

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 28, 1975

The SPEAKER (Hon. E. Connelly) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Business Franchises (Miscellaneous Provisions), Supply (No. 2).

### PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mrs. BYRNE presented a petition signed by 1 042 residents of South Australia stating that the burden of succession duties on a surviving spouse, particularly a widow, had become, with inflation, far too heavy to bear and ought, in all fairness and justice, to be removed. The petitioners prayed that the House would pass an amendment to the Succession Duties Act to abolish succession duties on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Petition received.

### QUESTIONS

#### SUCCESSION DUTIES

In reply to Mr. GUNN (August 7).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The detailed statement on succession duties which I engaged to provide to all members in order that they may be better able to answer constituents' inquiries is in course of preparation and I would propose to make it available to members when the amending succession duties legislation is presented to Parliament.

#### BUILDING COSTS

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (August 12).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The rate of escalation being encountered at the present time for building works can be categorised as follows:

- (a) Contracts for major works whose value exceeds \$2 000 000—the increase in building costs is assessed at 21 per cent per annum or 1.75 per cent a month.
- (b) Contracts for works of less than \$2 000 000—the increase in building costs is assessed at 18 per cent or 1.50 per cent a month.

The lesser of the two rates of increase is brought about by increased competition which is reflected by the increased number of tenders received compared with that for major works.

#### PRISONER'S WEDDING

In reply to Mr. MILLHOUSE (August 19).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the honourable member is no doubt aware, the wedding has now taken place, so the answer to his question is "No".

#### KINGSTON SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. VANDEPEER (August 19).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As the honourable member will be aware, a master plan has been prepared for the total upgrading of the Kingston Area School which will be spread over a number of years. Planning is proceeding with a view to providing a new library/resource centre and additional accommodation as soon as possible. The availability of the new accommodation will depend entirely on the Demac production programme. A review of all pro-

grammes being undertaken at present makes a definite committal impossible. However, it is most unlikely that the accommodation will be available at the beginning of the 1976 school year, although it is hoped that it will become possible during the year.

#### VALLEY VIEW BOWLING CLUB

In reply to Mr. WELLS (August 6).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Valley View Bowling Club has made only one application to the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport (in January, 1975) for financial assistance towards the cost of establishing a bowling club at a total cost of \$90 000. Funds requested from the department totalled \$60 000 (two-thirds of the total cost). The project was considered along with numerous other applications received for funding during the 1975-76 financial year under the department's capital assistance programme (major projects). The honourable member made an inquiry on behalf of the club and was advised by letter dated June 25, 1975, that the application had been thoroughly investigated and that having regard to other priorities, no assistance could be forthcoming in the foreseeable future. On July 23, 1975, the secretary of the Valley View Bowling Club was advised by letter that their application for the 1975-76 financial year had been unsuccessful. It was suggested, however, that the club could reapply for assistance in the 1976-77 financial year and that it would be advisable to discuss the project with one of the department's project officers.

Whilst the department recognises that there is a need for sporting facilities in the Valley View area, an application from the Valley View Bowling Club will be considered for the 1976-77 financial year. However, because of the limited funds available to the department, it is pointed out that bowling clubs receive a low priority. On May 20, 1975, the President of the Valley View Bowling Club, (Mr. E. C. Roocke) wrote to the department seeking information on the progress of the application and referred to "several established bowling clubs in country areas, namely Port Augusta, Peterborough" that he understood had been allocated Government grants towards the upgrading of existing facilities. Unfortunately, Mr. Roocke appears to have been misled. No grants have been made by the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport to either of the bowling clubs mentioned and, as far as can be ascertained, no other Government schemes have made an allocation of funds in this regard.

#### WAGE RESTRAINT

Dr. TONKIN: My question was to have been directed to the Minister of Labour and Industry—

Mr. Millhouse: He's taking a sickie!

Dr. TONKIN: —but, in his absence, I will direct it to the Premier. Can the Premier say what effect on the Government's wage policy announced yesterday by the Premier the opposition of the unions, as expressed by Mr. Shannon, will have on the implementation of the policy? Yesterday, the Premier announced in his Ministerial statement that, to combat inflation, wage increases should be confined temporarily to quarterly adjustments based on movements in the price index, apart from dealing with anomalies. He went on to say that a Bill would be introduced soon that would require the Industrial Commission to certify that any industrial agreement must not be contrary to the public interest before it could be registered. The Minister has also been authorised to intervene before State industrial tribunals in cases that affect State Government employees to urge the adoption of the commission's principles in all State awards.

Today, the spokesman for the trade union movement in this State, the Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council (Mr. Shannon) warned that unions would oppose any moves towards legislation restricting collective bargaining, and indicated union disagreement with the Premier's proposal. I understand now that the Federal President (Mr. Hawke) has also indicated similar sentiments. This opposition by the real power behind the Government, the left wing trade union leaders, must reduce the credibility of the Premier (as he must have known the unions' attitudes) and, therefore, the true worth of the proposals.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader of the Opposition is the Leader of a Party whose constant practice is to go in for some form of union bashing—

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —and to accuse members on this side of the House of taking our orders from the Trades Hall.

*Members interjecting:*

Dr. Tonkin: Don't you say it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. That is what the Leader has said and what members on his side have said constantly. When the Government does not do any such thing, but takes a proper and responsible attitude in relation to wage and price restraint in the community, all the Leader can do, instead of coming forward responsibly (as Leaders of the Liberal Party elsewhere in Australia have done) in agreeing with the Government's proposition, is to try to sneer. The Leader is acting with utter irresponsibility and not in accordance with the interests of the State.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I had intended to ask a question of the Premier on another matter but, because of the unsatisfactory reply the Leader has just received, I have decided not to ask my original question but to follow up the Leader's question. Does the Premier believe he can control Mr. Shannon in respect of the implementation of the proposals the Premier outlined to the House for the control of the escalation of wages in this State, and will he enlist the support of the Minister of Transport in his attempt to secure the co-operation of the left wing of the Labor Party in South Australia? Today the Premier has poured scorn on the Leader of the Opposition, who asked him about the practicability of putting into effect the proposals the Premier outlined yesterday, in view of the fact that Mr. Shannon, who is probably one of the most powerful figures in the Labor movement in South Australia, publicly repudiated what the Premier said. Does the Premier believe he will be able to implement his proposals because, if he does, it would appear to be efficacious for him to enlist the support of the Minister of Transport to try to come to terms with the left wing of the Labor Party in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member obviously lives amongst that group of Liberals who, in relation to the Labor movement of South Australia, live in cloud cuckoo land because they know absolutely nothing about the Labor movement within this State. What they do is go in for some strange fantasy of their own. To suggest to me that I should ask the Minister of Transport to get the left wing of the Labor Party involved is something which can only produce roars of laughter from this side of the House.

Mr. Millhouse: It's insulting, isn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is nonsensical and therefore risible.

Mr. Coumbe: You said yesterday you inclined to the left.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So I do, and I think my lines of communication with the left wing of the trade union movement are quite as adequate as those of the Minister of Transport. Regarding Mr. Shannon's repudiating me, that has not happened. So far as my keeping Mr. Shannon under control is concerned, I have no intention of doing any such thing, nor do I need to, nor do I suggest that I should. The policy that the Government has outlined was put by me to the Premier's Conference in September last year, as I outlined in my statement, after consultation with the Trades and Labor Council executive and the executive of the Labor Party. It is well known (it has been discussed with members of the Labor movement at all levels) that the responsibility of the Government is to put forward what it believes is a proper policy on behalf of the people of this State, and to consult with the people affected. All of that is being done. There is no question of my exercising control over this or that person or this or that area of the Labor movement.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've never been able to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can only say I can keep a darn sight better control of people on the Labor side of politics than the honourable member can of people on his side of politics.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can remember quoting the honourable member to effect about the disagreements on his side of politics. The honourable member cannot quote our people and say that; we here are united. I suggest to the Deputy Leader that before he talks about control within the Labor side of politics he had better keep his own house in order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether he has had any conversations with Mr. Greg Stevens, the former President, I think, of the A.L.P. in this State, in his capacity as Acting General Secretary of the Public Service Association, about the policy of wage restraint? If not, does he propose to do so? Two earlier questions, one from the Leader and one from the member for Kavel, dealt with the attitude expressed by Mr. Shannon to the Government's policy of wage restraint announced yesterday. I notice that the same reaction to the proposals has come from Mr. Stevens, and there is a report of that in the *News* today. The Premier, in the same report, has spoken rather hopefully of the attitude of the P.S.A. by saying:

But the Public Service in South Australia has had such a good deal from our Government that it is just not true. I do not think there is a basis for complaint.

That apparently has not impressed Mr. Stevens, because according to him State public servants will fight the move that the Premier is to make (or the Government is to make), and Mr. Stevens points out that there are several groups in the P.S.A. who feel they have dropped behind and that until they catch up then indexation is not on. Of course, that has been the response very widely through the community but, because of the close links in every way between the Public Service Association and the Government, the nature of the relationship between the two, and particularly because Mr. Stevens is an active member of the Labor Party, one would expect close liaison on a thing like this, and one would perhaps not have expected the immediate adverse response that has occurred. It is to allow the Premier to clear up this matter that I have asked the

question in the way I have. I hope I shall have more luck in getting a more direct answer than either the Leader or Deputy Leader received.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate the honourable member's vast charity and concern.

Mr. Millhouse: At last I am appreciated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, Sir, there are no doubt times when the honourable member needs to be. There has been an application in areas that the Public Service Association has claimed are catch-up areas within the terms of the national wage decision. The degree to which that is the case is not entirely agreed by the Public Service Board. There is some difference in a certain number of cases that have been specified by Mr. Stevens. Because of the effect of the national wage decision, numbers of people have been trying to get in before the boom falls in order to restore what they consider to be distorted relativities. I point out to the honourable member that, within the terms of the Government's decision, there are provisions for catch-up cases. Those applications will be properly dealt with by proper arbitration proceedings. The Public Service Association has claimed that the adjournment of matters before the Public Service Arbitrator until after the national wage decision is preventing the association from proceeding with a catch-up case. I do not believe the association will be deprived in any way of an opportunity to put a proper case under the catch-up provisions if it has such a case. In a matter of this kind, Mr. Stevens is the servant of his executive when speaking on its behalf. The executive at times may disagree with the Government in some areas about the way in which certain cases should proceed immediately. That is inevitable in discussions concerning wage matters. However, this matter does not concern me. If it concerns the honourable member, I am sorry for him. I do not think there will be any grave differences between me and Mr. Stevens on political matters. I think the honourable member will find that Mr. Stevens will continue to adhere staunchly to the Labor Party and that the honourable member's question will do nothing to wean him from it.

#### LITTER

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister for the Environment, as the Minister responsible for the Coast Protection Board, say whether the board has done or attempted to do anything to help councils in areas with sea frontages to deal with the everlasting problem of litter that is often deposited on beaches by visitors from other areas? I know the problem of dealing with refuse is primarily a council matter, but is there any way that the board, which has a special interest in beach-front amenities (perhaps even some formal responsibility for them), can help?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Although the Coast Protection Act does not place any real responsibility on the Coast Protection Board regarding the litter problem along beaches, it is true, as the honourable member says, that this problem is of significant interest to the board because of its interest in amenities on our beaches. Some developments have occurred in recent weeks that might be of interest to the honourable member. The first relates to the board's interest in developing beaches on Yorke Peninsula. The board has, after discussing this matter with councils, taken the opportunity to negotiate on behalf of those councils with a view to providing along their beaches litter bins similar to those authorised by my colleague the Minister of Transport along our highways. In this regard, the board has been able to negotiate a

price for the supply of bins which will be of advantage to the councils. Under the provisions of the Act the board has power to subsidise councils in connection with the purchase of these bins. Further, the board believes it can help, if it can negotiate on behalf of all metropolitan seaside councils, in providing for the joint collection and emptying of all rubbish bins along the metropolitan coastline. This service would ensure that bins were emptied properly and on sufficient occasions. An approach has been made to councils to see whether they would authorise the board to undertake negotiations in this matter. Regrettably, however, the councils overwhelmingly declined the offer, although two councils (Brighton and Port Adelaide) were willing to accept it. I regret the action taken by most of the councils concerned, because it would have been a good opportunity to use the services of the board. I hope those councils will reconsider their refusal because, had they accepted, the litter problem on the metropolitan beaches would have been considerably reduced.

#### WHYALLA SHIPYARDS

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister for Planning and Development take up for me with the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones) the matter of current and foreseeable orders in relation to shipbuilding programmes in Australian shipyards in order to ascertain whether any likely effect could occur to those yards because of the likelihood of massive retrenchments of employees in Japanese shipyards? Japanese shipyards have led the way in shipbuilding for some years and have considerably curtailed shipbuilding orders in other areas, including this State and other States of Australia, because of their ability to build ships of huge tonnage quickly and economically. For example, over the years the Whyalla yard has turned to cargo vessels of the diesel-turbo type in order to overcome the situation. I question whether the Japanese yards may be forced to engage in this type of shipbuilding, thus posing a serious threat to possible further orders received in this country.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I can understand the honourable member's concern about this matter, but I am not certain whether the Hon. Mr. Jones can take any real action to assist. However, I will refer the honourable member's concern to the Commonwealth Minister of Transport to see whether any action can be taken to offset the likely threat to which the honourable member refers.

#### MURRAY LAND

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say where the ownership of land recently purchased along the Murray River will be vested? I have not been able to find in the press a statement by the Minister, but I believe I heard the last part of a radio news broadcast a couple of evenings ago on my way home from this House that concerned the purchase of land along the Murray River near Murray Bridge in the area of the Mobilong District Council and the corporate town of Murray Bridge. I would like to have the Minister's assurance of this, or otherwise. I understand that the Crown Law Department has recently asked the Mobilong council about rates outstanding for freehold land along the river frontage, and other questions. I wonder whether this land will be vested in the name of the respective district councils to be under their care and control, or will it be vested in the Monarto Commission, or left to the Lands Department, becoming Crown land?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My understanding is it will be vested in the Monarto Commission. There may

be further proposals relating to the ultimate transfer to district councils or retention and control by the Government of which I am not aware at this stage, but I will bring down a detailed reply soon.

#### REDWOOD PARK BUS SERVICE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport consider extending the Redwood Park Metropolitan Tramways Trust bus service to serve now an area at Surrey Downs? The Minister will be aware that I wrote to him on April 15, 1975, requesting such an extension, to which he replied on May 12, 1975, as follows:

The Bus Service Planning Group agrees that this area is poorly served and has proposed that the bus route be extended via Riverside Drive, Cronulla Drive, Kincumber Drive, Terrigal Road, Springwood Avenue and Grenfell Road to Agonis Street, Surrey Downs. This proposal is subject to approval by the Tea Tree Gully council and to the provision of adequate roads. As with all other route extension proposals, it will not be possible to proceed until sufficient new buses are available. It will therefore be between one and three years before the service can be extended.

As the subdivision in question at Surrey Downs now has about 90 houses occupied and, as the number will increase, I ask that the decision be reviewed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to ask my officers to review this decision. However, I think that I am duty bound to point out to the honourable member that acknowledging the need and demand for a bus service is one factor, while receiving the buses currently on order from overseas is another factor. The regrettable lack of buses is holding up improvements to the transport system, including the circular bus service. I will have my officers investigate this matter to see what can be done for the honourable member.

#### BEE-LINE BUS SERVICE

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister say when the existing bee-line bus service will be extended to operate from east to west in the city? I think it fair to say that the reaction to the present bee-line service has proved that it was warranted, and it is filling a gap in the city's transport needs. Many requests have been made for an east-west service, particularly from the Adelaide railway station to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Although I appreciate what the Minister has just said in reply to the member for Tea Tree Gully, I ask him whether there is any way in which this extended service could be introduced more rapidly.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Basically, the reply I gave to the member for Tea Tree Gully answers the question the honourable member has raised, except for one other point, namely, that I do not think there is the same pressure or urgency for the east-west bee-line service, which will not be an extension of the existing service but a separate service altogether, that exists in some other areas where we are anxious to upgrade the public transport system. The route that will be followed by the east-west bee-line service (or whatever name we finally give it) is now and will in future be transversed by normal bus services. People who wish to travel in an east-west direction are able to do so now on buses and, particularly since we have introduced a transfer ticket system, this form of travel is fairly economical. We will shortly be reassessing our future proposals to try to determine some order of priority when we have a better knowledge of the likely arrival and operation dates of the new buses.

#### TIMORESE REFUGEES

Mr. WELLS: Is the Minister of Community Welfare aware of newspaper reports to the effect that unfortunate refugees from Timor are currently in Australia and that some may come to Adelaide? Can he confirm these reports and say whether his department has had any request for assistance in respect of the plight of these people?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am unable to say whether the newspaper reports are correct, and I would not attempt to do so. However, it is possible that some refugees could arrive in Adelaide over the weekend. Any such group is not expected to be large. The Community Welfare Department will provide assistance to back up other assistance provided by the Australian Government's Social Security Department. The kind of help needed would possibly be clothing, which would be provided under the auspices of the Red Cross. If money were required by any refugee, that help would be forthcoming from the Social Security Department. If accommodation were needed (as would almost certainly be the case for a short time, anyway), that would be provided, I understand, by the Australian Government department concerned at the hostel at Pennington. I need only add that departmental officers are aware of this matter, which has been raised in the press and now by the honourable member. Over the weekend, they will be willing to provide any assistance that is required, outside the assistance that I have already outlined.

#### KANGAROO ISLAND TRANSPORT

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Transport say whether he has been able to consider my request for a reduced freight rate on the m.v. *Troubridge* specifically to allow the economic disposal of surplus livestock on Kangaroo Island? If the Minister has considered the matter, can he tell the House his decision? This serious situation was brought to the attention of the House in a question addressed to the Minister on August 6. Unfortunately, at that stage the Minister had not actually received the official submission, but he stated:

When it arrives, I assure the honourable member that I will give every sympathetic consideration possible to see whether a case exists to enable a special rate to be determined.

