in favour of this development taking place were elected. Now the people have been denied it.

Mr. Jennings: Myers were behind—

Mr. GUNN: That is the kind of interjection one would expect from an Australian Labor Party member who hates the free enterprise system. It is a reflection on the people who were elected by ratepayers at Port Adelaide and a slur on the integrity of the people of Port Adelaide who elected them. Members of the Australian Labor

Party use this place to publicly denigrate others, and I challenge the honourable member to make that statement outside the House. I hope that, in the next few weeks, the Minister and the Government will face reality and reconsider the whole planning and development regulations. Opposition members always take a responsible point of view and believe in properly planned development, and we believe that the present Act does not do all that is possible in this regard. The State Planning Authority is an unrealistic group of people completely out of touch with the opinion and aspirations of most people in this State. It is an isolated group, and many of its decisions have caused much heartbreak and made it impossible for proper development. Other decisions have inflicted severe financial burdens on many citizens, and this situation should not be tolerated. A full-scale inquiry should be made into the State Planning Authority. As a result, we could see a more representative and realistic body that would be aware of the State's needs.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Shame on you!

Mr. GUNN: I make no apologies for what I say. There should be at least two representatives of primary industry on the authority.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: And there are.

Mr. Chapman: Who are the primary-producing representatives on the authority?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You wouldn't know: there are two of them.

Mr. GUNN: I know whom the Minister is referring to, but grower organisations have not been given the chance to submit nominations. If it is good enough for the Chamber of Commerce and Industry to have a nomination, it is good enough for primary producers to have a nomination in their own right.

Mr. Keneally: You would give the trade unions a representative, too?

Mr. GUNN: I am not against the trade union movement having a representative: if it has something to contribute to the welfare of the people of this State and to planning, it should make representations to the Minister, but no doubt he would be more inclined to appoint a representative of trade unions to the authority than he would be to appoint someone from primary-producing organisations. The decisions of the State Planning Authority affect more primary producers than any other section of the community.

Mr. Keneally: If you lived in a rural town or in the city you would agree that people there are affected, too.

Mr. GUNN: What the member for Stuart does not understand is that decisions of the authority affect the livelihood of the rural sector to a significant degree. I wonder what the member for Florey would think if one of his unionists on the wharves at Port Adelaide was placed in a situation in which his income was reduced by a decision of the authority: no doubt he would pull them all out on strike. However, that is the situation faced by many primary producers, and they have virtually no right of appeal. The power of acquisition of the authority and many other Government departments is far too severe and should not be tolerated. A person whose property is affected by compulsory acquisition should have a right of appeal to an independent authority but, at present, this right of appeal does not exist. This situation is unjust and unfair.

I know of a person who was financially embarrassed in this regard: he has lost half his land on which he would have grazed stock. What should he do with the stock? If this Government has the welfare of the people at heart and is concerned that we have proper planning development, it should make a realistic approach to this matter and review the whole area of State planning. The present planning regulations are unfair and unjust in their effects on John Citizen, and the Myer Queenstown situation was one example. I shall be interested to hear what the Minister has to say on this matter, because many people will consider his comments closely in the next few days. The retrospectivity clause in this Bill is bad and undemocratic, and sets a precedent that, unfortunately, other Governments may follow. This is bad legislation, but, with some reservations, I support the second reading.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister for Planning and Development.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, do I get the call?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I just heard the member for Eyre say that this Bill was undemocratic and so on, yet he said he would support it.

Mr. Gunn: Only to the second reading stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not going to support even the second reading. I have listened this evening to some fulminating speeches from members on this side. I must say they have not seemed to have much point; when we consider the purpose of the Bill, the speeches seem to have been pretty wide of the mark. Several members who have spoken have complained that the Minister has been lonely (I think that was how the member for Victoria put it) on the front bench. I do not really blame him for being here on his own. He did not have much to take from the other side, so there was no point in other members wasting their time in here. The Bill arises out of one of the most scandalous situations we have had in the State for a long time, that is, the bitter opposition that the Government has shown for many years to the Myer project at Queenstown. My great regret is that by hook or by crook (and mainly by the latter) the Government seems to have won, and Myers has, as far as I am aware, given up the battle to build at Queenstown. Even though they had a victory in the Supreme Court, that was a pyrrhic victory.

Members will not have forgotten that last session, I think, the Government introduced a Bill in this place which would have had retrospective effect and which would have blocked Myers cause of action in the court. Of all the scandalous proceedings, that was one of the most scandalous. The Bill passed this House despite my opposition and that of all members on this side. Then it was suddenly dropped in the Upper House and never put to the test there, because the Attorney-General said rather lamely that the Government thought it would not get it through. That is the first Bill I have ever known to be dropped on that basis, although the Government has not expected to get several other measures through and they have not got through, but the Government has not abandoned them in the Legislative Council because it thought it would be beaten on them. However, that was the lame excuse given on that occasion. My own view is that the Attorney-General was so shamed that he persuaded his Cabinet colleagues that the Bill was too bad even for this Government to persist with.