Today the Chairman of the Kangaroo Island Transport Committee has told me that the disposal of this massive surplus of livestock on Kangaroo Island is becoming urgent, and in the interests of growers there I raise the matter again. In fact, the Chairman of the committee, in the telephone conversation with me, stated:

Many of the identified 40 000 surplus sheep will have to be slaughtered on the island and dumped and wasted on the properties unless transport relief to some form of consumer outlet can be arranged quickly.

A similar situation also applies in relation to thousands of cattle on Kangaroo Island.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When I received the request from the honourable member, I did what I had assured him I would do, namely, see that it received sympathetic consideration, and to do this I referred the matter to the appropriate Ministers, the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture, to find out whether some relief could be provided from their areas of administration. Those Ministers have told me that there is no similarity between the case that the honourable member has stated and the case on the West Coast, because the position on the West Coast relates merely to the abattoirs charges. Indeed, it is considered that the circumstances on Kangaroo Island probably are little different from those applying in the remainder of South Australia and that, if any transport relief were

provided, it might be reasonable to argue that it ought to apply over the whole State. Frankly, that would be a situation that could not be accepted. However, I have had the opportunity, following consideration of the matter by the Minister of Lands, to have a brief discussion with the Commissioner of Highways. I will be discussing it further with him to find out whether there is any unoccupied space on the *Troubridge* coming back and also whether, if that is so, he would be able to consider meeting the honourable member's request, at least in part if not in full. I hope to have an answer soon. As the House will not be sitting next week, if I get a favourable reply for the honourable member I will let him know either in writing or by telephone.

#### JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. SIMMONS: Will the Premier, in his capacity as Attorney-General, say how many justices of the peace there are in the State and how many applications are received each year for appointment to this position?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I do not have those figures readily at hand, I will get them for the honourable member.

#### EDUCATION FINANCE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education say whether he and his Government have been planning on the Commonwealth Government's acceding to the submissions by the Schools Commissions, the Australian Universities Commission, and the commissions for the colleges of advanced education? Further, if there has been such planning, will the Minister say how he sees the financial position for education in the State now that the Commonwealth Government seems to have set aside the submissions of the Schools Commission and rejected the triennium submissions of both the Australian Universities Commission and the colleges of advanced education for 1976-78? Further, in view of the fact that the Minister's predecessor, the present Minister of Mines and Energy, stated, I understand, that any reduction in the amount of money made available in the Commonwealth Budget for education would be a tragedy, does the Minister intend to protest to his Commonwealth colleague about the drastic cuts that have been made, or does he intend to take the matter lying down?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Taking the question backwards, I think I have already made certain public statements that would have to be interpreted as a protest at the amount of money that has been granted for education. Although I am sure that the honourable member is well aware of what I am about to say, the way in which he worded his question could mislead some people, and I point out for the benefit of the House that the triennium is to be postponed to the end of 1976 rather than done away with altogether. That of itself gives some opportunity, because, although the current funding that we have been given cuts out at the end of this financial year, there remains a six-month period during which, on assurances that have been received from the Prime Minister, there will be sufficient funds to carry over until the beginning of the new triennium. I (and I am sure I have the backing of this Government) will be regarding this as a possible catch-up period in what is going to be a quiet year on the capital side of education. I imagine that other States will be doing the same thing and that everyone will be putting in fairly large accounts for the first half of the next calendar year, hoping that a large amount will be available in the second half of the year to carry us into the next triennium. If that money is not available, certainly the position will be tragic. The

Government had some sort of advance idea of what might happen, so we were by no means caught napping regarding the amounts of money coming to us.

In the further education field (and I am aware that the honourable member did not specifically refer to this), since I have the figures with me, I should give them for the benefit of the House. In that field, we assumed that we would be written down to \$9 300 000 from the \$9 500 000 that originally had been referred to as capital money going into that area, so there has been no variation from what is in the Loan programme regarding that. The House already has some information in this field, because honourable members will recall that already I have had to tell the member for Whyalla that a contract in this field that had been expected at the beginning of the next calendar year will now not be let until March so that the payments can be spread over a longer period and will have less impact on the money that we have available to spend this year. As I have said, in that field, although we are disappointed about what has happened, we certainly were not caught napping.

In the area of the colleges of advanced education, we have a more serious situation. It is not unlikely that capital works of any significant kind will not take place in the first half of the next calendar year. We will continue to plan and design in the hope that, whatever money comes forth in the second half of the calendar year, we can continue some sort of programme. The situation is simply that we will receive a total of only \$550 000 in the first half of 1976. It is indeed fortunate that the Government is not in the situation that it requires massive injections of numbers into the colleges of advanced education to sustain the pupil-teacher ratio in the school system. Quite apart from that, it has been necessary for me to say that we will employ all the exit students from the colleges who request and are suitable for employment in our system. That is, I suppose, something of a straw in the wind, but it has been necessary for me to make that announcement. It does take something of an edge off the difficult situation the colleges of advanced education will be in to know that at least that will not involve us in any embarrassment in relation to recruitment of teachers. Time is limited, and I think there will be a further opportunity in the Loan Estimates debate for me to expand further, as I have already done in part on the schools situation. I have not full information for the honourable member about the position of universities, but I will give him a detailed report.

#### TRADE WITH PENANG

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier say what is the trading position between South Australia and Penang since the formation of Austral-Asia Development Proprietary Limited Company and its counterpart? I ask the Premier particularly whether he can say what industrial benefit has accrued or will accrue to South Australia from this agreement, in particular what type of manufactured goods or prefabricated components can be exported to Penang and surrounding areas, and in return what type of imports from the Penang area are expected to come to South Australia by that agreement.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are many areas of interest to the two companies which are quite wide-ranging. The immediate investigation has been in the area of industrial housing. The provision, with the assistance of South Australian companies, of panel-built houses for Malaysia, incorporating white goods, for which the components would be manufactured here and the plumbing requirements manufactured here—

Mr. Dean Brown: Are they Atco and Atlas?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, they are not Atco and Atlas. This is one area involved. In return, we have been looking at timber supplies and componentry for South Australia. As the honourable member will be aware, one of our major increases in building costs has been in the enormously escalating costs of imported timber, and this was looked at in the back-shipping operation that would be involved. These arrangements will necessarily have to be long term, because it is not expected that we will be able to establish regular shipping between Port Adelaide and Georgetown within two years, and the operations of these companies are likely to take some two years. However, in relation to the first factory, which it is expected will be jointly established (it will be a factory which relates to the panel-built housing), discussions are currently taking place. We are also having discussions in many other areas, including such things as local brandy production from concentrated vine products from South Australia being reconstituted within the area and competing with the French brandy, which would be of assistance to the wine industry.

A very broad range of projects is under discussion. The South Australian Film Corporation has prepared a report at the request of a special Cabinet committee of the Malaysian Government for assistance from the film corporation in the establishment of Film Megara and the possibility of a joint operation of film laboratories, which would save money for both operations. The combined operations would give sufficient throughput for film laboratories and, indeed, at the moment the film industry right throughout the region is at a disadvantage because there are only two workable film laboratories in the whole South-East Asian region—one in Hongkong and one in Sydney. That will give the honourable member an idea of the range of discussion that is taking place through these companies. The Prime Minister of Malaysia will be visiting South Australia in October, and he has scheduled a considerable time for discussions with me. I shall be bringing him to meet members in this House, and I hope he will come here and take his place in this Chamber during his visit here. The degree of interest that has been shown by the Federal Malaysian Government in these initiatives from South Australia is considerable. I hope that can give the honourable member an interim idea of what has taken place, and I hope that in his visit to Penang in December he will be able to see, on the ground, further developments of this kind.

#### TELEVISION CENSORSHIP

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Premier say what steps have been taken or are being taken now to prevent previews of adults only evening shows from being televised during the time that children could be watching television? I realise this is a Commonwealth matter, but the number of such previews is increasing rapidly and there is growing concern about the matter in the community. The concern is reflected particularly in the number of letters to the Editor in our newspapers expressing concern that these previews are being shown on television. Parents of young children are especially concerned, because the previews always show the goriest or hottest parts of a film to be shown later that evening. Such previews automatically attract the attention of young people, and this causes concern to parents. I therefore urge the South Australian Government to look immediately into this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has an advantage over me regarding this hot and heavy

material, because I have not seen it myself. The honourable member is correct in saying that this is a matter of Commonwealth responsibility. It is not possible for the State Government to take administrative action in this area. I therefore suggest that, if the honourable member is concerned on behalf of his constituents, he should take up the matter direct with the Broadcasting Control Board and the Minister for the Media.

#### AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Does the Premier agree with the prediction of the Industries Assistance Commission that new car registrations for the September quarter will be the lowest since September, 1961, and, if he does agree, can he say what action his Government will take to alleviate the effects of this down-turn on South Australian industries? I agree with the predictions of the I.A.C. Indications are that total car sales have already started to decline and that the number of imported vehicles has increased recently. The artificial boom in the car industry in the first part of this year will now reduce the demand in the immediate future: I am sure the Premier would agree with that. The increase in sales tax and the present unstable economy will further compound the problem. The labour force in the South Australian car industry has already decreased by 1250 people in the past 12 months, despite the temporary reduction in sales tax that was introduced by the Australian Government earlier this year; however, sales tax that applied before the recent reductions is now being reimposed. The number of vehicles exported from Australia has been reduced to about 25 per cent of the level being exported 18 months ago. The high inflation rate in Australia, the devaluation of the New Zealand currency, and the sharp increase in shipping costs have now largely priced Australian vehicles out of the export market. I understand that a South Australian manufacturer recently introduced an early retirement scheme for his employees and is offering a benefit consisting of 2½ days pay for each full year worked for the company. The company is making the offer available until the end of August obviously in an attempt to minimise possible future retrenchments. The superficial economic policies applied to the motor vehicle industry earlier this year by the Dunstan and Whitlam Governments—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must remind the honourable member that this is Question Time and that he must not debate his question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member talks about superficial policies and says he agrees with the predictions of the I.A.C., yet no policy has come from the Liberal Party which would have cured the difficulties that exist in the motor car manufacturing industry in every country throughout the world that manufactures vehicles. Governments of the same economic persuasion as that which the honourable member who has asked the question have, in every country in which they are in office, produced massive down-turns in the market, in the number of cars produced and in employment in the industry. The most outstanding example is the United States of America, from which, of course, we derive the management of our major manufacturing concerns in this country.

Mr. Dean Brown: I did not dispute that. Just get on and reply to the question.

Mr. Millhouse: He regards offence as his best form of defence.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Inevitably, motor car manufacturing companies that have concentrated on medium and large car manufacture have misforecast the market

and face considerable difficulty as a result. Indeed, the I.A.C. failed to forecast accurately the market, as was shown in the analysis made by this State Government of the proposals of the I.A.C. to concentrate the manufacture of Australian cars in the middle range car manufacture area. Such a policy would have affected directly about 15 000 jobs in South Australia, and many more people would have been affected as a spin-off. With the support of the car industry, the South Australian Government put forward to the Commonwealth Government an alternative policy which provided for an 85 per cent local content plan and which also provided for small car manufacture in Australia using the existing capacity within this State. We are proceeding with that plan, but we note it is under attack by the Liberal Party. However, regarding the immediate market, representations are constantly being made by this Government in conjunction with the car industry to the Commonwealth Government regarding sales tax and the inducement of better market conditions. South Australia was no more successful in convincing the Commonwealth Government to postpone the final phase of the restoration of sales tax than it was in similar circumstances when a Liberal Government was in office in Canberra.

Mr. Dean Brown: I thought that when Dunstan fought he won!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I win most of the time when I have a ruddy good case. I won in relation to the I.A.C.'s plan for the car industry in Australia, and honourable members can be darned sure that the first people into the field to knock the case that South Australia has successfully put up will be the member for Davenport and his pals.

Mr. RUSSACK: In view of the proposed partnership between the Commonwealth Government, Chrysler Australia Limited, Nissan and Toyota to manufacture four-cylinder engines in South Australia, will the Premier press the Commonwealth Government for an assurance that it will negotiate with the Government of Papua New Guinea to accept South Australian produced cars as falling within the recommendation made by a Territory Commission for standardising motor vehicle imports? The commission report has recommended that the territory should import only five makes of vehicle, all of them Japanese. Will the Premier say what effect this will have on exports of South Australian vehicles to Papua New Guinea and on employment in the local motor vehicle and components industries, bearing in mind that General Motors-Holden and Chrysler Australia Limited have said that the Government's plan will only fragment the industry in Australia, with the possibility of mass sackings and higher prices?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report on the Papua New Guinea proposal for the honourable member.

#### NEW SOUTH WALES DEFICIT

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier seen the article in today's *News* about the dilemma of the New South Wales Premier regarding the financial position of that State? Many times in this House members opposite have ridiculed the Premier on financial matters and prophesied doom for this State, but what about the expected deficit of \$210 000 000 in New South Wales?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I outlined at election time, the Liberal-governed States in Australia were facing serious deficits this year, even with increased taxes and even after they had scuttled into Medibank. Despite the fact that various of these people from the east and west were imported here at election time to deny that they were facing deficits of this kind, they are facing serious deficits

after increasing taxes and charges markedly, and after keeping on the petrol tax and the like. Mr. Lewis is facing a deficit of \$210 000 000 in New South Wales, a position which for a State Government is completely insupportable. If honourable members opposite are dinkum about being worried about the State's finances, perhaps they will say why they should be worried when they compare the situation in this State, which had a surplus last year and which will have a marked surplus this year as compared with New South Wales, when we are running services at a higher rate than New South Wales, we have lower taxation per capita, and we have a balanced Budget and a surplus in finance. If that is bankruptcy for this State, then honourable members are flying to the moon. I do not think they are getting there yet.

#### FARM MACHINERY

Mr. GUNN: Is the Premier concerned at the apparent down-turn in the farm machinery manufacturing section of the South Australian economy? The Premier will be aware that it has been reported that John Shearer and Sons Limited is laying off 50 employees and another large manufacturer, Horwood Bagshaw Engineering Proprietary Limited, has laid off a number of men. A union representative has sent a telegram to the Prime Minister seeking the reintroduction of the superphosphate bounty, and I should be pleased if the Premier would follow up this action to give some stimulus to the rural section of South Australian industry so that primary producers will again be in a position to purchase new machinery.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Naturally, I am concerned with the down-turn in the market for agricultural machinery in South Australia, not the least because the Government has been directly involved in the development of the agricultural machinery industry in this State. A considerable sum of Government money is involved in the direct development of Horwood Bagshaw, and in addition there has been close co-ordination between Government activity in export marketing with the agricultural implement manufacturers, particularly with John Shearer. However, the Government cannot immediately restore the overseas markets for the agricultural products of this State. If the honourable member thinks that in that regard I am Mandrake the Magician, I modestly confess to him that I am not.

#### TAILEM BEND POWER LINE

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether the Government intends to duplicate the Mobilong to Tailem Bend power line?

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

#### VICTORIA SQUARE

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Premier say what is the present situation relating to the site on Victoria Square for a luxury hotel of international standard, which has been so often promised by him? Over several years a hotel with Japanese-type and casino-type accommodation, with convention facilities and shopping complex, has been mentioned by the Premier for construction on the site.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member goes in for his usual mis-statements. He has suggested that on a previous occasion I have promised this development. I have done no such thing, and he cannot quote a single statement of mine in which I have said it. What I have said, and said rightly, is that South Australia, in order to get the fullest return from employment in its tourist investment, needs a first-class international hotel, and anyone in the tourist industry will tell him that.

Dr. Tonkin: In Victoria Square?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It needs to be within Adelaide and a first-class international hotel. In furtherance of this proposal, the State Government has made available a prime site in Victoria Square on a peppercorn rental for 90 years.

Dr. Tonkin: I would say that was metricating!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If members opposite want an answer I will give them one but, if they are just going to carry on with the most juvenile of interjections, there is no point in answering. Does the honourable member want an answer?

Dr. Tonkin: Of course I do.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Oh good, then I suggest you shut up and allow me to answer.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the Premier to order. His remark to "shut up" is unparliamentary.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask that I be allowed to answer without constant interjections against the Standing Orders of the House.

Mr. Chapman: Are you going to withdraw the remark or not?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader.

Dr. TONKIN: I rather thought you upheld the point of order before I took it, Sir, but if the Premier insists, I take the point of order that the language used has been ruled by you before in this House as being unparliamentary, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Does the Premier withdraw?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I withdraw and ask that honourable members opposite keep quiet. I hope that that will be carried out. The offer by the State Government concerning the hotel has been for a 90-year lease at a peppercorn rental, the provision of a reduction in rates and taxes during that period, and the provision of a Government guarantee for two-thirds of the investment. This was done as an inducement towards establishing an international hotel. At this stage, although we still have several proposals and inquiries to the committee responsible for recommendations to the Government on the site, we have no firm proposals. Frankly, in present circumstances, that is not surprising, as the track record of major hotels in central city areas in Australia in the past four years has been extremely poor. In other words, they have not returned a reasonable dividend on the investment, and people who had a firm proposal originally before us withdrew, because of their re-assessment of the escalation in costs of the establishment in Victoria Square on the basis that they had originally proposed. That is the position at present. The Government would like to induce an investor to come to South Australia and proceed with an international hotel. Although we are still getting inquiries, at this stage we have no firm conclusion. If the honourable member can suggest that there is some better way to get a hotel without greater cost to the public, perhaps he will put forward some constructive proposals other than that the Government should be a gladiator for a casino on the top floor.