That is briefly the history of this legislation. Now, as a result of the victory (pyrrhic though it may be) of Myers, we have this Bill which is to validate, if validation be required, the practice and regulations that have been

assumed to be valid in the past. I am always opposed to retrospective legislation on principle and because it affects the rights of people. In a case such as this those rights can be affected in ways that we cannot even guess. We do not know what effect the Bill will have on other people. I, for one, am not willing to take the risk of prejudicing other people's positions just to save the Government's face, yet apparently the Liberal Party is willing to do that.

Mr. Mathwin: You weren't listening when the member for Fisher spoke.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All Opposition members I have heard have said they will support the second reading of the Bill. I will not support the second reading. I do not believe we should have a measure of this type.

Mr. Mathwin: Speak for yourself.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought that was what I was doing and that was what the honourable member was complaining about.

Mr. Mathwin: You never said—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the call.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not believe that we should allow this Bill to remain in the House for one moment longer than we must have it here in order to defeat it. I will certainly not support the second reading of a Bill which is retrospective and which may affect other people's interests. What possible purpose the Liberal Party can see in supporting the second reading, I do not know. I think the Bill is thoroughly bad. One clue to its badness is a provision such as that contained in new subsection (18) to be inserted in section 36. I realise that an amendment will be moved to alter this provision, if the Bill gets that far, so that it will be messed about with anyway. This provision makes a significant exception that, in itself, is a pointer to the badness of this section. New subsection (18) provides:

Subsection (17) of this section does not affect the interest of the plaintiff or of his assigns in the judgment given in action No. 1017 of 1973 in the Supreme Court.

I know that, if the Government has its way, that provision is to be altered and made a bit better, but its purpose is still the same, and that is thoroughly bad. I cannot really remember ever seeing anything like that in South Australian legislation before. I will have no part of it. I oppose the Bill as strongly as I possibly can.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I support the Bill, which will go a long way towards correcting some of the minor anomalies that occur at present in the Planning and Development Act. This Bill will lead to better planning in South Australia in future.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you know what effect it will have on people's rights?

Mr. DUNCAN: I will ignore that comment.

Mr. Millhouse: You ought to appreciate that more than most other members in the House.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham has had his say on this Bill.

Mr. DUNCAN: The member for Mitcham is well aware that this Government has always been concerned about people's rights; it has always shown a great concern for the rights of people in the community. As a result, it has received the confidence of the people at the last election and at the election before that.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you give me a direct answer?

Mr. DUNCAN: The member for Mitcham well knows that that is the situation. The Government has had a mandate for the sort of programme it has introduced in South Australia. It has continued to look after the rights and interests of people in accordance with its record. This Bill was introduced to improve planning in South Australia. It should ensure that the sort of situation that developed over the Myer proposal at Queenstown does not occur again. It will ensure that, in future, planning in South Australia will be undertaken on a more rational basis, and it will lead to greater controls over planning, ensuring that the policy of the Government can be put into effect by the State Planning Authority. As members know, the Government has had a fine record in the field of planning. Contrary to what was said by members opposite in this debate, until this Government came to power (as members opposite know) there was little or no planning in South Australia. Little or no attempt was made by previous Governments to do anything at all to ensure that landholders and citizens of the State generally had proper planning of the development of South Australia. The Government is rightly proud of its record. It will not be held to ransom by the sorts of tactic that the Myer shopping development at Queenstown tried to introduce into planning in South Australia.

Mr. Evans: Did they do anything unlawful?

Mr. DUNCAN: That is not the subject of the Bill, so the details of that case are not strictly involved in the matter before the House.

Mr. Millhouse: On the contrary, it is referred to in the Bill.

Mr. DUNCAN: The details of that court case are not strictly within the ambit of the Bill, and that is precisely the situation. Until the Walsh Government came to office, except for a brief period just after the First World War, there had never been satisfactory and effective planning in this State.

Mr. Harrison: It was haphazard.

Mr. DUNCAN: It was. The State never had satisfactory planning for the whole of the reign of the Playford Government, so the State developed in a completely haphazard fashion. It was an appalling indictment on the Playford Government that not a greater amount had been done to ensure that development in this State occurred on proper, planned lines. This Bill is a continuation of the sort of legislation that started with the Planning and Development Act in 1966. The Government's record remains unblemished.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: Members opposite may laugh, but they well know that the record of this Government is second to none in relation to planning, because the Playford Government never bothered about planning; the haphazard development of the State was the sole concern of that Government. The most important thing that concerned the Playford Government was whether or not developers were making money. The attitude of the Opposition this evening clearly indicates that that is still its main concern. For many years the sole criterion for developing South Australia was whether there was a dollar in it for the developer. That is the criterion that members opposite supported.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! One thing the Speaker knows is what Standing Orders provide. If honourable members infringe Standing Orders they will be implemented and members will suffer the consequence. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr. DUNCAN: I thank you, Sir, for calling the House to order and thereby enabling me to continue the important

contribution I wish to make in this debate. I will now deal with the rights of developers, because one of the rights represented and supported by members of the Liberal Party for many years was the right to rip off money from the people of this State. "Development at any cost" has been the motto of the Opposition. What a cost that has been to this State. "Speculation at any cost, speculation for money for private profiteers and private investors" has been the sort of record we have seen from members opposite. To think they have the audacity to attack this Government's proud record in relation to planning is nothing short of appalling. One has only to look at the shabby efforts the Liberal Government made to introduce the 1962 metropolitan plan. What sort of effort was there—little or none! The Liberal Government set up the plan, but that is about all it did.

What an appalling condemnation of members opposite the hills face zone represents. What an appalling example of how they neglected the future of this State through the improper and insufficient planning they allowed before 1965. Members opposite allowed the situation to develop in the Hills overlooking Adelaide to a stage where we now see appalling quarries and developments, which are aesthetically unsatisfactory and should never have taken place, and which have led to a situation where much of the hills face zone overlooking Adelaide has been irreparably damaged. Did we hear complaints in those days from members of the Liberal Party when that matter was being considered and when the rape of the hills face zone occurred? Of course we did not. We have been doing everything in our power to ensure that planning in this State is carried out properly, efficiently and in an effective manner, but what have we seen from the member for Fisher (the shadow Minister for the Environment) who represents an area in the Hills? We have seen an appallingly belated concern over the future of the Hills. His attitude and response has been nothing short of a disaster to the State.

This Bill represents a continuation of the sort of proper and correct planning procedures we have seen from this Government in the past and which we will continue to see in the future. It contains the sort of proper planning procedure for which the people of this State cried out for 50 years but were denied. It is a credit to this Government that it has taken on itself to give planning a central position in the Government of this State to ensure that the State will be developed in a planned and proper manner. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill in general, but I certainly do not support in full the matter of retrospectivity, which was well canvassed by the member for Fisher. Anyone who wishes to read *Hansard* can read what was said if they did not hear what was said by the member for Fisher. In his second reading speech the Minister said:

> In fact, for some time the policy of the State Planning Office has been to amend regulations that have been recommended by councils in order to bring them to substantial conformity with most recent models.

We all know that planning started in 1966, with councils taking over this type of planning regulation, development control and zoning, but they were given little scope to implement their own ideals relating to local problems. Standover methods were used by the Government to get its way. The member for Mitcham would well remember, as would the Brighton council, the Government saying to councils in relation to railway land, "Unless you rezone these areas we will not allow your zoning to get through Parliament at all." The Government forced its ideas on councils. Members of councils know what is needed in an area, because they are more than familiar with local conditions. The State Planning Office would not acknowledge this fact and, at times, made it most difficult for local government. In his second reading explanation, the Minister states:

> This Bill relates to planning regulations whose validity has been thrown into doubt by the decision of Mr. Justice Wells in the Myer Queenstown case.

This is the very brunt of the matter, and it involves a threat by the Government and the Premier to private enterprise. It is all very well for the member for Elizabeth to speak about planning or the lack of it. However, the zoning regulations in respect of the Myer Queenstown case were gazetted on June 9, 1972, and were being declared invalid as from April 15, 1975. That is the reason why we have this Bill before us.

This action resulted in problems not only for Myers but also for the Port Adelaide council, which had no zoning regulations. Therefore, the council's problems were considerable, causing much inconvenience and embarrassment. I hope that the Minister eventually will agree (and that is why I and other members on this side will support the second reading) to refer this matter to a Select Committee. The only way in which we can get the matter to a Select Committee is by supporting the second reading. The member for Mitcham knows—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can make only a passing reference to a Select Committee, because nothing before this House relates to a Select Committee.

Mr. MATHWIN: I apologise, Mr. Speaker, but I understand that a contingent notice of motion is on the Notice Paper and—

The SPEAKER: Order! Nothing before this House deals with a Select Committee.