#### CIGARETTES (LABELLING) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all purposes set forth in the Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year 1975-76 and the Appropriation Bill (No. 2), 1975.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the appropriation of revenue of the State for the financial year ending June 30, 1976, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

In doing so, I present the Government's Revenue Budget proposals for 1975-76 which forecast a balanced Budget result, with aggregate receipts and aggregate payments each expected to be about \$1 051 000 000. The forecast of payments comprises detailed provisions of \$953 000 000 at wage and salary rates and approximate price levels estimated to be effective at June 30, 1975, a round sum of \$82 000 000 for the possible cost of new salary and wage rate approvals which may become effective during the course of the year, and a round sum of \$16 000 000 for the possible cost of further increases during the year in prices of supplies and services.

The necessary detailed appropriations for future wage awards will be arranged under a special provision which is included in the main Appropriation Bill each year. Where departments are able to demonstrate that increases in costs of supplies and services are greater than the allowances included in their detailed appropriations, extra funds will be made available from the round sum allowance of \$16 000 000. There is no special provision in the Appropriation Bill to cover this procedure, so that it will be necessary to call on the authority of the Governor's Appropriation Fund and eventually of Supplementary Estimates.

Consolidated Revenue Account: As to the longer-term movements and trends in the Consolidated Revenue Account, I reported to the House 12 months ago that the accumulated deficit at June 30, 1974, was only \$500 000. However, we were aware that the Grants Commission had recommended a completion grant of \$8 500 000 in respect of the 1972-73 year and that this would be paid in full shortly. Therefore, the 1974-75 Revenue Budget was planned in the knowledge that the accumulated result in cash terms was effectively a useful surplus of about \$8 000 000.

That was not a new situation within the State, because under my Treasurership there has been a very careful management of income and expenditure, so careful, in fact, that consistently while we were under the Grants Commission this State recorded Budget results which then led the Grants Commission not to provide certain of the moneys assessed to the State for us, because it considered our Budget results were better than standard and that we did not require the moneys from the commission as against deficits. That has consistently been the situation in this State. There has been very conservative accounting and budgeting done by this Government. At all stages during the history of my Treasurership, when it seemed financial circumstances were altered and they required additional revenue, I did not at any stage hesitate to come to the Parliament and seek that additional revenue in order to see to it that the State's accounts were kept in the best state of any in Australia. That has been consistently the case, and it has been



extraordinary that some Opposition members have been willing to go to the media, and that the media has been willing to put forward that this State was mis-managed financially and was faced with financial disaster. No State in the terms of its Budget has been better managed than this one.

Mr. Becker: Why not give your Treasury officials some credit? You've got good ones.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have some very good Treasury officials, and have always acknowledged their great worth. What I am saying is that a little truth and honesty from Opposition members in relation to the accounts of this State would do the public of South Australia good.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've managed to get them so confused, it's hard for them to know what's going on.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The confusion has not come from me or the Treasury officials, but it has deliberately come from Opposition members.

Mr. Goldsworthy: No fear!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Budget forecast for 1974-75 was for a deficit of \$12 000 000, after making provision for two factors which could not be estimated accurately. The first, on the payments side of the Budget, was a round sum allowance of \$30 000 000 for future wage and salary awards. The second, on the receipts side, was the inclusion of a special grant which we hoped might be about \$6 000 000. Then, because of a series of adverse factors, it seemed quite early in the year that the deficit could move as high as \$36 000 000, if no corrective action were taken. Following the introduction of new taxes, the prospective deficit was contained in part and later, as a result of extra grants secured at a Premiers' Conference held in February, the picture was improved further. Finally, the arrangements for the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways to the Australian Government led to the payment by that Government of additional grants of \$20 000 000 in respect of 1974-75 (and of \$6 400 000 in respect of previous years).

That is the money the Grants Commission had not paid out and would not have paid to us in respect of this year, even if we had not had the agreement to get out of the commission, because we were better than the Budget standard. The final result of all the changing factors was that the actual result for 1974-75 was a surplus of \$8 400 000. An attachment to the printed Financial Statement gives details of the major movements and trends last year.

The recorded deficit of \$500 000 at June 30, 1974, the subsequent receipt of a completion grant of \$8 500 000, the achievement of a useful surplus of \$8 400 000 in 1974-75, and the receipt of \$6 400 000 of further completion grants in respect of 1970-71 and 1971-72 (as a result of the railway transfer arrangements) have resulted in an accumulated surplus of \$22 800 000 being recorded on Consolidated Revenue Account at June 30, 1975. The Prime Minister has informed me that the Grants Commission has recommended the payment to South Australia of a completion grant of \$2 500 000 in respect of 1973-74. Accordingly, we are able to plan the 1975-76 Budget against the background of a very useful effective surplus of \$25 300 000, the best financial situation in this State's history.

Loan Account: Two weeks ago I introduced the Public Purposes Loan Bill and the Loan Estimates for 1975-76. The Loan documents showed that at June 30, 1975, the

accumulated balance of Loan funds held was about \$1 900 000. The proposals for the State's capital programme envisaged the use of all new borrowings and all recoveries expected to become available during the year and the use of the small opening balance only to meet urgent and unforeseen needs which might occur. However, support from the recent Australian Government Budget has fallen below our expectations, and it will be difficult to avoid some overspending on Loan Account in 1975-76. Happily, because we begin 1975-76 with a useful revenue surplus on hand and the prospects of a balanced Revenue Budget for the year, there is no requirement to attempt to hold Loan funds to support revenue purposes. We are in a different position from the other States, most of which (certainly Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia) were forced to hold substantial amounts of Loan money as against revenue deficits.

Mr. Goldsworthy: This is all because of the railways Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, because of fighting and winning for South Australia.

The transfer of the non-metropolitan railways: The arrangements to transfer the non-metropolitan railways to the Australian Government have been a most important factor in the framing of this Budget. Put at its simplest, I can say that the direct benefit to the 1974-75 Budget, apart from the Grants Commission arrangements, was \$10 000 000 as a result of our receiving a special payment in consideration of land, minerals and other assets, while the direct benefit in 1975-76 will be of the order of \$31 000 000, which is derived from a special amount of \$25 000 000 in consideration of land, minerals and other assets, built into the base of the financial assistance grants and escalated in accordance with the formula. People were going all around South Australia saying that we were getting only \$10 000 000 in payment for the railways.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is all here. I have explained it all to the House before, and we can see in this Revenue Budget the immediate cash benefits in the first year.

Mr. Goldsworthy: There were three different answers, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, that is not so. Opposition members have only tried to take things out of context.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Something different came into the context every week.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, this is completely consistent with everything that has been said at every stage. As a result of these major benefits to Revenue Account, the Government has been able to afford the repeal of the petrol franchise tax.

I point out that, because it will take some time to complete arrangements for transfer of staff and associated matters, the South Australian railway administration will remain much as it is for the moment and the State will act as agent of the Australian Government in the operation of the non-metropolitan system. I have thought it best, for purposes of the 1975-76 accounts, to retain the existing appropriation procedures for the whole of the railways operations and to take to the credit of Revenue Account the reimbursement from the Australian National Railways Commission in respect of the non-metropolitan deficit.

The Grants Commission: Associated with the agreement to transfer the non-metropolitan railways was an arrangement for South Australia to become a non-claimant State.

As a result, we received last year a completion grant of \$10 000 000 without further review by the Grants Commission. We had received already an advance grant of \$15 000 000, so that the total special grant received in respect of 1974-75 was \$25 000 000. Additional to this was the receipt of \$6 400 000 of further completion grants on account of the years 1970-71 and 1971-72. These had been withheld from payment in line with recommendations of the commission and in keeping with the commission's former cautious attitude towards placing a claimant State in a position of significant Budget surplus.

Earlier in 1974-75, prior to the railways transfer agreement being negotiated, the State had received a completion grant of \$8 500 000 on account of 1972-73. Accordingly, the only matter outstanding in respect of the whole period from July 1, 1970, to June 30, 1975, is a completion grant on account of the year 1973-74. The Prime Minister has announced that the Grants Commission has recommended payment of \$2 500 000 to settle that matter and we may expect to receive the grant shortly. In getting \$10 000 000 of completion grant built into our annual payment without review by the Grants Commission, I am doing a pretty good deal when, in fact, the grant for this year was \$2 500 000.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I am the greatest!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, but South Australia is all right. All the honourable member can do, when I am pointing out that we have got something for South Australia, is sneer. As to 1975-76 and the future, the total of \$25 000 000 of special grants actually received on account of 1974-75 is to be built into the base of the financial assistance grants and escalated in accordance with the formula. The State has now withdrawn its application for a special grant in 1975-76 and hopefully will have no further need for special assistance. However, it is not possible to see the future so clearly as to be able to say that South Australia will never be claimant again. The way has been left open for us to make a submission to the commission in respect of a future year if South Australia's financial position should deteriorate relative to that of New South Wales and Victoria and if the making of such a submission should appear to be in our best interests.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That is important.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it is. I got the amounts we were getting from the commission built into the base of our formula and got a better deal in connection with being bought out of the commission than any other State has got; but though I have got that already for us, we are still able to take advantage of the commission if in future we should consider it proper to do so.

May I remind members that South Australia was a claimant State from 1934 until 1959. As a result of an agreed increase in the financial assistance grant in that year, the State was able to operate without the aid of special grants for a period of 11 years until 1970. Then, because of the deterioration which had occurred in our financial situation relative to that of the bigger States, we applied to the Grants Commission for assistance again. For a period of five years the State has been claimant. In my contacts with the commission and from my understanding of the commission's conduct of hearings and investigations, I have been most impressed with the efficient, courteous and fair way in which the commission has arrived at its recommendations. On behalf of South Australia, I thank the commission for the financial benefits, and thus the improved services, which have flowed

from its recommendations and for the manner in which it has carried out its work.

Medibank; The financial problems of the 1975-76 Budget have been eased considerably by the State entering into an agreement with the Australian Government to conduct and finance its hospital system under the Medibank arrangements. Under the agreement the Australian Government and the State will each meet half of the net operating costs of recognised hospitals. Under the previous arrangements the State had been responsible for almost two-thirds of operating costs and, with the continued escalation of costs, it had become increasingly difficult to raise fees in order to avoid an increase in the proportion of cost falling on the Revenue Budget. The net financial benefit to the State in 1975-76 is estimated to be of the order of \$25 000 000 but for a number of reasons it is not possible to give this estimate with confidence. I have explained some of the uncertainties in the payments section of the printed Financial Statement when dealing with the Hospitals Department and grants to hospitals under "Minister of Health—Miscellaneous". The Government was delighted to become a partner to the Medibank arrangements which are designed to bring improved standards of health care within the reach of all Australians.

Financial assistance grants: The early planning and forecasting of the 1975-76 Revenue Budget took place in a climate of uncertainty as to what might be done to improve the financial assistance grants arrangements. A major review of the grants and associated financial measures had been made in 1970 and, while the legislation of the Australian Government had continuing effect without limitation in time, it provided for a review after five years, if Governments so wished.

It was the unanimous wish of State Governments that the system of grants be reviewed and improved. During the course of 1974-75 there occurred a long series of meetings of Treasury officers in the first place and then of Premiers. The Premiers, after considering the material put before them by their Treasury officers, made a submission to the Prime Minister suggesting improvements to the base and to the formula, so as to yield greater grants in 1975-76 and future years to assist in meeting Revenue Budget problems which were becoming more serious year by year. The core of the Premiers' submission was that:

- (1) all States had made considerable efforts to help themselves by increasing their own revenues with new and increased taxes and charges;
- (2) on the expenditure side of Budgets there was little scope for further economy and, in fact, every expert committee which reviewed the needs of particular areas recommended that more be done;
- (3) the effects of inflation on State Budgets were particularly severe because the costs of wage increases were covered only in part by increased receipts from grants and pay-roll tax, while increased costs of supplies and services were not covered at all by those receipts.

Against this background, the Premiers sought an improvement to the formula by way of a progression factor which would have replaced the old simple wages factor. I point out for the benefit of new members that under the previous arrangements the grants made to each State were increased year by year by applying three factors. The first was a factor reflecting the rate of population increase in the individual State. The second was a factor reflecting the rate of increase in average wages throughout Australia. The third was a betterment factor of 1.8 per cent.

The new progression factor proposed by the Premiers was to be derived by increasing the annual wages factor by a multiplier (suggested as 1.5). The result would have been to give the States rates of increase in grants which more nearly approximated the rates of increase in revenues flowing to the Australian Government through the effect of progressive personal income tax scales. A major benefit would have been to give the States a better measure of protection against the severe adverse effects to Budgets in times when wage levels were escalating rapidly.

At the Premiers' Conference in June, 1975, the Prime Minister informed the Premiers that, while the Australian Government recognised the problems facing the States and agreed that some improvement to the grants was necessary, it was not possible to meet their case in full. In the event, the Australian Government agreed to add a sum of \$220 000 000 to the total of grants which would have been payable in 1975-76 under the existing formula, to build that sum into the base in future years, and to improve the old betterment factor from 1.8 per cent to 3 per cent for purposes of calculating grants in 1976-77 and future years. South Australia's share of the special addition of \$220 000 000 is expected to be about \$26 000 000.

Summary of major financial factors: While I am disappointed that a longer-term improvement in the financial assistance grants along the lines of the States' submission was not achieved, I am happy to be able to report to the House that the approved addition to those grants, the special grants associated with the railways transfer and the financial benefits of the Medibank agreement, enable me to present a Budget which allows for modest expansion, which aims at a balance on the year's current operations, and which does not require any new or increased taxes. As to taxes, it is a pleasure to be able to refer to two areas of relief, the first being the repeal of the petrol franchise taxation for which legislation has been passed and the second being the reduction of liability for succession duty for which legislation will be introduced shortly to give effect to the remissions I announced several weeks ago. In addition, of course, there will be the change in the maximum amount of pensioner remission money in relation to rates and taxes.

In its longer-term planning, the Government recognises that, while 1976-77 will see a continuation of the revenue benefits gained in 1975-76, it is most unlikely to see further improvements on the scale of those of this year. The modest expansion of services this year will have carry-over effects into 1976-77, wages and prices of supplies and services will continue to rise, though, hopefully, at gradually reducing annual rates, and, without doubt, the community will look for some further improvements of services beyond the standards reached this year. If we are able to achieve a balanced Budget this year, as we plan, and to hold the accumulated revenue surplus of \$25 300 000 towards the financing of increased costs in 1976-77, we will reduce considerably the necessity to raise new or increased taxes and charges in that year.

I point out to honourable members that the achievement of a very marked surplus this year does not mean that members opposite can come to the Government and say, "Well, you have a surplus, so why do you not spend it on this project or that?" The proper and reasonable course for the State to take in present financial circumstances is to restrain spending to reasonable and conservative limits, and we should retain the accumulated surplus as against the problems that can be foreseen with escalating costs next financial year without our being able to expect, in that financial year, the extra amounts that we have derived for the Budget for this year.

That is the proper and prudent course, and the Government does not intend, simply willy-nilly, to spend the surplus that is in its hands. If, in fact, some extreme emergency calls for some financing, that will have to be considered. We always have to consider that sort of situation, but our aim is to conserve the accumulated amounts as far as possible against the difficulties that we could face next year in providing the normal modest expansion of State services and the carrying out of the normal policies on which the Government was elected.

South Australia has entered 1975-76 in a better financial situation than any other State. We propose to keep a firm control of expenditures within the limits approved, to improve our forward planning and budgeting still further, to maintain flexibility so that we may cope with changing requirements, and to continue to keep long-term financial stability as one of our major aims.

I pay a tribute to the Treasury officers in South Australia. Members opposite have said how good they are, and I acknowledge that.

Mr. Venning: You couldn't do without them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would not get on without them. I do not for a moment pretend that I would. The Treasury officers in South Australia are, I believe, the best in Australia. They are the envy of the Treasurers of the other States. There has been a great tradition in the South Australian Treasury of effective work, and Mr. Carey and Mr. Barnes particularly have done a tremendous job in preparing these Budget Estimates. I express to them my personal thanks and the thanks of the people of the State for the work that they do.

As the remainder of the explanation refers to details of estimates of revenue and expenditure and to the clauses of the Bill, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### EXPLANATION OF REMAINDER OF BILL RECEIPTS

In 1975-76 receipts are expected to total \$1 051 000 000 and to be divided between the principal categories as follows:

	\$
Taxation . . . . .	275 483 000
Public undertakings . . . . .	134 150 000
Recoveries of debt services . . . . .	51 011 000
Other departmental fees and recoveries . . . . .	164 303 000
Territorial . . . . .	3 845 000
Australian Government grants and reimbursements . . . . .	422 208 000
	<u>1 051 000 000</u>

Taxation: Members may recall that fees for the registration of motor vehicles and for drivers' licences were raised from October 1 last in order to finance the State's share of the cost of the planned roads programme. This year the higher fees will operate for a full 12 months and greater receipts are anticipated as a consequence as well as from increased numbers of vehicles. As the extra funds will be transferred to the Highways Fund for construction and maintenance of roads there will be no net impact on the revenue budget.

Under an amendment to the Land Tax Act passed earlier this year, the unimproved values of all properties in the State are to be brought into line with those in the one-fifth of the State which is actually revalued each year by the Valuer-General. In this way equity between taxpayers will be achieved at any given point of time

and, in future, increases in valuation will take place progressively instead of in large jumps every five years. This year, however, many properties will be valued at figures well in excess of the valuation ascribed to them last year as the increases in land prices which have occurred in recent times have rapidly outstripped historical valuations. Having regard to this, the Government reduced the rates of tax imposed by the Act and the reductions will offset in part the effects of the higher valuations. An increase in receipts of \$6 434 000 is expected.