Mr. MATHWIN: Anyway, I am sure that the member for Mitcham knows what is going on. The main amendments in this Bill add provisions to section 36, which already has 16 subsections. We are adding new subsections (17) and (18). In his second reading explanation, the Minister left no doubt about the amendment being retrospective. He stated:

> This is a retrospective amendment, and accordingly a new subsection is inserted preserving the interest of Myers in the judgment given in action No. 1017 of 1975 in the Supreme Court.

My Party is concerned about the retrospectivity of the Bill. We realise what the effect will be, particularly on others. Perhaps this is the most important part of the Bill and the reason why we object so much to it. The member for Elizabeth has made much play about the rights of people as far as his Government is concerned. I wonder how much the rights of Myers came into the situation. That company was embarrassed completely, and eventually, when it was able to do something about all the property it had acquired, the cost was so high that it was impossible to proceed, and that left the Premier's baby, the West Lakes organisation, with the whole field open.

That organisation suggested that it could develop part of Port Adelaide. However, I suggest that the organisation was talking with tongue in cheek, that it did not care much about the advancement and welfare of Port Adelaide, and that it was more concerned about its own area. The member for Elizabeth said that there had been no planning for many years and that the matter of planning had been haphazard in all areas. We can regard those remarks as being typical of the remarks

that come out of the mouths of babes. I know from practical experience over 10 or 15 years in local government that there always have been areas set aside for brick houses, areas for timber-frame houses, areas for shopping and areas for industrial operations. Indeed, many councils obtained approval for their own by-laws by which they were able to control petrol outlets in their area, a matter about which the Premier screamed some time ago. For many years Brighton council was able to control petrol stations within the council boundaries, so the statement by the member for Elizabeth that planning has been haphazard over the years proves that he knows nothing about the subject. I support the Bill, hoping that the Minister will agree to refer it to a Select Committee.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): There is no doubt that this is retrospective legislation in relation to planning regulations, particularly in relation to Queenstown, with which previous speakers have dealt. The Minister has said as much. In fact, the clauses of the Bill clearly show it. The Myer organisation, having won in court, now cannot proceed with its project, because of the escalation of building costs out of all proportion. In fact, the Government has had a victory. It has been able to stifle yet another aspect of private enterprise. Now it is trying to regularise the situation by passing retrospective legislation. It was an eye-opener to hear the member for Elizabeth say he believed that this legislation would go a long way towards correcting minor anomalies. There are no minor anomalies here: there is one big anomaly. That is that we are considering legislation which, by enacting provisions retrospectively, will justify those earlier actions. That is totally reprehensible and wrong and it is against the whole principle of Westminster democracy and the whole principle for which this Parliament stands.

Certainly, Myer has been protected, however much good it may do it in the present circumstances, by a clause specifically relating to that court case. I repeat what other members have said: who else is there who will not be protected? Who else will be affected by this legislation? How many others are not covered? How many other exemption clauses should there be? I do not believe that the Minister knows or even cares. The member for Mitcham said that he will reject the Bill outright: that is his decision, and it is his right to make it. I understand his position. He is a lawyer, and impulsively he must immediately reject this sort of shonky practice in relation to the law.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't have to be a lawyer to do that.

Dr. TONKIN: No, but I suspect that one must be a lawyer to feel that attack on the law particularly and to act impulsively. The member for Elizabeth, as another lawyer, surprised me even more. He attempted to justify this kind of activity, and that is even more reprehensible than is the Government's action. We believe that the difficulties arising from the apparent conflict between the aspects of the planning regulations and interim development control should be examined most carefully. The member for Elizabeth erred when he said that we were not interested in orderly planning. We believe that these matters should be examined carefully. It is not enough to walk away from the problem by rejecting the legislation out of hand. We believe that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, because we are totally opposed to the retrospective provisions contained therein. The Bill is not the way to settle differences or discrepancies. The Opposition supports the Bill to the second reading stage in the confident expectation that it will be referred to a Select Committee for detailed examination.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I have heard Opposition members' contributions to the debate and have listened with interest to the member for Mitcham, and I agree with the member for Bragg that the member for Mitcham is impulsive in his attitude towards the Bill.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: As in most other things.

Mr. CHAPMAN: He has been known to be difficult on a number of occasions about a number of matters. I cannot agree with the principle of introducing any form of retrospective legislation, on the basis that it will introduce a precedent into this Parliament that will not be in the Government's interests, the Opposition's interests, or the interests of the public generally. I am concerned about any further interference with or alteration to the regulations, because every time there is a change in the regulations (and there have been several of them recently by the Government) we only get into a bigger mess in relation to the State Planning Authority and its purpose within the State. Government members are ready to criticise the Opposition for its cries about the authority's activities, but I assure the Minister that the Opposition is responsible in its attitude to planning. The Opposition supported the establishment of the State Planning Authority as a responsible group of people that would assist, guide and recommend planning throughout the State.