Stamp duties are expected to produce about \$55 000 000, an increase of \$9 293 000 over actual receipts in 1974-75. In that year rates of duty on cheques, insurance licences, third party policies, conveyances and registrations of motor vehicles were raised and these higher rates will operate for a full year in 1975-76. In addition, it is to be expected that there will be some natural increase in the number of transactions and also higher values in some areas. Receipts from the totalisator tax increased sharply last year following a significant increase in amounts wagered. It seems likely in the current circumstances that the volume of betting will continue to rise and provision has been made for an increase in duty of \$137 000.

One of the election undertakings given by the Government was to alter the Succession Duty Act so that a widow or widower could inherit an average-sized family home without payment of succession duty. Legislation to give effect to this undertaking will be introduced shortly. The effect of the principal changes proposed in that legislation, an increase in the general statutory amount applying to a widow or widower and an increase in the rural rebate, will be to reduce expected receipts from succession duties by a little over \$1 000 000 this year and by about \$2 000 000 in a full year. It is difficult to estimate the likely effects of continuing increases in property values or variations in the number of large estates becoming dutiable, but allowance has been made for these factors. Increased receipts of \$865 000 are included in the Budget. The increase applied last year in the rate of pay-roll tax from 4½ per cent to 5 per cent will operate for a full year in 1975-76 and produce some further rise in receipts. By far the most significant influence, however, will be the increase in average wages. The Australian Government has used a rate of 21 per cent in projecting the financial assistance grant and, on that basis, we can expect pay-roll tax receipts of about \$126 000 000, an increase of \$24 574 000 over 1974-75.

I had hoped to be able to abolish the franchise tax on the sale of petroleum products as from the beginning of 1975-76, but the decision of the Opposition to prevent the passage of the railways transfer Bill made such action impossible. The tax will therefore apply for one-quarter of the year and receipts in respect of that period, together with the payment of amounts outstanding from 1974-75, are expected to total \$4 900 000. The franchise tax on the sale of tobacco products will operate for a full year in 1975-76 and it is expected that receipts will increase from \$1 393 000 to \$6 300 000. Higher liquor licence fees were introduced last year and the full year effect of these, together with an increase in the volume and value of consumption, is expected to produce extra revenue of \$2 132 000.

Betting with bookmakers followed a pattern similar to betting on the on-course totalisator last year and there was a consequent increase in revenue from commission on bets. A somewhat similar increase is expected this year. Following the receipt of the report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry, the Government introduced several tax measures designed to raise extra finance for the racing clubs. A minor side effect of the measures designed to

improve the clubs' receipts from the tax on bookmakers' turnover was a slight increase in the percentage coming to the Government. This will be received for a full year in 1975-76. It is anticipated that revenue will increase by \$364 000 to \$1 660 000.

Public Undertakings: Receipts by the Marine and Harbors Department are expected to decline by \$589 000. Shipments of grain are estimated to fall by about one-half and to cause a sharp fall-off in revenue from wharfage, bulk handling charges, pilotage and tonnage rates. Although receipts elsewhere may improve slightly, it is not expected that they will be sufficient to offset the loss of revenue from grain. Officers of the Railways Department are expecting a similar experience, with a substantial decline in the revenue from grain. There is also much less scope for a reduction in outstanding accounts than at the same time last year and it is inevitable that there will be some fall in receipts from this source. On the other hand, earnings from the carriage of general merchandise are expected to rise significantly while increased fares and freight rates across a wide range will operate for a full year in 1975-76. It must be borne in mind, of course, that only factors affecting metropolitan operations will have any net influence on the State Budget this year.

Members will note that no provision has been made for a transfer to the Railways Department towards deficits. In the past it was customary to pitch this figure a little below the deficit estimated for the department in order to encourage the most economical operation by giving a practicable target achievable through cost reductions or increased business. With the takeover of the non-metropolitan railways by the Australian Government, it has been decided to discontinue the financial transfer. I mentioned earlier, when discussing land tax, the new valuation procedure adopted for this year. A similar scheme has been introduced for the determination of water and sewer rates except that, instead of the assessed annual values of all properties being brought into line with those in the one-fifth of the State which is revalued each year, a series of differential rates, designed to produce the same effect, will be declared. Such a scheme is not possible with land tax because of the progressive nature of the tax scale, but it is feasible with a simple proportionate levy as used for water and sewer rating. As a consequence of the adoption of this scheme and the determination of appropriate rates, it is anticipated that there will be a substantial rise in the receipts of the Engineering and Water Supply Department from \$47 092 000 to \$60 500 000.

Other departmental fees and recoveries: Recoveries from the Australian Government towards State payments of financial assistance to people in need are expected to rise by \$855 000. Amounts paid by the State to deserted wives and unmarried mothers are tied to social security pensions and allowance has been made for increases in both the rate of pension and the number of applicants. Receipts for educational purposes are heavily dependent upon specific purpose payments made to the State by the Australian Government. Based on information contained in the recent Australian Budget, I have included a figure of \$23 800 000 in the Estimates of Revenue for receipts by the Education Department from this source, principally in the form of grants recommended by the Schools Commission and of assistance towards the technical and further education programme. A further sum of \$6 000 000 is expected as a contribution towards the costs of the activities carried out under the auspices of the Childhood Services Council.

The receipts of the Hospitals Department have been radically altered by the entry of the State into the Medibank

scheme. Patients' fees, hospital benefits and pharmaceutical benefits are estimated to be well down on last year, while provision has been made for the first time for the \$16 a patient bed day payments by the Australian Government and the half share of net costs to be reimbursed by that Government. The State will push ahead with the domiciliary care and community health schemes, and substantial subsidies from the Australian Government are expected in this area. A change in accounting procedures will result in the sum of \$11 500 000 being transferred to revenue from the Hospitals Fund. Grants to subsidised hospitals have been debited in part direct to the Hospitals Fund on a rather arbitrary basis since its inception in 1967. This has resulted in some unproductive clerical work designed to keep track of grants deemed to be paid from the Hospitals Fund and grants deemed to be paid from Revenue Account. With the advent of Medibank it has not been possible to estimate the grants which will be required by individual recognised hospitals and to apportion these grants between Revenue Account and the fund.

The opportunity has been taken, therefore, to rationalise the whole process and to make a transfer from the Hospitals Fund to Revenue Account towards the costs of hospital operations generally. A total of \$8 700 000 was paid out of the fund last year but further rapid increases in the turnover of the Totalizator Agency Board and the Lotteries Commission and a full year's effect of the increase in the third party insurance surcharge should boost this figure to about \$11 500 000 in 1975-76.

Provision has been included this year for the receipt of \$5 500 000 by the Public Buildings Department for hospital maintenance. The Australian Government has insisted that only actual payments by hospitals themselves are eligible for subsidy under Medibank and so, in order to ensure that the State receives its full entitlement under the scheme, it has been necessary to provide for payment by the Hospitals Department to Public Buildings Department for services previously met entirely from the votes of the latter department. For comparable reasons, an actual cash transaction is necessary to bring into Medibank the value of stocks of hospital supplies held at July 1, 1975. Receipts and payments include an amount of \$4 000 000 on this account. Recoveries by the Public Health Department are expected to increase from \$1 834 000 to \$2 470 000, principally as a result of further expansion of the school dental programme and the substantial Australian Government support which it attracts.

Grants: I have given members the details of the new financial assistance grant arrangements. For 1975-76, the grant is estimated at \$376 300 000 on the basis of an increase in average wages of 21 per cent and a small increase in population. Debt service reimbursements have now ceased, as the Australian Government will this year take formal responsibility for \$1 000 000 000 of the debts of the States. State liability for debt services has been correspondingly reduced. As a result of our cessation of claimancy there will, of course, be no grant recommended for South Australia by the Grants Commission. Earlier in my remarks I mentioned that the railways accounts had been shown as if the department were to remain a State responsibility. Therefore, it is necessary to show a recovery from the Australian Government of the amount of the estimated deficit on non-metropolitan operations. A figure of \$44 500 000 has been estimated.

#### PAYMENTS

In 1975-76 payments from Revenue Account are expected to total \$1 051 000 000 of which \$82 000 000 is an allowance against future wage and salary awards and \$16 000 000

an assessment of the possible impact on the Budget of increased prices for supplies and services. Towards the detailed provisions of \$953 000 000 the Government has authority under existing legislation for the expenditure of \$140 683 000 and a further \$812 317 000 is sought in this Bill.

Special Acts: Apart from the transfer to the Highways Fund, which is derived simply by deducting from motor vehicle taxation the costs of collection and certain other costs directly attributable to roads, the major appropriations contained in special legislation are the Government contribution to the South Australian Superannuation Fund and payments on the public debt. A provision of \$15 000 000 has been made for the Government's liability under the Superannuation Act. It is known that \$11 750 000 will be required to meet pensions of existing superannuants at current rates and that a further \$2 250 000 will be required for the cost of living adjustment. The balance of \$1 000 000 is simply an assessment of the impact of new retirements, offset by the normal reduction through death of the Government contribution in respect of existing superannuants.

Interest on the public debt and the contribution to the National Debt Sinking Fund are together estimated to require \$108 100 000 in 1975-76. There is a particularly heavy liability this year in respect of old loans falling due for conversion. With interest rates at their current levels the cost of replacing these funds with new borrowings is certain to be heavy. The apparent burden of debt charges would, of course, have been much greater but for the fact that the Australian Government will this year assume responsibility for \$1 000 000 000 of the debts of the States. In South Australia's case this means a reduction of \$130 000 000 in public indebtedness. The State has been progressively relieved of the costs associated with this indebtedness over the last five years through special grants but 1975-76 is the year in which the formal transfer will be effected.

Education Department: Expenditure other than for further education is expected to rise from \$181 981 000 to \$214 000 000. The Arbury Park Camp School, which will be the first of its kind in South Australia, will open at the beginning of 1976. It will cater for 96 children and six teachers and will supplement normal school activities with a wide variety of outdoor educational experiences. It is also proposed to open the Music Centre at Marryatville High School from the beginning of 1976 as the first of several planned special interest centres at high schools. A further 308 scholarships have been granted to teachers for 1976 to enable them to upgrade their qualifications, particularly in areas of specific need such as special education, remedial education, librarianship and school-community relationships. Book allowances, which are currently \$30 for years 8 to 11 and \$32 for year 12, will be increased to \$35 for all grades in recognition of the fact that the cost of books has risen substantially in the past 12 months and is a significant burden in many cases.

Pre-school Education: During the recent election campaign, the Government gave an undertaking to introduce one year of free pre-school education for all children in the State by the end of the decade. As a first step towards this aim, funds have been made available in the Budget, through the Childhood Services Council, to enable fees in kindergartens affiliated with the Kindergarten Union to be eliminated from January 1, 1976.

Independent Schools: The provision for grants to independent schools has increased by \$2 333 000 over actual

expenditure in 1974-75 to a figure of \$4 900 000. Following representations from the Cook Committee, the Government agreed, prior to the election, to supplement the committee's 1975 allocation by at least \$175 000. More detailed analysis has suggested that this would still leave the schools in a difficult position and allowance has been made in the Budget for total supplementation of \$551 000. For 1976 the Government has agreed to make available to the committee, for distribution between the schools on the basis of need, a sum equivalent to 20 per cent of the estimated cost of educating children in State schools.

**Further Education:** The fastest growing area of further education is that in which technicians, sub-professional and middle level personnel are trained for commerce, industry and the Public Service. The numbers being trained in these fields in 1975 constitute a 20 per cent increase over 1974. Government policy is to give priority to courses which are designed to improve the level of training of the work force and, as a consequence, it is not always possible to meet the demand for general interest courses for the wider community.

**Libraries:** The sum of \$1 000 000 is provided for subsidies to local government libraries. Subsidy limits have been raised quite significantly for all such libraries and, in recognition of the particular problems of the larger councils, capital and administration subsidies for branch libraries will be raised from 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the limits applicable to the first library in a council area. The new limits will be as follows:

	First Library	Subsequent Library
	\$	\$
Capital subsidy . . . . .	80 000	60 000
Initial book grant . . . . .	32 000	16 000
Book subsidy . . . . .	21 000	10 500
Administration subsidy . . . . .	18 000	13 500

**Hospitals Department:** For Hospitals Department, an aggregate appropriation of \$144 028 000 is proposed. In the absence of the Medibank agreement, the provision would have been about \$124 528 000. The difference of \$19 500 000 may be broken into two parts for ease of understanding. In the first place, a provision of \$15 000 000 is merely a matter of accounting and does not mean an increased cash impact on the Revenue Budget. This \$15 000 000 is made up of \$5 500 000, being the estimated recoup to Public Buildings Department in respect of maintenance of hospitals to be carried out by that department in accordance with previous practices, \$4 000 000, being the estimated recoup to the Hospitals Department itself in respect of the stocks of various supplies taken over at July 1, 1975, for purposes of Medibank, and \$5 500 000, being payments to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science for services previously provided free. For claims on the Australian Government to be accepted under the Medibank arrangements, it is necessary for actual cash payments to have been made by the Hospitals Department for the relevant costs involved. Notional payments brought to account because another department has provided a hospital service are not acceptable. Of the \$15 000 000 of payments, \$9 500 000 is offset completely by equivalent receipts under the Hospitals and Public Buildings Departments, while \$5 500 000 is offset by the reduced need for grants to be paid to the institute.

In the second place, provisions of \$4 500 000 have been included to meet estimated additional cash costs which are likely to fall on the Hospitals Department as a result of Medibank. These cash costs will include payments to medical practitioners for services which would previously have been billed directly to patients and costs of diagnostic

and paramedical services which likewise would have been billed directly. It is not possible to estimate accurately what changes will occur in the proportions of private and standard ward patients and, accordingly, the changes in cost from direct billing of patients to residual charge against the hospital itself. Apart from the advent of the Medibank scheme, the major development in the hospitals field will be the opening of the Flinders Medical Centre. For the first time in Australia a school of medicine and its associated teaching hospital have been planned and built as one institution. The objectives are, first, to provide for full functional integration of the school and the hospital and, secondly, to allow maximum flexibility to meet changing needs. Beds for more than 700 patients will be available when the project is completed and there will be a full range of supporting services, including X-ray department, diagnostic laboratories, large consultative clinic for out-patients, an emergency department and substantial research facilities.

Further progress is planned in the Government's community health programme, involving the provision of centres for primary health care, aid for the handicapped, community psychiatric services, occupational health services and health education. Social work services to general practitioners in areas of need, and training courses for paramedical aides and community health nurses, will also continue to receive priority.

**Public Health:** Expenditure by the Public Health Department is expected to increase from \$4 737 000 to \$6 430 000. Provision has been made for the establishment of a maternal and child health section, for additional staff to meet the department's increasingly heavy commitment to the design and supervision of common effluent drainage schemes, and for further expansion in the dental health field. Members will doubtless be aware of the Government's election undertaking to provide dental care to all primary children by 1980 and to all children up to the age of 15 years by 1985.

**Other medical and health:** The method of presentation of that section of the Budget which deals with assistance to non-government hospitals and institutions has been considerably altered this year. First, there is no provision for particular grants to be charged against the Hospitals Fund following the decision to transfer amounts credited to the fund to revenue as a contribution towards hospital costs generally. Second, the appendix has been split into three parts, the first a summary of assistance to recognised and eligible hospitals, the second a list of these hospitals, and the third a detailed presentation of the assistance to be given to non-recognised hospitals and other bodies. The increase of \$549 000 in the provision for capital grants is a reflection of a greater number of capital projects to be undertaken and capital items to be acquired, principally for aged citizens clubs and aged persons homes.

To compare properly assistance to recognised and eligible hospitals for current maintenance purposes, it is necessary to refer to Appendix I rather than to the "Minister of Health—Miscellaneous" section of the Estimates of Expenditure, as the latter excludes amounts made available from the Hospitals Fund in 1974-75. There is, nevertheless, a substantial increase from \$14 858 000 in 1974-75 to \$33 200 000 in 1975-76. Much of the increase (perhaps \$10 000 000 or so) is the result of the agreement reached under the Medibank arrangements. The requirement of these hospitals for grants will be increased because of a reduction in their fee income and because of the impact on them of costs for medical services that were previously billed directly to patients. An offsetting factor will be the payment to them of \$16 a patient bed day by the Australian

Government. I should point out that the figure of \$33 200 000 is subject to a very wide range of possible variations, depending on the choices that individual patients make between standard ward treatment and other accommodation.

Assistance for current maintenance to organisations shown in Appendix III is down considerably from the amount provided in 1974-75. The drop of \$4 604 000 is mostly attributable to the reduced level of support for the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. As the Australian Government has insisted that it will subsidise only hospital costs under Medibank arrangements, it has been necessary for the State Government to arrange for the institute to charge recognised hospitals for services previously provided at no cost to the hospitals. In these circumstances, of course, the institute becomes much more nearly self-supporting. Apart from this factor, however, Australian Government assistance to Minda Home, the Crippled Children's Association and the South Australian Spastic Paralysis Welfare Association has reduced the need for State Government support.

**Law Enforcement:** It is expected that expenditure by the Police Department will increase by \$6 059 000 to \$36 300 000. The principal development in 1975-76 will be the upgrading of the police radio communication network. Facilities in the operations room at police headquarters will be completely up-dated, while a number of country stations will be equipped with the new radio telephone system which directs public calls to patrol vehicles. In addition, the first stage of a development plan, which will enable police officers to communicate personally with headquarters from any part of the metropolitan area by means of miniaturised radio transceivers worn about the body, will be introduced. The Government proposes to introduce legislation to permit the issue of community work orders in lieu of imprisonment. This will involve a direction by the courts that persons undertake Saturday work but remain in the community and assume their normal responsibilities during the rest of the week. Allowance has been made in the estimates of the Correctional Services Department for the initial stages of this programme.

**Welfare:** Provision is included in the Budget for the Community Welfare Department to recruit 40 social workers from overseas to fill existing staff vacancies. This will enable the department to staff its decentralised district and branch offices more adequately. It will also facilitate establishment of a crisis care service which will be available on a 24-hour, 7-day a week basis to deal with family crises. Youth services throughout the State will also be strengthened by the appointment of neighbourhood youth workers whose function will be to help train and support voluntary workers in local community organisations for young people. As promised during the recent election campaign, the maximum remission to pensioners for water and sewer rates will be increased to \$50 in each case and for council rates and land tax to \$100 in each case. A total of \$5 790 000 has been provided for the cost of these remissions.

**Public Undertakings:** The major public undertakings that have an impact on the Revenue Budget are the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Railways Department, the Marine and Harbors Department, the Woods and Forests Department and the Municipal Tramways Trust. With the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways to the Australian Government, the nature of the State's involvement in the railway undertaking will alter significantly and become very similar to its involvement in the activities of the Municipal Tramways Trust. The Government reaffirms its belief that both these organisations

have a vital part to play in the transfer of people within the city. In the absence of a public transport system, the mobility of the poorer sections of the community and of particular groups such as the aged and those who are unable to drive a car would be severely curtailed. For this reason alone, it is appropriate that the general community should bear part of the cost of operating the system. In addition, however, the immense benefits to non-users as well as users in terms of freer movement, cleaner air, safer travel and a convenient alternative when the car is not available justify a policy of spreading costs beyond the circle of regular users. It seems probable, also, that there is a considerable saving to the community in terms of the quantity of resources which it is necessary to allocate to transport functions where a comprehensive system of public transport is in operation. There is no reason to believe that the benefits which derive from society's ability to allocate a greater proportion of its resources to other functions accrue any more to users of public transport than to non-users. With this in mind, the Government has taken the attitude that it would be inappropriate to insist that only those people who use the system should pay for public transport. It is expected that about one-quarter of the railways deficit (that is to say, about \$15 000 000) will be incurred on metropolitan operations, while the provision for the M.T.T. deficit is \$8 000 000.

It is reasonable, normally, to require the users of port facilities to meet the costs of providing and operating these facilities. For 1975-76, however, a deficit is forecast. Payments by the Marine and Harbors Department, excluding debt charges, are expected to total \$8 100 000. Receipts will exceed this figure but are not expected to be sufficient to cover all debt charges. The matter of charges will need to be reviewed before 1976-77. Much the same argument could be said to apply to the operations of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Given the extreme scarcity of water in South Australia, however, and the general acceptance of the need for a measure of decentralisation, it seems likely that it will prove necessary, in this State anyway, for country water supplies to be made available at less than cost.

Expenditure by the Engineering and Water Supply Department is expected to increase this year by \$5 617 000 to a total of \$36 460 000. Provision has been made for rather greater costs of pumping than in recent years because of the poor level of intake into the reservoirs in the winter months. At the same time, a start will be made on a major new programme of investigation of the State's water resources in an effort to overcome the problem that has constantly hindered our development. The Government is, of course, also taking steps to improve the quality of South Australia's water supply, and during the year the first filtered water will flow through the system. Members will note that the department has absorbed what was formerly the Minister of Works Department. Over many years, the State Government has made Loan funds available to the Woods and Forests Department for the establishment of a softwood timber industry in this State. The department operates as a commercially viable enterprise, and its annual contribution to Revenue Account represents a return to the taxpayer on the investment in the industry. A contribution of \$2 500 000 is provided for in 1975-76.

**Other Activities:** The Government has made a special contribution of \$35 000 to maintain the programme of grapevine improvement in South Australia. This programme is for the development of superior strains of the most important wine grape varieties and for research

into the use of new rootstocks needed for an industry replanting programme. In co-operation with the industry, the Agriculture Department is establishing source areas of these new varieties on growers' properties to provide the essential planting material for vineyard reconstruction.

In recognition of the importance to South Australia of the fishing industry and the difficult economic situation which it faces, the Government has decided to allocate increased funds to the Fisheries Department sufficient to double last year's expenditure. The additional funds will enable a greatly intensified research programme to be undertaken into the State's fish resources, including investigations into possible new fisheries as yet untapped. Much greater emphasis will be placed on management techniques, and negotiations are proceeding for the engagement of an oversea consultant to undertake, in collaboration with departmental officers, a comprehensive technical and economic survey of our fish resources and their management.

For Public Buildings Department, a provision of \$32 156 000 is proposed in order to meet Government office service costs, the costs of maintenance of public buildings and the management and office expenses of the department. Service costs are the most rapidly growing item in the department's budget. This year's appropriation includes provision for increased charges for electricity, telephone and cleaning and for lease rentals for accommodation for the Mines and Agriculture Departments. Within the appropriation for maintenance is the normal provision for maintenance of hospital buildings. This is to be recovered from the Hospitals Department so that the latter may make appropriate claims under Medibank.

ATTACHMENT  
THE YEAR 1974-75

The Revenue Budget was presented to the House last year in a climate of some uncertainty. Apart from the now universally acknowledged difficulties of forecasting in a time of rapidly escalating cost levels, an application by South Australia for special budgetary assistance had not been fully considered by the Australian Government. In addition, that Government's Budget had not been brought down and its budgetary assumptions about estimated wage and salary increases were therefore not available. The State's estimated deficit of \$12 000 000 was necessarily somewhat tentative, but it took into account a possible increase of 20 per cent in the level of average wages and an expected grant of \$6 000 000 towards South Australia's particular problems. Receipts were expected to total \$762 645 000, and payments \$774 645 000, after allowing \$30 000 000 for future wage and salary awards. When the Australian Government brought down its Budget in mid-September, the financial assistance grants to the States were based on the assumption that the level of average wages would rise by 25 per cent rather than 20 per cent. The net effect of this on the South Australian Budget was estimated to be adverse to the extent of about \$4 000 000, as the cost of wage awards is greater than the increase in grants and pay-roll tax which flow from such awards. In addition, advice was received from the Australian Government that no special assistance would be forthcoming. As a consequence of these two events, the explanation which accompanied the introduction of the Budget into the Upper House referred to a likely deficit of \$22 000 000.

Subsequently, there occurred a significant down-turn in stamp duty revenues and a greater than expected rise in departmental costs other than wages. Faced with a prospective deficit of \$36 000 000, the Government proceeded to introduce legislation to impose franchise taxes on the sale of petroleum and tobacco products and placed a virtual

freeze on the creation and filling of new positions in Government employment for some weeks. Principally as a result of these measures, the outlook at the time of the February Premiers' Conference was for a deficit of about \$27 000 000. At that conference the Australian Government agreed to make additional general purpose grants available to assist with the problems faced by all States. South Australia's share was about \$6 600 000, and I was able to report subsequently to Parliament that there were prospects of holding the deficit for the year to about \$20 400 000.

Between mid-February and the end of the year the situation changed entirely. Under arrangements made with the Australian Government for the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways, the State received a special additional grant of \$10 000 000, and a \$10 000 000 completion grant for the 1974-1975 financial year was brought forward in time and paid without further review by the Grants Commission. Furthermore, revenues from other sources picked up somewhat, and the combination of these factors resulted in the Government's achieving a surplus for the year of \$8 384 000. Receipts totalled \$828 985 000 and payments \$820 601 000.

These rapid and large changes in the Government's prospective Revenue Budget position inevitably had consequences for capital expenditure policy. The original Loan programme for 1974-75, put before Parliament in mid-August last, proposed that all funds becoming available in that year be used for works and that the balance of about \$4 500 000 in the account be run down by a nominal \$200 000. In view of the uncertainties surrounding the Revenue Budget at that time, it was necessary to hold a balance of Loan funds in reserve as a buffer against possible deterioration in Revenue Account. Had the two Budgets, as put to Parliament, been achieved, Loan funds at June 30, 1975, would have totalled \$4 300 000 and the accumulated revenue deficit would have been \$4 000 000, which is to say there would have been a nominal surplus of \$300 000 on the two accounts combined.

When the Australian Government brought down its Budget in September, it provided for additional support of State Loan programmes to an extent that added about \$12 500 000 to South Australia's new borrowings and capital grants. By then, of course, we were aware of the deterioration in our revenue position and of indications that the down-turn in revenues and the increases in non-wage costs could exacerbate the situation. In these circumstances, the Government decided to hold those additional Loan funds in reserve to cover the rapidly growing revenue deficit. At the February Premiers' Conference an extra \$8 100 000 of Loan funds was added to South Australia's 1974-75 programme. This amount, together with the additional \$6 600 000 of revenue moneys mentioned above, put the State in the following position on its two major accounts:

	Revenue \$ mill.	Loan \$ mill.	Combined \$ mill.
Effective opening			
balance . . . . .	8.0*	4.5	12.5
Planned Budget result	—12.0	—0.2	—12.2
	—4.0	4.3	0.3
Net deterioration . . .	—15.0	—	—15.0
Increased Australian Government assist- ance . . . . .	6.6	20.6	27.2
	—12.4	24.9	12.5

\*After receipt of completion grant of \$8 500 000.



It was decided, therefore, to authorise the expenditure of a further \$14 700 000 of Loan funds to enable construction departments and contractors to retain their labour forces. The Government considered such action warranted in the circumstances, despite the fact that it would mean a combined short-fall on the two accounts of about \$2 200 000 by the end of the year. As the Revenue Budget position improved, the Government was able to relax further its tight control on Loan expenditures and, in particular, to assist the statutory bodies with the problems created for them by rapidly escalating costs. For the full 12 months there was in fact a deficit of \$2 593 000 on Loan account, leaving a cumulative surplus of \$1 903 000 at June 30, 1975. At that date the cumulative position on Revenue Account was a surplus of \$22 782 000, made up as follows:

	\$
Deficit at July 1, 1974 . . . . .	536 000
Completion grant 1972-73 . . . . .	8 500 000
	<hr/>
	7 964 000
Surplus 1974-75 . . . . .	8 384 000
Further completion grants on account of 1970-71 and 1971-72	6 434 000
	<hr/>
	22 782 000

Payments for the year totalled \$820 601 000 compared with an estimate, including the allowance for future wage and salary awards, of \$774 645 000. The principal explanation for the excess of \$45 956 000 was the cost of wage and salary awards in excess of the allowance of \$30 000 000. Awards for which automatic appropriation was given by section 3 (2) of the Appropriation Act amounted to \$58 996 000, but in addition costs of \$5 912 000 were incurred as a result of decisions on wages that fell outside the ambit of that section. Together, these two items exceeded the original provision by \$34 908 000. It is of interest to note that, had State Government employees as a whole experienced the same increase in average wages as the community in general (a little less than 27 per cent was the wages increase factor in the Financial Assistance Grant formula), this cost would have been some \$10 000 000 lower. As it was, their rates of remuneration increased more rapidly than average and imposed further strains on the Revenue Budget in particular. I mention this to illustrate the difficulties of forecasting in a period of strong inflationary pressures and the degree of approximation that is inherent in forward estimates of the likely cost to the Budget of future wage and salary awards.

Apart from wage and salary awards, the excess of expenditure over estimate was \$11 048 000. Of this amount, \$1 500 000 was the State's share of the cost of the beef industry assistance programme and the balance, \$9 548 000, comprised the effects of price increases on the costs of goods and services purchased by Government departments and the cost of new initiatives not included in the original Budget proposals.

Receipts for the year amounted to \$828 985 000, and exceeded by \$66 340 000 the original estimate, which is taken to include the \$6 000 000 expected from the Australian Government. The greater part of the excess was in the area of payments from the Australian Government, which were \$38 252 000 greater than the original estimate. Whilst the special grant of \$6 000 000 was not received, the operation of the financial assistance grant formula produced significantly more than expected, a special allocation was made to all States in February at the Premiers' Conference, and the arrangements for the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways to the Australian Government

included grants of \$26 434 000, of which \$20 000 000 was in respect of the 1974-75 financial year. State taxation revenues exceeded estimate by \$15 277 000, due principally to the introduction of franchise taxes on the sale of petroleum and tobacco products and to the effects of rapidly rising wage and salary levels on the liability of employers for pay-roll tax. Public undertakings returned \$6 159 000 more than estimate, with the major variations being in the operations of the Railways Department (\$7 830 000 above estimate) and the water supply undertaking, which fell short of estimate by \$1 908 000. Departmental fees and recoveries was the other area to show a significant variation from estimate, with an excess of \$6 628 000. Payments by the Australian Government for education and health purposes and greater revenues from hospital fees were the major factors in this case.

To this point I have dealt in very broad terms with the most significant influences on the 1974-75 Budget. I shall now attempt to give more detail.

#### RECEIPTS

In summary, the variations from estimate were as follows:

	Estimate	
	\$	
Taxation . . . . .	15 277 000	above
Public undertakings . . . . .	6 159 000	above
Recoveries of debt services . . . . .	110 000	above
Departmental fees and recoveries . . . . .	6 628 000	above
Territorial . . . . .	86 000	below
Australian Government . . . . .	38 252 000	above
	<hr/>	
	\$66 340 000	above

Taxation: The revaluation of part of the State had a rather greater impact on land tax receipts than had been expected and resulted in the final figure exceeding estimate by \$916 000. Stamp duties receipts, on the other hand, were \$3 993 000 below estimate. In presenting the Budget to the House last year, I mentioned that there were indications of some stabilisation in the volume and value of land transactions and that receipts from stamp duties on conveyances were therefore expected to increase at a much slower rate than previously. Stamp duty on mortgages was expected to follow a similar pattern. In fact, the difficulties being experienced in the real estate market proved to be more severe than had been expected, and revenue from these two sources fell well short of estimate. Actual revenue from succession duty was \$2 135 000 above estimate. This resulted from a marked increase in the number of estates assessed, higher values of estates generally, and the receipt of duty from some very large estates. There was virtually no increase over 1973-74 in receipts from gift duty. The number of returns lodged did not come up to expectations, and consequently revenue was \$253 000 below estimate. Receipts from pay-roll tax were naturally influenced by the rapid increases in wage and salary rates that took place during the year, and exceeded the original estimate by \$7 426 000. When it became apparent early in the year that there was every prospect of a very large deficit on revenue account if no action were taken, the Government introduced business franchise taxes based on sales of petroleum and tobacco products. The taxes operated from late March and early April, 1975, and were expected to yield about \$11 000 000 in 1974-75. Actual receipts from the taxes were \$6 836 000 in the case of petroleum products and \$1 393 000 in the case of tobacco products. Nothing was included for either levy in the Budget papers, so the full amounts represent collections not expected at the beginning of the year. Receipts from the petroleum franchise were below estimate

because of the failure of one company to pay duty, the adoption by the Government of a slightly narrower definition of petroleum products, and the fact that no reliable statistics were available at the time on which to estimate the likely tax base. Sales of tobacco products actually exceeded expectations but revenue fell short of estimate because some second quarter payments were not received in time to include in the 1974-75 receipts.

**Public Undertakings:** The Marine and Harbors Department received \$211 000 less than estimated in 1974-75, due almost entirely to the necessity to credit to a deposit account fees from the registration of small boats, consequent upon amendments to the Boating Act. Commercial earnings were very close to estimate. Slaughtering charges imposed by the Produce Department were increased substantially in September, 1974, and this, together with a large increase in the throughput of cattle, caused revenue to exceed estimate by \$438 000. Railway receipts were above estimate to the extent of \$7 830 000. Fare increases were introduced from February 1, 1975, after freight rates across a wide range had been raised on December 1, 1974. The main factors leading to the large excess, however, were the heavy carriage of grain and a very marked decline in the volume of outstanding accounts, following a determined effort on the part of the department to ensure prompt payment by debtors. Engineering and Water Supply Department receipts fell \$1 908 000 short of estimate. Charges for excess water were a little higher than expected, but the effect of this was more than offset by a big increase in the volume of outstanding accounts.

**Departmental Fees and Recoveries:** The most significant variations from estimate in this section occurred in receipts related to education and health services. At the beginning of the year it was expected that the State would receive \$250 000 outstanding from a previous triennium under tertiary education arrangements. A claim was forwarded to the Australian Government in the second half of the year but no reply had been received by June 30. Of far greater significance, however, were the extra amounts received for other education purposes. The largest of these were \$1 043 000 on the recommendation of the Schools Commission, \$853 000 under various schemes for technical and further education, and \$263 000 under the childhood services programme. Receipts on account of hospital services exceeded estimate by \$2 069 000. Within this total the largest factor was the variation in patients' fees which arose from a higher occupancy rate than expected and higher charges in mental health institutions and nursing homes following pension increases. Expenditure on domiciliary care was well in excess of estimate, and this led to higher contributions by the Australian Government. On the other hand, delays in capital projects under community health schemes resulted in recurrent expenditures and consequent recoveries falling well below estimate. Hospital and pharmaceutical benefit receipts were both affected by the higher than expected bed occupancy, and receipts from pharmaceutical benefits also increased in line with price rises. The maintenance of tuberculosis patients proved to be considerably more costly than expected, and receipts under the tuberculosis scheme rose correspondingly.

**Australian Government:** There were two separate factors that influenced the size of the financial assistance grant. The first of these was the rapid increase in wage and salary levels, and the second was the influx of people

following the Darwin cyclone. Both raised the level of the grant by virtue of their effects on the elements of the formula. Additional financial assistance grants were received for two quite separate and distinct purposes. At a special Premiers' Conference in February, South Australia received an extra \$6 616 000 as its share of revenue funds made available to the States by the Australian Government for employment generating purposes. Then, as part of the arrangements for the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways to the Australian Government, a further \$10 000 000 was paid to the State to be used for general budgetary purposes. The special grant paid to the State was also \$10 000 000 above estimate. An advance grant of \$15 000 000 had been recommended by the Grants Commission for 1974-75, and in the normal course a completion grant for that year would have been recommended and paid in 1976-77. As part of the arrangements for the cessation of claimancy by South Australia, it was agreed that a completion grant of \$10 000 000 in respect of 1974-75 would be paid immediately.