I believe that that was the authority's function initially. It was the intention that the State Planning Authority should guide; certainly at no time was it the intention that the authority should dictate to local government and other responsible bodies the plans for future development of their areas. It concerns me each time there is a change in the regulations that tends to give the authority more control over the planning of this State and more dictatorial control over the individuals within it. For this reason, I am anxious to support the second reading for the purpose only of having the Bill referred to a Select Committee, which can spend some time on the legislation, because we have had little time in which to deal with it. The Government introduces this kind of legislation one day and expects the Opposition to deal with it the next day, in addition to carrying out the ordinary duties of the House.

It is unfair and unrealistic to expect any Party, whether in Opposition or Government, to deal fairly with legislation in such a short time. It is another example of the way in which many of the 218 Bills we have debated thus far this session have been bulldozed and expected to be dealt with in the proper way. I do not intend filibustering in this instance. I believe that I have clearly indicated my attitude towards this kind of bulldozing of legislation. I do not approve of it. I support the Opposition move to have the Bill further examined in order to have it properly dealt with.

Another matter that concerns me is the regulation that allows the acquisition of land. The State Planning Authority will decide what land may be subdivided for development and what land will remain in its original state. I have had brought to my attention recently the case of an applicant who, about three years ago, sought the authority's approval to subdivide his rural land into housing blocks. The application was refused for several reasons that I will not canvass now. Recently, the applicant has received a notice that a Government department wishes to acquire his land. We all agree with the principle of land acquisition by the Government: that it

is necessary for public purposes from time to time for the Government to declare its intention to purchase land or, if necessary, to acquire it compulsorily. In this instance, the Land Commission is proposing to buy the land for no purpose other than to subdivide it for housing. This is a clear example of where the Government has taken advantage of a property owner in the hundred of Willunga, grossly over-stepping the mark. The Government has prevented the applicant from doing what he wanted to do with his own freehold land. It has done this by setting out to take advantage of the situation in order to make money for the Crown. There can be no excuse for the Land Commission's superimposing its powers in a situation such as the one I am explaining. I will bring this matter forward in greater detail at a later stage.

On or about November 28, 1972, a member of the State Planning Authority called on a property owner for a $100 contribution to accompany his application to resubdivide a section of land in the Adelaide Hills. The applicant paid the $100, and then after December, 1972, he was called on for a further $200, because on or about December 1, 1972, a notice in the *Government Gazette* required $300 to be paid for each unit subdivided in that area.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That applied everywhere, as a result of an amendment to the Act.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes. Because the approval of the State Planning Authority had been granted before the Act was amended, the applicant paid the balance of $200 under protest. Some months later, in 1974, an officer of the authority telephoned the wife of the applicant and said, "You may expect the $200," giving no details. I do not know whether that $200 has been refunded, but until quite recently it had not been. I believe the officers of the authority have unreasonably and unfairly over-stepped the mark. I shall be pleased to furnish the Minister with details: does the Minister know about this case?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Yes.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Then why the hell does not the Minister do something about it and straighten up his department? This is the sort of tactic that we oppose and the reason why we cannot support legislation such as this. We cannot support the Minister and the authority in its further dictation to the community. The Minister's admission spells out clearly why there are such long delays and situations that concern us, as well as people in the community. I have many other similar examples and generally, whilst people in the State support the principle of planning, they do not support the methods adopted by officers of the authority, who are too far away from the scene, are not competent as planners, and take no notice of recommendations by people who know about and can manage their affairs, and I refer to councils in particular.

Recently, I received letters from two councils in my district which are concerned at the way the State Planning Authority is dictating to them: the councils entered into an arrangement with the authority and accepted interim control, but they are not receiving the co-operation that was promised to them. If the Minister is a responsible person, he will have a damned good cull of officers in the authority, sort out the wheat from the chaff, and straighten up the department. I have had a fair gutful of the authority from its early entry into affairs in the outer metropolitan areas, and the Minister should be aware of my tolerance of him and of his department. However, I have run out of patience and cannot support this legislation unless and until it is more carefully considered and dealt with in the responsible way it deserves.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for Planning and Development): Frankly, I hardly know where to begin, because I have never heard such a deluge of ignorance as I have heard from Opposition members in this debate. I think it was the member for Murray who suggested there should be a seminar for council officers to enable them to familiarise themselves with the planning laws of this State. Perhaps we need urgently a seminar for Opposition members to familiarise themselves with methods by which planning laws operate here. Many members have, I think genuinely, referred to aspects that have caused difficulties, but in almost every instance, they have been so far off the track that it is not funny. Members opposite have blamed the authority and its officers for all sorts of actions that they believe should have been under the control of councils, but if members considered the Act they would realise that that is the whole design of our planning legislation.