#### PAYMENTS

In the form in which the Budget is now prepared, the built-in allowance for future wage and salary awards is not distributed over departments but shown as a special item. It is inevitable, therefore, that actual expenditure by individual departments will exceed estimate at a time when wage and other costs are rising rapidly. In 1974-75 expenditure under all Ministerial heads was greater than the figures shown on the Budget papers at the beginning of the year, but it must be borne in mind that, where wage and salary costs are involved, part of the over-spending at least was provided for in the round lump sum allowance for future wage and salary awards. The following is a brief explanation of the major areas of difference.

**Special Acts:** Expenditure under special appropriations was the one major area of under-spending in the Budget. The transfer to the Highways Fund was \$1 695 000 below estimate, due principally to the increase in the costs of operating the Highways Department and the motor registration branch of the Transport Department. Other costs deducted from motor taxation before the transfer to the fund were also greater than expected. Interest payments on the public debt were \$1 362 000 below estimate as a direct consequence of the decision of the Australian Government not to float public loans early in the financial year. Much of the borrowing for the Loan programme took place in the latter half of the year, and the first instalment of interest will fall due early in 1975-76.

**Chief Secretary:** Expenditure by the Police Department was \$4 180 000 above estimate. The cost of wage and salary awards was responsible for \$3 420 000 of this, and most of the balance flowed from price increases, bonus payments over the Christmas period, and a rapid and substantial change in the relationship between the prices that the department was obliged to pay for motor vehicles and the prices that it could negotiate for trade-ins. Price increases were responsible for part of the extra expenditure of \$915 000 by the Correctional Services Department, but award costs of \$713 000 were the main cause.

**Minister of Lands:** Award costs of \$888 000 more than accounted for the excess expenditure by the Lands Department. In the "Minister of Lands—Miscellaneous" section, however, two special factors influenced expenditure. Late in the year the Australian Government agreed to assist

the States to make concessional loans to beef producers affected by the difficult market situation. South Australia's obligation under the programme was \$1 500 000, and this amount, which will attract an equal contribution from the Australian Government, was paid into a trust fund. Expenditure on natural disaster relief was much higher than the sum originally appropriated, because of the unexpected severity of the Murray Valley floods. Money was spent primarily on emergency works on embankments to protect public assets. Included were grants to local authorities for this purpose.

**Minister of Works:** The cost of wage and salary awards to the Engineering and Water Supply Department was \$2 751 000. Maintenance costs for tanks and pumping stations in the metropolitan area also contributed to increased expenditure by the department, as did higher costs for goods and services generally and the cost of treating water supplies in the very hot summer weather. The River Murray Commission required a much higher contribution than had been expected towards the costs of operating and maintaining the Murray River locks, while the cost of electricity for pumping through the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline and from the Eyre Peninsula basins was somewhat greater than estimated. Following the February Premiers' Conference, the Government embarked on a deliberate policy of expanding its maintenance and repair activities in order to provide as many employment opportunities as possible. This led to considerable over-spending by the Public Buildings Department both in direct wage costs and through payments to contractors. Rising price levels had their effect here as in other departments, while wage and salary awards cost \$1 270 000.

**Minister of Education:** Expenditure by the Education Department exceeded estimate by \$26 601 000. Of this sum \$22 887 000 was needed to meet the cost of wage and salary awards, the extension of leave loading to teachers, new rates for contract cleaners, higher allowances for student teachers, increases granted to ancillary staff, greater accrued leave payments to former staff members, and other salary payments beyond estimate. Higher prices and a higher level of activity in certain programmes supported by the Australian Government led to provisions for contingency items being exceeded. In the "Minister of Education—Miscellaneous" section, expenditure on early childhood care services from Australian Government funds proved to be somewhat greater than expected, and a special allocation of \$100 000 was made to the South Australian Institution for the Deaf and Blind to assist with that organisation's budgetary difficulties.

**Minister of Transport:** Apart from the cost of wage and salary awards, which amounted to \$503 000, the principal area of over-spending in the Transport Department was in the Motor Registration Branch. The allowance in the original Budget for the cost of decentralisation and reorganisation of this function proved much too low, and additional cost was also incurred in replacing card punching equipment that had reached the end of its effective life. Excess expenditure of \$1 041 000 by the Highways Department was more than accounted for by wage and salary awards. Price increases, particularly for steel, were the biggest single factor in the additional expenditure by the Railways Department on contingency items, although certain work not included in the August Budget, such as the re-wheeling of freight vehicles, was undertaken. Wage and salary awards cost the department \$3 510 000.

**Minister of Community Welfare:** Expenditure by the Community Welfare Department exceeded estimate by \$1 773 000. As in past years, the Government adjusted scales of financial assistance in accordance with changes in pensions and benefits paid by the Australian Government, and this was largely responsible for State welfare payments being \$661 000 above the amount originally appropriated. The cost of wage and salary awards was \$1 162 000. The extent of the increase in water rates and local government rates was rather greater than estimated at the beginning of the year, and this resulted in the programme of remissions to pensioners being significantly more costly than expected. As a consequence, expenditure from miscellaneous lines was \$345 000 above estimate.

**Minister of Health:** The cost of wage and salary awards to the Hospitals Department was \$15 106 000. Price increases on contingency items also helped to push up the costs of operation, but savings due to a slower rate of progress in the community health programme and a higher level of vacancies than had been planned offset these factors to some extent and kept excess expenditure by the department to a figure of \$13 008 000. During the course of the year, it was necessary to allocate additional funds to a number of organisations providing health services to the community. Wage and salary awards affected these bodies to the extent of \$5 515 000 but, in addition, there were extra calls on Government funds for emergency assistance grants to nursing homes, the cost of transport of pensioner and indigent patients, and the completion of the Regency Park centre by the Crippled Children's Association. In total, the "Minister of Health—Miscellaneous" section required an extra \$6 083 000.

The clauses of the Bill are in the normal form. Clause 1 gives the short title. Clause 2 authorises the issue and application of such a further sum as will, together with the sums authorised by Supply Acts, amount to \$812 317 000. Clause 3 (1) appropriates the sum of \$812 317 000 for the purposes set out in the schedule. Clause 3 (2) provides in the normal way that, if increases of salaries and wages become payable by the State or by a prescribed establishment pursuant to any determination made by a wage-fixing authority, the Governor may appropriate additional funds by warrant.

Clause 3 (3) provides that, if the costs incurred by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for electricity for pumping water should be greater than the amounts set down in the Estimates, the Governor may appropriate the funds for the additional expenditure. Clause 3 (4) defines a "prescribed establishment". Clause 4 authorises the Treasurer to pay money from time to time up to the amount set down in monthly orders issued by the Governor and provides that the receipts obtained from the payees shall be the discharge to the Treasurer for the moneys paid. Clause 5 authorises the use of Loan funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Australian Government and the General Revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorised by clause 3.

Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1975. Clause 7 authorises the expenditure of \$11 500 000 from the Hospitals Fund during 1975-76, and of \$4 000 000 in the early months of 1976-77, pending the passing of the Appropriation Bill for that year. Clause 8 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly authorised. I commend the Bill to the consideration of members.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

## AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION CONVENTION

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer):  
I move:

That whereas the Parliament of South Australia by joint resolution of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly adopted on September 26 and September 27, 1972, appointed 12 members of the Parliament as delegates to take part in the deliberations of a convention to review the nature and contents and operation of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia and to propose any necessary revision or amendment thereof and whereas the convention has not concluded its business now it is hereby resolved:

- (1) That all previous appointments (so far as they remain valid) of delegates to the convention shall be revoked;
- (2) That for the purposes of the convention the following 12 members of the Parliament of South Australia shall be appointed as delegates to take part in the deliberations of the convention: the Hon. J. D. Corcoran, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Dr. B. C. Eastick, Mr. S. G. Evans, Mr. T. M. McRae, Mr. R. R. Millhouse, the Hon. R. G. Payne, Dr. D. O. Tonkin, the Hon. D. H. L. Banfield, the Hon. J. C. Burdett, the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, and the Hon. C. J. Sumner;
- (3) That each appointed delegate shall continue as a delegate of the Parliament of South Australia until the House of which he is a member otherwise determines notwithstanding a dissolution or a prorogation of the Parliament;
- (4) That the Premier for the time being, as an appointed delegate (or in his absence an appointed delegate nominated by the Premier), shall be the leader of the South Australian delegation;
- (5) That where, because of illness or other cause, a delegate is unable to attend a meeting of the convention, the leader may appoint a substitute delegate;
- (6) That the leader of the delegation from time to time make a report to the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council on matters arising out of the convention, such report to be laid on the table of each House;
- (7) That the Attorney-General provide such secretarial and other assistance for the delegation as it may require;
- (8) That the Premier inform the Governments of the Commonwealth and the other States of this resolution.

The purpose of this motion is to enable members of this Parliament to continue to work with members of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth and the other States as delegates to a convention which was established to review the nature and contents and operation of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia and to propose any necessary revision or amendment thereof.

On September 26 and 27, 1972, this Parliament adopted a joint resolution that it should join in such a convention and appointed 12 of its members as delegates to it. Eight delegates were members of this House and four were appointed by the Legislative Council. This motion is to substantially the same effect as the joint resolution adopted in September, 1972.

Paragraph (1) revokes previous appointments to the convention. Paragraph (2) appoints 12 delegates of the South Australian Parliament to the convention, and Paragraph (3) sets out the terms of office of delegates. Paragraph (4) appoints the Premier for the time being, so long as he is a member of the delegation, as leader of the South Australian delegation. Paragraph (5) enables substitute delegates to be appointed at short notice when an appointed delegate is unable to attend a meeting of the convention. Paragraph (6) provides that the delegation will report to Parliament periodically on matters

arising out of the convention. Paragraph (7) provides for secretarial and other assistance for the delegation, and Paragraph (8) requires the Premier to inform the Governments of the Commonwealth and the other States of this resolution.

The second plenary session of the convention is scheduled to be held in Melbourne on September 24 to 26, 1975, and an arrangement has been made for eight delegates to represent the full delegation at the Melbourne session; that is, four delegates from this House and four delegates from the Legislative Council, which has assured me that it can keep itself working with four members absent.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I second the motion and support it. I think that the arrangements that have been made and referred to by the Premier are a little unfortunate, inasmuch as I believe that a full delegation should have been able to attend the convention. Nevertheless, if that is the decision that has been made by the Government, there is little we can do about it. I think the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention should be reported to the House, and I suggest that steps be taken to do that as often as possible, and not as infrequently as now is the case. I support the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the motion. It seems to me that the Commonwealth Government has lost some interest in this Constitutional Convention. From the inquiries I have made and the reports which have come to me, the Commonwealth Government has sought to use it as a vehicle for some of its own political ends, unsuccessfully, but it seems to me to have lost a certain amount of interest in it, and it seems also that the State Government has lost interest in it, as it is pressing the sittings of the House into what seems to be an unreasonably short period, and it is not even willing to let the House rise for a week so that the full delegation can attend the conference. Be that as it may, I have no objection to the terms of motion. The House is well aware that the Government saw fit in my absence to push me off as a delegate. However, that is past history, but it indicates the way this Government is prepared to operate. I am pleased to support the Leader in his remarks on this motion.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

Motion carried.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

## PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 27. Page 524.)

First schedule.

Public Buildings, \$107 500 000.

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Education give me some information regarding the expenditure of money during this financial year in relation to major additions at Barmera, Berri, and Waikerie Primary Schools?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): The library resource centre at Waikerie Primary School has an estimated escalated cost of \$69 000. Stage 1 of Barmera Primary School has an estimated escalated cost of \$690 000, but it is not expected that all of that money will be expended in the current financial year,

because it is expected it will be necessary to delay the tender target by about two months. I have no specific information for the honourable member on the Berri school, but I will get it for him.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I have been led to believe that the Beachport school was to be a completely new school and that the land and the site had been chosen. As it appears under "major additions", I will seek information concerning that school.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It was originally intended to have a complete replacement of the existing school. We are having to look closely at all propositions for replacement. Absolute priority must be given in those areas where new schools are required because none exist and new developments are taking place. This is an unfortunate situation for those people who are expecting considerable upgrading or complete replacement. The information I have is that we will be spending about \$201 000 on the Beachport programme. I cannot say when this portion of the programme will be completed, but certainly not before the next calendar year.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It seems a rather quaint way of listing to show that a replacement school at Nuriootpa is listed as a major addition. I take it new schools are those constructed where no school has previously existed. As construction has started, can the Minister say when that school is likely to be completed? Also, the Minister is aware of the transport problem because of a delegation which waited on him. If there is any information on that matter, I should like to have it as soon as it is available.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The earliest that the new school would be ready is the beginning of the third term in 1976, and possibly the beginning of the 1977 calendar year. The honourable member did introduce a deputation from Nuriootpa regarding transport. We made arrangements for the council and the people involved in the school, through the consultants who have been retained, to speak to the planning people at the Education Department, and that has proceeded. Whether the discussions have taken place I do not know. I understand that contact had been made between Wallman and Partners and my officers for the discussions to go on. As soon as I have any specific report, I will let the honourable member have it.

Dr. EASTICK: I seek information in relation to the sums of money to be put into further education. I notice specifically that for planning and design it is proposed that additional moneys be made available for the Gawler Adult Education Centre. I know that most adult education centres seem to be utilised to promote, or in the main be the centre of, a philosophy or a type of education; so, the trade school for motor mechanics, I think, is at Kilkenny, and the electrical school is at Findon, or somewhere in that general area. It has been promoted, I believe to the Minister or to the department, over a period of time, that the Gawler Adult Education Centre should be recognised, as it already is, as the centre for training in the wine industry—to be developed not to the stage where it is comparable to the oenology course that Roseworthy Agricultural College provides to the senior technical assistants but to deal with how to serve wines and promote wines, and in total to give a complete course for persons engaged in the wine industry.

It has also been suggested that the Gawler Adult Education Centre should be a centre for training for the promotion of tourism. The wine course, conducted in conjunction with a course in tourism, would enable people to service the tourist industry. I would be

interested to know whether the concept put forward on behalf of the Gawler Adult Education Centre has been accepted and whether the Government is actively promoting the two lines of interest I have referred to. The Minister may not know that the Gawler Adult Education Centre was the first further education centre to be developed outside the metropolitan area using free-standing buildings. That centre fulfils a vital role not only in Gawler but also for the Mid North area of the State.

The member for Kavel referred to Nuriootpa Primary School, which I believe could be an excellent site for future adult education centre activities. Courses currently provided by the Gawler centre are being conducted in Nuriootpa in church halls and centres other than those directly associated with the Education Department. The primary school at Nuriootpa does not now lend itself to providing adult education classes. I would therefore be interested to know now or later whether the department has considered the extent to which the current Nuriootpa Primary School could be modified for later use for this purpose.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will take up the honourable member's suggestion with the department. Not having had an opportunity to visit the school, I do not know to what extent the school consists of solid-construction buildings or transportable buildings. I point out that transportable classrooms will be at a premium in the current financial year, and it will not be possible for the department to leave any surplus capacity lying around, because there will be a strong demand elsewhere for them. I will look at the honourable member's suggestion which, at first blush, is worth while. The emphasis in the expanded Gawler Further Education Centre will be on rural studies, including viticulture. Provision will be made for a new craft block, library resources centre, staff-student centre, and wine production area. The Further Education Department intends to expand the concept of the centre from one which serves specifically the needs of Gawler to one which serves the needs of the whole Barossa Valley area, including its major production base.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: An allocation of \$860 000 has been made to start work on what I understand should be a completely revised building scheme for Magill Junior Primary School. I compliment the Government for making the money available for this project, although the money is long overdue. The school council thought work was to commence about three years ago on the school. Earlier this year the former Minister of Education (Hon. Hugh Hudson) visited the school. Can the Minister say what work will be carried out with the money provided, when the work will commence, and whether tenders have yet been called? I notice that construction work on various schools includes Samcon buildings. I understand that Demac units, which are cheaper, are considered to be better construction units than are Samcon units, so will the Minister say why some schools are still being constructed using Samcon units and not Demac units?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I understood that the Magill Junior Primary School project was to go to tender at the end of June this year. I do not know whether tenders were called. The programme for construction at the school was that facilities would have been available for the beginning of the third term in 1976. I will get more specific information for the honourable member. Concerning the relative merits of Demac and Samcon, perhaps the Minister of Works would be better able to answer that than I would be, because his department services the Education Department. Account is

taken of the suitability of buildings used in terms of the existing school and the surrounding areas. In some cases the local community puts considerable pressure on the Government to provide a certain type of facility, because of the speed in providing the facility, even though people in the community would ideally prefer to wait a few months and get something which, architecturally, would be more desirable.

Mr. BLACKER: Under the line "Hospital buildings—preliminary investigations and design", can the Minister of Works say whether, in view of the investigations and design work that have been undertaken, any of these funds apply to Port Lincoln Hospital? As there is no specific line for extensions to that hospital, I wonder to what extent the Government intends to proceed with its investigations and whether the allocation under this line is for that purpose?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): As I do not know whether Port Lincoln Hospital is included in the funds allocated in this line, I will check out the matter with the Minister of Health and let the honourable member know the outcome of that inquiry.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The reference to Loxton school in the provision for major additions to primary and junior primary schools relates to completion of the new primary school recently built in the area and, likewise, under the line "Area schools—major additions" the reference to the Lameroo school relates to the completion of the project at that school? What new work is intended at Loxton High School because, apart from the assembly hall, I am not aware of any work in progress or intended for the school?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I cannot give the honourable member any more specific information on that matter except that it could relate to money that has not been spent on the assembly hall, because the escalated cost is \$493 000. I imagine that sum is the carry-over figure for this year.

Mr. ALLEN: What project is to be carried out at Quorn?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will get that information for the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: What is the Government's programme regarding the proposed new school at Ceduna? I understand that the Minister met a deputation from that school. I have received a letter from the Secretary of the school committee expressing concern about the Government's plans to build the school in stages. I know that there is a large financial involvement in this school, but the conditions at the school are fairly poor.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is true that the honourable member arranged for a deputation to come from Ceduna to see me in the House earlier this week. I think those people have been able to get over effectively the problems which are faced in what are different conditions at Ceduna, perhaps even more difficult because of the extremes of climate that exist in those more northern latitudes. I undertook to give those people, through their member, some more specific indication than I was able to do at the time as to when we might start the project. Planning has proceeded for some time, although it is not expected that full documentation will be completed until towards the end of this calendar year.

It is still not possible to give an exact starting time because of the review we are having to take in relation to replacement programmes. I can only repeat what I said

earlier that we have to give absolute priority to those areas where no school exists, despite the demand for one; the replacement programmes will have to wait a little longer. Despite that, I am fully aware of the problems that exist at Ceduna. I give the honourable member an undertaking (as I gave to the people from his district) that as soon as we have a specific prediction it will be made available. I point out that I have now checked on the matter raised yesterday by the member for Millicent, and that is a replacement programme; total replacement is going on under the tender that was let recently.

Mr. RUSSACK: In Parliamentary Paper 11A Moonta School is listed under the major completed works for 1974-75. In Parliamentary Paper II, on page 11, major additions to the Moonta school are mentioned. Will further major additions be built at Moonta and, if so, what will they be, or is this a continuation of the previous work?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I think the honourable member's second conclusion must be correct because I have no information of any additional facilities being provided there soon.

Mrs. BYRNE: As the member for a developing area where the population is continuing to increase, with the need for new schools or additions to existing schools, I have examined the school building section of the Loan Estimates with interest. I am pleased to note that, under "Major works in progress", money has been allocated to continue the building of the Holden Hill North Primary School, St. Agnes Primary School, and the Modbury South Special School. I am also pleased to see that the Fairview Park Primary School (stage 1) has been included in the list of works to be commenced during 1975-76; I was glad to receive from the Minister this week an assurance that this work would be proceeded with. I also notice that work on the Highbury Junior Primary School, Modbury South Junior Primary School and Modbury West Junior Primary School is included under this heading.

In the section relating to major projects for which planning and design has been proposed during 1975-76, Redwood Park Primary School, Modbury High School, and Modbury Heights High School have been included. I was disappointed to notice that the Modbury High School additions have been included only in the planning and design section, because for some time now it has been intended to provide a standard two-storey building at the school to house a library, resource centre, language laboratory, and facilities for other special purposes. I ask the Minister whether, during his term of office, he will examine this matter with a view to these additions being included in the works to be commenced next year.

Mr. Evans: He won't have time.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As I intend to have an extremely long term of office, I can assure the honourable member there will be plenty of elbow room for that to happen. I cannot indicate definitely when the additions to the Modbury High School will be available. Documentation on the project is complete, but it is not possible at this stage for me to give a date for work commencement. I will certainly keep in mind the vigorous representations the honourable member has made this afternoon. I will see what we can do. Of course, the project falls within the general ambit of the statement I made earlier that first priority must go to those areas where no school exists at all.

Mr. BOUNDY: What is the situation regarding Two Wells school, which is one of the oldest primary schools still in use? I imagine that a new school is due. Will there

be a new school or have the plans been changed because of the difficulties being experienced by the department? People in the Yorketown district appreciate the work being done on the new area school. Is the project going according to schedule, and what is the suggested occupation date?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will get that information for the honourable member. I cannot promise an early start for the Two Wells school. I appreciate the fact that this is an old school in need of modernisation that should ideally take place, but I think it is unlikely we can get going on that work quickly.

Mr. GUNN: What is the position relating to the upgrading of facilities at the Wirrulla and Haslam schools in view of the fact that the plans for Miltaburra school have now been shelved? Work on Miltaburra and Karcultaby schools has been planned for years, and work on Karcultaby school is now due to start at any time. Now that plans for the school at Miltaburra have been shelved, there is an urgent need to upgrade facilities that have been allowed to run down, particularly at Wirrulla and Haslam. What has the Minister in mind?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I cannot promise Karcultaby to be available before mid-way through 1976. However, I will keep in mind the statements the honourable member has made about upgrading the other two schools, and I will get a costing on it from the department.

Mr. COUMBE: I assume the Minister knows the history relating to the plans for a co-educational high school at Nailsworth. The new school will replace the old Nailsworth school in my district and it will serve children from the Districts of Florey, Gilles and Ross Smith, as well as from my own district. This project has been talked about for eight to 10 years and recently the previous Minister was roasted severely when he attended a meeting at Nailsworth, and he gave a definite undertaking regarding the matter that the additions now envisaged at the boys school would become co-educational, relieving pressure on the existing primary school. Is the Minister able to say when this work, which has been approved, will proceed?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Not absolutely. It is part of the expected programme that the school will be available probably at the beginning of the 1977 school year, but until the review which I have ordered on all programmes has been completed I cannot give the honourable member a cast-iron assurance. However, on present thinking we would go into a programme that would enable it to be available some time early in the 1977 school year.

Mr. ALLISON: Does the \$80 000 allocated for the Mount Gambier courthouse indicate that delays are contemplated or is the completion and opening of this building imminent?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Completion is on schedule, and this amount refers to the whole of this financial year in which no doubt outstanding payments will be required.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister indicate what building work is to be done at police divisional headquarters and also for the local police at Nuriootpa?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain this information.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: How is the money allocated for Yatala Labour Prison to be spent?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain that information.

Mr. EVANS: What criteria are used to decide in which areas school dental clinics will be built?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This is a problem because we are trying to provide a service that will eventually cover all the State. In the interim there may be a school with a clinic and another, 3 kilometres away, without one, and this situation generates some resentment among parents at the school without the facility. However, it is necessary to concentrate services at one school if we are to do the job properly. Generally, the availability of dental services in an area is affected by several factors, such as the distance to the dentist, and how well-off are the people living in the area with regard to their capacity to pay for the dental care of their children.

Mr. Venning: It sounds like the means test!

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Not at all, but these things are considered. I do not deny that anomalies will occur and it is not possible for me to explain why at Reynella South in my district a dental clinic was constructed before one was constructed at O'Sullivan Beach.

Mr. BOUNDY: As an amount of \$450 000 has been allocated to the Two Wells Primary School, is work to be done at this school during this financial year?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This amount refers to work in progress but, as I do not know when it will be completed, I will obtain that information.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Works say whether the \$100 000 allocated to Parliament House is to complete work now in progress, and can he say what was the actual amount spent last year compared to the \$1 250 000 allocated?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain from the Public Buildings Department the amount actually spent during the past financial year. The \$100 000 has been allocated because considerable work remains to be done in the library and kitchen areas. The Government does not intend to do everything that it has been asked to do, but additional staff must be accommodated in the library, and further work must be done in the kitchen.

Mr. VENNING: Regarding dental clinics, the Minister will recall that a few days ago I made a statement to the press regarding the position at Spalding. On July 30, the Minister announced that \$900 000 would be spent on dental clinics throughout the State and in a reply to a question stipulated where they would be established. He announced that 27 clinics would be located in country industrial areas and that 12 or 15 would be located in the metropolitan area. I am concerned about rural country areas where there are no dental clinics and where only few mobile clinics operate. When will dental clinics be established in country areas such as Mount Remarkable and Spalding? I understand that some people in these towns have never seen a dental clinic, whereas plenty of dentists are available in country industrial areas and in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am astounded at the honourable member's assumption that the country dental clinics are predominantly located in industrial areas. The honourable member's figures are correct overall, but, if he wants a crutch with which to remember them, I point out that the total number of clinics is equal to the number of books in the Old Testament; those in country areas are equal to the number of books in the New Testament; and those in the metropolitan area are equal to the number of Apostles. Although I am unable to give an unqualified assurance regarding the provisions of these facilities in the honourable member's own district, I will take up this matter with the Minister of Health, who has some part in this whole scheme. It is up

to the department to allocate these clinics in terms of the general guidelines which have been laid down and which have been operating ever since the programme commenced. That means that some areas will have to wait and some areas will be fortunate enough to get them earlier. We hope that we can extend the programme throughout the whole State as soon as possible.

Dr. EASTICK: The sum of \$174 000 is to be spent on the Agriculture Department's research centre. Work associated with research into the fruit industry must be undertaken. Earlier, there was a need for refrigeration facilities so that the department could undertake research into the storing of apples and pears. Does the Government expect that the department and many of its activities will be maintained at Northfield, notwithstanding some future decision that might be made to site it at that mythical place called Monarto?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The building will be put to use, irrespective of whether the department is moved to Monarto; the department's headquarters will continue to be used.

Mr. Dean Brown: What for?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I cannot recall the exact purpose, it is for a specific purpose of research. I am unable to say whether it will be for apples, pears or chickens, but I will ascertain the reason for the honourable member. The facility will continue in use irrespective of where the department is located.

Mr. GUNN: I see no reference to the proposed new Emergency Fire Services headquarters building to be located at Keswick. I have been approached by the Eyre Peninsula Fire Fighting Association, which has expressed concern about this matter.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Keneally): Order! I point out that the honourable member must not ask questions about projects that are not listed in the Estimates.

Mr. GUNN: What is the present position with regard to this new headquarters building?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The sum of \$800 000 was set aside at the time the building of the headquarters at Keswick was approved, but the whole matter of fire services in the State is still to be discussed in Cabinet. Two inquiries have been held into this fairly complex matter, and a decision on the building of the new headquarters is being deferred until we decide on the future of the State's entire fire services. I, too, am well aware of the displeasure that has been expressed, particularly in country areas, about any possibility of the E.F.S. being included in any other group, but no decision has been taken on this matter. Until a decision is made, nothing will be done about the new building at Keswick.

Mr. RUSSACK: I understand that approval has been given for a police residence to be built at Riverton. When will work on the building of this new residence commence?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I am not aware offhand when it is likely to commence, I shall let the honourable member know.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Can the Minister say how much money is being spent and what construction is involved with regard to the Millicent North school? Under the item "Preliminary Investigations and Design", a sum of \$1 300 000 is provided. Is money being drawn from this sum for the Kingston school? It is hoped the school will be able to be used some time this year. If this

sum is to be spent from the allocation for "Preliminary Investigations and Design", I do not think that we will see much of the Kingston school next year.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is expected that the estimated escalated costs for additions to the Millicent North school, amounting to \$240 000, will be made available some time towards the end of the 1976 calendar year. I think I should get a more strict account of the situation at the other school than give the honourable member a reply off the cuff.

Mr. WOTTON: I refer to the line dealing with major additions to schools, in which the Strathalbyn school is referred to. I presume this relates to Strathalbyn Primary School, the conditions at which, as the Minister is probably aware, are appalling. Indeed, there has been much publicity regarding the appalling conditions of the infants section, particularly in relation to overcrowding and unsatisfactory staff quarters. Will the Minister say when work at the school is expected to commence and how much money is to be allocated to this project?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member is, of course, talking about two projects: on the one hand, the library resource centre and, on the other hand, the general upgrading. I am afraid the latter must be put in the same category as many other works about which we have spoken in Committee in the last couple of days. This is at present in the melting pot because of the review that I have announced. It had been hoped that we could go to tender in October, the project costing about \$160 000. We may still be able to do so. However, I am afraid that I cannot give the member an absolute assurance until the review that I have ordered has been completed.

Mr. VENNING: I refer to the item "New schools". Will the Minister say whether any thought has been given to Port Broughton Area School, which was listed for construction three years ago, when the then Minister said that we would get the school within four years? As I cannot see any reference to the school in the Loan Estimates, I ask the Minister what stage planning has reached regarding it. The school committee would welcome a visit by the Minister, at the earliest opportunity, to inspect the school buildings. As recently as three months ago, a transportable building was placed on the playing area, thereby restricting that area. Various transportable buildings have been brought to the school from throughout the North of the State and, as this is an important and developing area in South Australia, I should like to know what is the position regarding it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Before I ask the Minister to reply, I point out that numerous questions are being asked about projects that are not listed in the Estimates and that, therefore, those questions are out of order. Although one or two of those questions have been allowed, they will not be allowed in future. The Minister can answer this question if he so desires, although I ask members not to ask questions about items that are not included in the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There are no specific plans for upgrading this school and I cannot give any assurance regarding when this may occur. However, I thank the honourable member for his invitation. I expect that, if I accept the invitation, his hospitality will flow without measure.

Mr. BOUNDY: I refer to the allocation of \$174 000 for additions to the Northfield Research Centre. Will the Minister say whether completion work on the insectory and



the growth room, for continuation of research into the biological control of sitona weevil, is included in that allocation?

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

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the allocation of \$317 000 for Magill Home. Unfortunately, it is stated that this is for the upgrading of the home. The Minister of Works may recall that there was a major industrial stoppage at the home in, I think, March, as well as late last year, because of the appalling conditions obtaining there. For those who do not realise it, Magill Home has been an annexe of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and is virtually an old folks home for people who are in an advanced stage of senility and who are sent to Magill, as possibly the last receiving point. If one has seen this place, one will realise quickly that there is no point in trying to upgrade it. Frankly, I believe the \$317 000 will be a complete waste of public funds. A bulldozer needs to be brought in to push all the buildings to the ground, and new buildings erected. I think it is a slight to our community to lock more than 100 old people away in absolutely appalling conditions like those obtaining at Magill, and try to forget them. Has the Minister been there recently?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: More times than you have, probably.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I wonder when the Minister was last out at the home. I have been there more recently than he has and seen 15 or 16 people in a ward being treated, not because of the staff but because of the conditions, almost like animals. There are cracks in the concrete floors, and the inmates must go outside to go to the bathroom or toilet. The dormitories are cold and draughty, and their only cooling facilities comprise a couple of Indian-type fans in the centre of the building.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: When did you last go out there?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In July, about five or six weeks ago. I was there before the election, and in March, too. I was also there late last year. I generally pay one or two visits to the home each year, which is obviously more than the Minister does.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Of course, we haven't got much to do!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Although I realise that, the Minister has time to go to certain high schools in my district. As the Magill Home is as close to his home as the high school that the Minister occasionally visits, why does he not visit the home and see the deplorable conditions in which these people must live? Members of the staff are upset, and have come to see me several times to point out the lack of facilities at their disposal and how it is impossible for them adequately to care for the patients. Will the Minister say what work is planned under this line? Also, why does not the Government bulldoze the lot and start again?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I hope that *Hansard* is not readily available at the Magill Home, to which the honourable member referred as the Magill Old Folks Home. He also used other phrases that, in the circumstances, I can only regard as deplorable. As an example of how much reliance one can place on the honourable member's statements, one can perhaps test his statement that he visited the home more recently than did the Minister. I think those were the words he used.

Mr. Dean Brown: I was referring to the Minister of Works.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is all very well for the member to have a second shot at these things. He is good at that. He is careless in what he says and, when he is caught out, he simply comes up with another answer. Despite what the member for Davenport has said, I have visited the Magill Home recently. The honourable member would know that I was appointed to the Ministry on July 24, and I have visited the home since then. It would therefore seem that, on the first ground, the honourable member is wrong because, according to his own statement, he was there some time early in July. Also, it seems strange to me that, as the honourable member said, although I have visited the home, not a couple of times a year like the honourable member does (indeed I accompanied Mr. Hunter around the whole area for some hours), the honourable member has had approaches from the staff that were not made to me. We live in a democracy, and the staff would have no fear that they could raise with the Minister any matter that concerned them. I do not suggest that everything at the home is 100 per cent, and \$300 000 is being provided because some work needs to be done.

I think I spoke to staff in every building. I also think that the honourable member will agree that in the Beatty ward (I think that is the name) first-class work has been done with an old building. I spoke to inmates at the home and perhaps the honourable member might have found out what they thought if he also had done so. There are plans to continue upgrading the installations, and much care is needed. The new Superintendent (Mr. Hunter) proposes to implement good ideas, and the department and I support him. It is a worthwhile attempt to provide a better standard of care and conditions in the home.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am pleased that the Minister of Community Welfare has been to the home, but he knows that I was referring to the Minister of Works. Surely the Minister of Community Welfare recognises that the facilities fall far short of facilities in any other home for the aged. I compliment the department on what it is trying to do with old facilities, but it is far short of what I consider to be the minimum standard. The conditions are appalling. Some members of the staff have made specific complaints to me, and I am sure that I have spoken to far more patients than the Minister has spoken to.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me particulars of the total cost of completion of the new combination hall at Loxton High School and also particulars of the progress being made on construction of the proposed Meningie Police Station?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mrs. BYRNE: I ask the Minister of Works whether the item "General—Purchase of land and property, \$1 800 000" includes provision for land for a community welfare centre at Modbury or Tea Tree Gully. On August 27, 1974, in a reply to a question I had asked, the then Minister of Community Welfare stated:

The Government is negotiating for the acquisition of a suitable site in the Tea Tree Gully shopping centre for the building of a community welfare centre. Subject to satisfactory completion of these negotiations, design work for the centre will be put in hand.

To the best of my knowledge, these negotiations have not been finalised. This land is ideally suited for a community welfare centre, but land in the middle of the Tea Tree Gully shopping centre is gradually being used for other purposes.

I consider it desirable for the Government to acquire land for a community welfare centre, and in my opinion the Government should acquire land in the area to which I have referred. It is a waste of Government money for departments to occupy rented premises. For instances, the Community Welfare Department now occupies part of a property known as St. Agnes House, on North-East Road, and I understand that the Motor Registration Division probably will occupy another building.

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, I ask whether this matter is in the Loan Estimates papers. You have told other members earlier that they could not raise matters that were not in the papers.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not uphold the point of order. I think the honourable member is within the lines.