Mr. Chapman: Why don't you take notice of them when the councils tell them that—

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I know that the honourable member has a thick skull and cannot learn too much but, if he listens instead of interjecting, I will explain the situation. Councils are required to implement zoning regulations so that those who live in the area, or may live in it in future, will know what is to happen. A purchaser of a house can ascertain from the council what the zoning regulations are and in which zone the house is situated. The whole object of the exercise is to guarantee to the community that it will know what is to happen. Zoning regulations are drawn up by the council, which first considers the areas to be zoned. Councils are required to publicise plans and inform the community what they intend to do in order to enable people to have the chance over a three-month period to consider these proposals.

The member for Rocky River complained about this three-month delay: would he like his council to make an arbitrary decision overnight to allow a factory to be built next to his house, without his being given the chance to lodge an objection? This three-month period of delay is proper and valid and it is allowed in the interests of the community. After the zoning regulations have been displayed for three months, people can object to the zoning, which may allow for flats or factories, for instance, and suggest why the zoning regulations should not apply. The council must then consider the objections and whether the regulations should be altered. From that point, they are forwarded on to the State Planning Authority to ensure, before the Governor signs them, that they have properly taken into account the objections of the community. What could be more democratic than this? What greater community and local government involvement could we have? That is what this is all about. There are a couple of exceptions. In the opinion of the Government, some areas are of critical and significant importance to the State.

The member for Alexandra is confused about this matter. He happens to represent one of the areas of importance. Kangaroo Island and the Flinders Range are areas which the Government considers to be of great natural beauty and which require specific State attention. I do not think that the honourable member would disagree with that. I believe it would be wrong for a few residents of the Flinders Range area to have total control of what development took place throughout the Flinders Range. I do not think it could be denied that this area should be properly placed under the auspices of the State Planning Authority so that that authority can develop plans for the development of the area in the interests of the State. I believe that our

interest in the development of Kangaroo Island is also of State importance.

Mr. Chapman: The department has come along after Kangaroo Islanders have managed it for 150 years.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Alexandra has already spoken once, and will not be permitted to speak again in this debate.

Mr. Chapman: I'm being aggravated by the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! I said that the honourable member for Alexandra had spoken once and would not be permitted to speak twice in the debate. That is the ruling I make. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think I should point out some matters to members who do not seem to know how the planning laws work in South Australia. I can understand that they do not know how the laws work, as they pay little attention when these matters are before the House, except to make wild charges, as they did during this debate. It is worth mentioning the history of planning in this State, because members will know that, when the Labor Government was elected under the present Premier, he interested himself in this field. He is well aware of the importance to individuals in the community of the quality of life. To have let the State drift on without any planning would have caused a serious position to have developed by now. We went for many years under a Liberal Government with absolutely no planning law in the State whatever. Members opposite may not like that, but they certainly cannot deny it, because it is true.

Mr. Mathwin: You know it isn't true.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am not surprised that there have been a tremendous number of instances of difficulty in relation to planning that have been drawn to the attention of members opposite, because throughout the world it has been found most difficult to legislate for planning in a way that is perfect. Our planning laws in South Australia are far from perfect. Last year we introduced many amendments to the principal Act. I have already pointed out that later this year there will be a substantial number of amendments to the principal Act dealing with zoning regulations. I am confident that in the following year, and the year after that, there will be further amendments, because there are constant changes occurring in this field, and rightly so. Whatever the political complexion of the Government, it must keep up to date with changes occurring in the community in relation to planning.

It disturbs me to see even people with considerable knowledge in this field making differing statements about the state of our planning legislation. Members will agree that the Chief Justice made some monstrous allegations about the state of planning in South Australia. However, immediately following that, in the Myer case, to which reference has been made, in his judgment Mr. Justice Wells said:

The Planning and Development Act does not present the spectacle of a series of legislative salvoes fired, at random, against several miscellaneous and disconnected objects—compare, in this respect, the Local Government Act: it represents, rather, a series of broadsides directed, in strict and orderly succession, against a group of associated target areas. Technically, the legislation appears to have been well-planned and skilfully drafted in accordance with a scheme in virtue of which its provisions were closely integrated and the interdependence of its several parts was carefully maintained.

In that case, we had another learned gentleman considering the legislation, and he said some flattering things about the composition and effect of that legislation.

Mr. Millhouse: Yet the whole object of the Bill is to get around his judgment.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The object of the Bill has been misunderstood, even by the member for Mitcham. Its object is certainly not to get around that judgment.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, it is; you said so in your explanation.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The object is to give effect to this judgment and to deal with a weakness in the legislation that was drawn to the attention of the Government. The honourable member should have been given a copy of the second reading explanation. To give the member for Mitcham credit, I do not think he is dull. If he looked at the explanation, I think he would understand the object of the Bill, because he would know that what was said in the judgment was that it was clear that, where councils were given interim development control and that control was not withdrawn immediately their zoning regulations came into effect, decisions made during the period in which they had interim development control were likely to be successfully challenged.

We are saying, "Let us remove that doubt," and any decisions councils may have made during the period they have had interim development control will be deemed to be valid. The reason why so many councils went through the period where they had interim development control plus zoning regulations was that they were given the control during the period they were developing zoning regulations. The State Planning Authority was not developing zoning regulations. This was while the councils themselves, with public involvement and participation, were able to determine what zoning regulations they wanted; this was not worked out by the State Planning Authority. During this period the council was given interim development control. Honourable members will be aware that, from the time councils' regulations were placed before Parliament, there had to be a period of time while those regulations were laid on the table of the House. While the councils were entitled to operate under their zoning regulations, technically speaking they had their interim development control continuing until such time as their zoning regulations were legally effective. Therefore, nearly every council in the metropolitan area had this period of time.

A couple of other councils sought from the State Planning Office, and were granted, approval to extend their interim development control powers for a somewhat longer period than that simply taken up by the processes of Parliament. The object in those cases was to have the final detail of interim development control powers available to them so that they could control and police activities, such as the construction of sheds and other smaller items of that type that were not available to them during the interim development control period. In his judgment, the judge in this case has made clear to us that interim development control was not able to be provided to a council while it had its zoning regulations. The Bill seeks to overcome that difficulty. If anyone challenges a council on any decision it made during that period, we will, by legislation, be preventing that challenge from being made. This is quite the reverse situation from the nonsense stated here by the member for Fisher that we should delay the matter for some period in case anyone else was likely to get caught up. I certainly know of no area in which anyone can get caught up by what we are doing. I have made inquiries, and no cases are pending. The only embarrassment we can cause people is to delay what is proposed by the Government and to ensure that any council decisions that are made are not open to

challenge. I honestly cannot see how the member for Mitcham can read into this some attack that the Government is making on Myers or trying to take some action that will delay any activities. It is clear that we want to preserve the Myers' interests set out in the judgment.

Mr. Coumbe: Ha, ha!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If members opposite dispute that, I should like to hear how it can be done. It is useless making strange noises about it, because I am relating the actual situation, and that cannot be denied.

Mr. Venning: Didn't you have a go at what His Excellency the Governor had to say the other day about the Hills area?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I would be only too pleased to canvass the issue if I knew what it related to.

Mr. Payne: What about how members opposite had a go at officers of the department?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That was absolutely appalling, so when members opposite appreciate what I have to say—

Mr. Millhouse: They would ring up in the morning and apologise?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes. However, the member for Mitcham did not do it, but that could be because he had a better understanding of the processes of the Planning and Development Act. I think the way members opposite launched an attack on officers of the Government who are implementing legislation enacted by this Parliament was shameful. I therefore hope they will withdraw their remarks at the first opportunity. The member for Alexandra referred to the sum that had to be paid into the Open Space Development Fund (and it is true that we amended this legislation two years ago regarding that matter) if developers subdivided 20 blocks or fewer in lieu of the 12½ per cent of open space they were required to provide if they developed 20 blocks or more. We amended the Act because of the increase in the value of land and because people were deliberately encouraged to subdivide areas into fewer than 20 allotments and pay the $100 rather than provide 12½ per cent as open space. They were benefiting financially by taking that step. The Government wanted the space rather than the funds so, to discourage developers from adopting this procedure, we increased the value to $300 an allotment, which legislation was passed. However, legal doubt was raised about whether or not that change applied to any application that was before the State Planning Office before the legislation was enacted. After some time it was held that the Government could not collect the $300 from people who had applications before the State Planning Office before that legislation was enacted. Accordingly, such payments were refunded. The member for Alexandra was not justified in attacking as he did the Government or officers of the State Planning Office, because the situation was not as dreadful as he made it out to be. Unfortunately, it usually takes some time to clarify a situation such as the one involved, and because of the large sum involved it was only right that a proper assessment be made. As I know that other matters are likely to be canvassed on what other areas of embarrassment could be caused to people with existing cases on this matter, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1975)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BEEF INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CIGARETTES (LABELLING) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CONSUMER CREDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from March 26. Page 3221.)

Clause 3—"Repeal and saving provision."

Mr. COUMBE: As it is some time since this matter was discussed, will the Minister reiterate his reason for the insertion of new subsection (7)?

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs): The reason for inserting the provision was set out in the second reading explanation, which indicates that the clause provides that an exemption granted under section 6 of the principal Act before the commencement of amending legislation will remain in force for the balance of the period for which it was granted: it is therefore a machinery provision to ensure that an exemption granted under section 6 continues, notwithstanding the amending Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): During the second reading debate I pointed out a course was being charted by the introduction of this Bill that would encompass the activities of all banking organisations, insurance companies (which could conceivably be included), and certainly some stock firms. My understanding of the measure has not changed since that time, and it has certainly not changed as a result of statements made by the Minister when replying to the second reading debate. Indeed, I considered moving a series of amendments, but I have stood them aside because I believe the interests of the Committee would be best served by the measure passing this Committee without further delay, and by allowing a proper and reasoned attitude to be taken on it in another place. The Attorney-General's earlier inability to accept the criticism of the Bill, which I believe was perfectly warranted, shows that he is not willing to consider the difficulties associated with the measure. Therefore, I can see no purpose in delaying the Committee by moving my amendment. I make the point that, when we deal with the following clause, a suggested amendment goes part of the way towards achieving the result that we are seeking to achieve. However, I do not believe it is sufficient to safeguard in total the organisations that have been referred to. Therefore, whilst supporting the Bill, in the hope that the Attorney-General will accept that amendment, I indicate that I will vote against the third reading.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In the definition of "revolving charge account", after paragraph (*b*), to insert "but does not include a banking account maintained with a body corporate lawfully carrying on the business of banking".

The object of this amendment is to take out of the Bill the provision relating to bank cards which will soon be introduced in this State, as they have already been introduced in several of the Eastern States and overseas. I was emboldened to put this amendment on file by some of the remarks made by the member for Hanson in the second reading debate. He said that, if the definition was amended satisfactorily so as to leave the banking

system alone, the Opposition might be willing to reconsider the Bill. As no member of his Party bothered to put an amendment on file, I thought I would do so myself.

It is for that reason that I have moved the amendment. I do not believe there is any reason at all why bank cards should be controlled in the way in which the Attorney-General suggests they should be controlled. He did not in his second reading explanation give any reasons for doing that. He gave, as I remember it, quite a short explanation, and said that in his view (and I think I am paraphrasing correctly) there were dangers to people through bank cards and, therefore, they had to be controlled. The scheme of the Bill is to control them by regulation, and I am informed that no-one yet knows the precise form of the regulation. So, what we are doing, if we pass the Bill in its present form, is giving the Government a blank cheque to control bank cards in any way it wishes. I know there have been conversations between the Registrar of the tribunal and representatives of the banks, but they are by no means conclusive nor concluded.

I point out to the Attorney-General that this is the only State (or Territory incidentally) in Australia where there is to be control of bank cards. About 1 500 000 cards have been sent out in Melbourne and Sydney, and there is no legislative control there. Even in the Australian Capital Territory, which is still so heavily under the pall of Socalism and where bank cards are operating, there is no ordinance regulating the use of bank cards. If the Commonwealth Government, with its views, has not seen fit to do it in Canberra, why must we do it here? The only conclusion to which I can come, in the absence of any reason on his part but the introduction of the Bill, is that this is an example of control for control's sake, and I do not believe that that is a sufficient reason for us to do this.

I may say that I am already sold on the idea of bank cards. I first saw them in the United Kingdom late last year when I was over there, and I wished I had one. It was obviously a convenient way of doing business, especially for a person like me who hates carrying cash and who never has more than a few cents in his pocket. I could see the advantages of having a bank card and, when my own bank offered me one some time ago, I took it. I now have that card in my wallet and could use it if I went to Melbourne or Sydney. I think it is a good thing, and I can see no reason why cards should be subject to regulations. We may hear the Attorney-General advance a reason for the necessity for regulations. However, we have not yet heard a reason, and it may be that there will be something to say in reply to him later. However, for the moment I content myself with that and with moving this amendment, which will have the effect of taking the provision relating to bank cards out of the Bill.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I would not have thought the fact that the central Government in Canberra had not taken this step was a sufficient reason for the State Government in South Australia not taking it, and I am surprised at the attitude of the member for Mitcham, who seems to wish that we slavishly follow the centralists in Canberra. Perhaps it has something to do with the recent flirtation between the Party of which he is a member and that most notorious of all centralists who has sat in the Commonwealth Parliament since Federation: Mr. John Gorton.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's an odd alliance.

The Hon. L. J. KING: It certainly is, and one suspects that it is having an influence on the thinking of the honourable member, who now seems to consider that we should slavishly imitate the actions of the Government in Canberra. At this stage, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 24, at 2 p.m.