Mrs. BYRNE: There is a district office for the member for Tea Tree Gully and, again, that should be in a regional office. I do not know whether the State Government, in conjunction with the Australian Government, has considered providing a regional office to be used by both Governments, but this could be considered. The Australian Government establishes regional offices for the Department of Social Security, the Department of Labor and Immigration, and other departments. Under this line, has land been purchased, or is it proposed to be purchased, for the Modbury Community Centre?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether this piece of land is included in the line, but I will find out for the honourable member what stage the negotiations have reached. It is Government policy that no electorate office shall be located in any Government building.

Mr. BLACKER: Under the line dealing with major additions to high schools, is the allocation for Port Lincoln High School for the commencement of the second stage; if not, for what purpose has this allocation been made?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: There is an allocation of \$285 000 for Somerton Park Dental Therapy School. Is that to complete the project or are further extensions to be made to that building?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is for further extensions.

Line passed.

Environment and Conservation, \$820 000.

Mr. ARNOLD: As regards the purchase of land for national reserves, can the Minister for the Environment say what the present position is in relation to large areas that the Government has indicated it intends to purchase—areas such as the Coffin Bay Peninsula, Pike River, the Gurra Gurra Lakes, and also country stations to the north? What is the overall position in relation to the estimate provided in the Loan Estimates, and also as a result of the recent Commonwealth Budget?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment): I think I have explained, in reply to questions over the last day or two, the doubt currently existing in some of those areas. The honourable member will recall the purchase of land in the Pike River and Gurra Gurra Lakes areas, Coffin Bay, and Morgan Vale; they were all areas that the Commonwealth Government indicated during last year it would be funding for purchase. However, there has been a break-down in that attitude by the Australian Government, in that it has said that, because of its budgetary situation, it would be clearly funding those areas of land that were either purchased, or in respect of which a

contract had been entered into for their purchase, before the end of June; but that any other areas that had not been purchased or in respect of which firm contracts had not been entered into would be subject to further consideration by it. I sent an urgent telegram to the Australian Minister telling him that this left many people in doubt about their future as they had agreed to announce the intention of the Australian Government to buy those areas, and those people should be informed as quickly as possible which of these areas (hopefully, all of them) will be funded by the Australian Government.

I have been informed that we shall get a reply to that in two or three days time; I sent the telegram last Monday and received a reply saying that those decisions would be made within a week. In view of the commitments entered into by the Australian Government, we shall receive substantial help, if not help for all those areas that it indicated it was happy for us to purchase. Until I have clearly from the Australian Government its view, I cannot say which of the remaining areas we shall be able to meet from State funds, either this year or the following year. Suffice it to say that the work done on the projects so far, and the fact that we were able to recommend them to the Australian Government for purchase, would lead to the conclusion that they are desirable areas for national parks, whether they are purchased by Australian Government or State funds; that remains to be seen.

Mr. ARNOLD: Of the areas mentioned, which ones were contracted for prior to June; which ones would the Minister regard as being definite contracts?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is difficult to answer that, as there is likely to be some disagreement between ourselves and the Australian Government on what it means by its terms, but clearly there was a \$52 000 purchase in the Gurra Gurra Lakes area. However, there were some areas of land where we had, as is our normal practice and in the time available to us from the acceptance of the proposals, followed the normal practice—first, to negotiate a price with the owner, because it is preferable for us to come to an amicable agreement about a price rather than take other steps; and certainly those in respect of which money had changed hands, with funds from the State Government to be used temporarily to purchase the land, clearly fitted the criteria indicated to us by the Commonwealth. But there is still room for argument whether or not a contract had been entered into.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister tell me how much more land is to be purchased in the Cherry Gardens and Dorset Vale area for a park? Are the homes on the properties that have been acquired to be destroyed? How much money has been spent on Belair Recreation Park and on the upgrading of the golf course there? Is it near completion, and will it be completed, if ever? Is it intended to demolish Melville House in Belair Recreation Park and replace it with some other building, or merely demolish it? Is it intended to demolish the blue cottage in Belair Recreation Park?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I assume that the honourable member would not expect me to have all that information now. I can provide it to him in relation to Cherry Gardens, but, in respect of the Belair golf course, the upgrading that has taken place has cost more than \$49 000 during last year; and \$60 000 is proposed during this year. This will provide it with at least 12 completed greens, so the course will be completed up to that stage. I am attempting to establish whether, in the interests of the people who would like to use that

course, we can complete all the 18 greens during this current year so that the total project can be completed. There have been some problems with the provision of the fill and the costs involved for the golf course. We required the fill to be supplied by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which delivered the fill as it became available. That is the real reason for the delay. Apart from that, the project is progressing satisfactorily and I hope it will be in use within 12 months. I will get the other information the honourable member seeks.

Mr. MATHWIN: As regards the \$100 000 for beach protection along the foreshore, in 1973-74 and 1972-73 the allocation was \$450 000 a year, making a total of \$900 000 for those two years. The Government then carried out a programme of filling with rip-rap certain sections of beach at Brighton and Glenelg. Coupled with this process was the removal of thousands of tonnes of sand from one area of beach to another to replenish the beach. This was done especially at Somerton and Brighton. Rip-rap is still needed in the Somerton area because some of the houses in the area, because of erosion of the cliff face, are sometimes in danger. I am sure the Minister agrees that more rip-rap should be placed in the area of the new surf-lifesaving building, just north of Repton Road. The rip-rap would not have to be placed right up to road level, but a substantial quantity would have to be used even to go to half that height, and the cost would be great. If this is the type of work to be carried out, little work will be done because only \$100 000 has been provided. Certainly, no money would be left for sand replenishment.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The \$100 000 provided in this line is not the total for the Coast Protection Board: it is simply a sum transferred from Loan Account to the board's trust fund. Under the Coast Protection Act the board has power, which it will exercise as it has done in past years, to raise money by debenture and in other ways. Money raised in this manner will be used to carry out the projects referred to by the honourable member.

Mr. ARNOLD: If the Coffin Bay Peninsula, Gurra Gurra Lake and Pike River basin, along with the Canopus, Hypurna, Morgan Vale and Postmark stations are to be acquired primarily with Commonwealth funds, how does the Government intend to use the \$620 000 allocated for this purpose? I believe the money is there primarily to buy national reserves. Can the Minister indicate what the Government has in mind for those funds?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Without checking to see which areas are being considered, I could not reply to the honourable member. An area of land is to be purchased in the Deep Creek area, and a considerable list of areas to be considered is constantly passing over my desk for reference to the National Parks and Wildlife Service and consideration by the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council. We could spend many times the amount allocated in those areas. The areas to be given a priority this year I do not know, but some of them may have been determined and recommendations made. I will check the areas and inform the honourable member which they are.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister explain why his department's allocation has been reduced from \$1 091 303 to \$820 000 when the country is facing such a high inflation rate and when environment and conservation issues are important in the community? In explaining the Loan Estimates, the Treasurer said absolutely nothing about the environment, conservation, or the Minister's department.

Does this show that the Government has less interest in this field that it espouses? Is it trying to hoodwink the community into believing that it is doing so much in these areas? Can the Minister also tell me whether Acme Shoes, which consists of about 60 hectares of natural bushland at Heathfield, is soon to be acquired by his department as a national park?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I regret that I cannot reply fully to the question about the reduction, but I can assure the honourable member my department's allocation has not been reduced. National parks, which were previously covered by this line, are now included in the Public Buildings line. That accounts for part of the reduction: I cannot say to what extent, but I undertake to find out. When the total picture is known it will be evident that the allocation has actually been increased. I am not sure that the honourable member was serious in saying that the Government was less active in the environmental field than it had been in the past. If he looks at the Budget he will see substantial increases in all environmental activities: it is fair to say that the Government has been expanding those activities rapidly and that the legislative programme for the remainder of this session and for the next year will indicate the Government's sincerity on these matters.

Mr. ARNOLD: The Minister would be well aware why I am interested in the area in which the \$620 000 is to be used, because of the continuous discussion I have had with him concerning Maize Island in the Riverland where the Lands Department has bought out fruitgrowers but has left one landholder on that land. I ask the Minister whether he will further consider this matter when this money is being allocated for various projects. It is an untidy operation for the Lands Department to buy out a complete area, an area that I believe has a certain value as a national park or recreation park, but to leave one landholder who has a freehold title and virtually the entire river frontage to that land.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to keep the matter under review for the honourable member. The honourable member knows that I believe the area would be a useful acquisition for the department but, regrettably, I do not consider it to be of high priority. If funds become available, I will reconsider the matter.

Line passed.

Other Capital Advances and Provisions, \$23 000 000.

Dr. TONKIN: I refer to "Adelaide Children's Hospital, \$1 800 000", and I should like to know what is the state of the building programme and whether it relates to a power house that is being constructed across the road from the hospital or whether other additions are to be made also.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I understand that this is a major programme for which the hospital has been waiting for some time. I understand that all services have been provided and that this is for work that will be commenced or which will be continued this year to complete that phase of the building. A large sum is involved, but this allocation is our share towards the building now. I understand the hospital has about \$4 000 000 to contribute towards the cost of the facility.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

To strike out the item "Monarto Development Commission, \$1 200 000". This line deals with the Monarto Development Commission, a project to which I have the strongest opposition. This

is my opportunity, and I now take it, to move this motion, which is tantamount to a vote of no confidence in the Government. My motion is unlike those which have been moved so far in this debate and which arose out of a situation in this House: this motion is a vote of no confidence on a substantive matter. It is on a matter on which I believe the Government is more vulnerable than on any other matter. I make no secret of the fact—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What does your rank and file say about this?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will tell the Minister what the rank and file says about this. I make no secret of my opposition now to the Monarto project—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has moved to strike out the line "Monarto Development Commission, \$1 200 000" from the vote for other capital advances and provisions. I point out to the Committee that Standing Order 315 (4) provides:

An amendment to omit or reduce any vote, item or line may be moved and members shall speak only to such question until it has been disposed of.

Paragraph (5) provides:

After a question for amending any item or line has been disposed of, no debate or amendment shall be allowed upon any preceding item or line.

Accordingly, if the honourable member proceeds with his amendment, it is in order for members to speak only to the line before the Committee, that is, "Monarto Development Commission", and, on a decision being reached on the proposed amendment, the line "Other capital advances and provisions" will be put without debate on any of the other lines in the vote. In these circumstances, I seek an indication from the honourable member whether he wishes to proceed immediately with his amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not want to cut anyone else out of debate and, provided I do not in any way lose my opportunity to move the motion, because it is one of the last lines under this vote I am willing to wait and allow debate on the other lines before I proceed, if that is in order, so long as I do not lose my chance.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any other member wish to speak on any other matter relating to this line? Will the honourable member for Mitcham withdraw his motion temporarily?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, as long as I can do it only temporarily. I seek leave to do so.

Leave granted; motion withdrawn.

Mr. WARDLE: The Minister is aware that there is some land still to be purchased.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the honourable member for Murray is speaking about Monarto. I must therefore ask him not to continue with his comments.

Dr. EASTICK: Regarding the provision of \$590 000 for gas turbines and associated equipment at Dry Creek, it has been admitted that one of the turbines failed to stand up to testing, and the Minister previously in charge of this matter has said that no final payment will be made until the turbines have proved themselves. Can the Minister say, first, what is the exact position at the Dry Creek station at present; secondly, has the station reached the supply capacity originally planned for it; thirdly, is the whole of the equipment functional; fourthly, is there a continuing dispute about the provision of the turbines; and, finally, has the Government's experience in connection with the turbines and associated equipment caused it to determine any attitude for the future toward this kind of power generation?

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If no-one else wants to ask anything else, I move:

To strike out the item "Monarto Development Commission, \$1 200 000".

Before you stopped me, Mr. Chairman, the Minister for the Environment challenged me to say what the rank and file (I think that is what he called it) of the Liberal Movement thinks about this. The best answer I can give him (even though he is not here now) is to quote from the policy speech that I gave on behalf of the Liberal Movement during the recent election campaign. The policy speech was a considered document, and I know perfectly well that it has already been studied by many members on both sides. The Special Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff has referred to our policy. Nevertheless, to please the Minister for the Environment I shall read the short section of the speech relating to this topic. This is what we said during the recent election campaign, and we stick to it now:

We had increasing doubts about the wisdom and need to establish the new city of Monarto. We have come to the conclusion that the whole project should be stopped now. The Borrie report is the indication that our population growth has slowed sufficiently to make it unnecessary. It is extraordinarily expensive, and no answer for the Government to say that the money comes from the Commonwealth—it doesn't—it comes out of the same pockets—those of the taxpayers.

That has even more point now than when I said it, in view of what the Commonwealth Government has done in its Budget. My policy speech continues:

We know of no significant industry which proposes to establish there. No-one wants to live there. We certainly will not conscript public servants for that purpose. We are against this monument to socialist folly. We realise that this decision will be a severe disappointment to the people of Murray Bridge and the surrounding district. That town itself is well placed for further development. We regard it as a natural centre for growth. We shall encourage it as there is opportunity.

That is still our policy, and I do not resile from it. We have moved on a good deal since then. I do not intend to canvass at any length the arguments for and against Monarto, because I believe that the time for that is past. Events outside our control in South Australia have taken charge and they, in my view, are decisive. I will recite some of the facts and the opinions expressed by Government members, opinions which have been given here and elsewhere that I assume are considered opinions and from which the Government no less than I would resile. These facts and opinions emerged during 1975, and I believe that they make the case for not going on with Monarto but for abandoning it now absolutely unanswerable. On the arguments of opinion on whether we should go on with Monarto, I will mention only three things. First, regarding water and drainage, I refer to the document which, I think, was given to all members at one time or another and which is called the Monarto New Town Report on Proposed Designated Site under the Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Act, 1972. Paragraph 3.1.4, under the heading "Drainage", states:

The Engineering and Water Supply Department investigations indicate that the Murray Plains would require a fully artificial drainage system for urban development. This would be more expensive than a drainage system in the more elevated country with its natural drainage pattern and it would produce the undesirable result of a more direct discharge of stormwater into the Murray River.

That is all we heard. Apparently, everything regarding drainage would be lovely under that report, but what do we

find when we look at the Environmental Study Progress Report issued by the commission in 1975? Page 70 of the report states:

The long-term effect of pumping water from the Murray to supply the town's gardens and vegetation requirements, will be for the water to return to the Murray in a more saline form.

Not a word was mentioned in the earlier document about that, and it is no wonder that Mr. Richardson, the General Manager of the project, was moved to say some time this year that a detailed economic study had not been made. One wonders what detailed studies were made. The following is a quote from a report in the *Advertiser* of May 6:

Monarto chief talks. "The decision to build Monarto was made without any detailed economic analysis of the advantages of the site," Mr. Richardson said last night. "The initial decision to develop Monarto did not involve any detailed economic analysis of the advantages of the site," Mr. Richardson said.

It was, of course, denied by the Premier immediately, so one wonders who to believe—the General Manager of the project or the Premier. The report continues:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) today denied that no economic studies had been carried out before the Monarto site was chosen and planning started.

He goes on with a bit more garbage and ends up:

Mr. Dunstan repeated today that Monarto would go on. I believe that not only was there no economic planning but there was no other adequate planning either. I have referred to that as one of the three matters. The next to which I refer is the brochure put out by the South Australian Council of Social Service, Inc., in March of this year. The title is "Can the people trust the planners?" and the subtitle is "A response to the document 'The social plan for Monarto, Section 1, Methodology' issued by the Social Planning Division of the Monarto Development Commission". I intend to quote only a couple of paragraphs from the preface to that document, as follows:

Our response—

and that is the response to this document I have just mentioned, the one put out by the commission—

is grounded in the over-riding belief that cities are primarily about people—their needs, their aspirations, their lives—not buildings, highways, or tree-lined streets. Therein lies our most important criticism of this planning document, that it is grounded in broad theoretical conceptions and leaves out of consideration the social and political realities of our time—it leaves out the people.

Then they go on with what is a significant paragraph, as follows:

If Monarto is to go ahead (and that in itself must be questionable), then the Monarto Development Commission must re-orient its thinking quickly. This report spells out some of the directions that re-orientation should take. These directions would give Monarto at least some chance of becoming a living city, a diverse and vibrant community. At present it is likely to be either a shining package filled with alienated, frustrated people, or an urban ghetto, of which there are many unfortunate examples overseas.

I think that is out of date now, because there is no question of Monarto going ahead, and members opposite know that, even though they will not admit it. They will admit it soon enough, but they know it will not go on. I merely mention that matter as one area of controversy. The only magnificence that has come out of Monarto so far has been the glossy brochures we get and the staff for whom we have to pay. I give full marks to the commission for the production of its first annual report, which is full of the most marvellous photographs.

Mr. Boundy: The first and the last?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The first and the last, as my friend says. It is a glossy, impressive document, and it shows

no less than nine directors, all of whom have their photographs in the second to back page—an impressive lot of people.

Mr. Venning: Intelligent people?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, they look intelligent; certainly they are being paid well enough. It sets out the staff, right down to the switchboard girls. That is about all we have got from the \$12 000 000 or whatever it is that we have paid so far for Monarto. Let me leave the opinion side of it, because that is past. I believe the die is absolutely cast. I said I would start from 1975, but I must go back, to use the words of the Government itself, just a little bit further than that to what the Treasurer said when he introduced the Loan Estimates 12 months ago. This is the key to the whole thing. At page 374 of *Hansard* the Treasurer set out what was hoped to be done last year and said:

This is a rough measure of the amount which the Government believes can be set aside to support Monarto. The planned development—

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will note this—

can proceed only with the full and continued support of the Australian Government. In the event that this support is not forthcoming to the extent necessary to finance this programme—

and admittedly that was the programme last year, but I think it cannot be argued that the same is true now—the Government will have no alternative but to require the commission to drastically curtail its operations.

That is what the Treasurer said in one of the most considered documents laid before this House, the Loan Estimates last year. I take that as the starting point of the argument I put tonight against going on with Monarto and therefore in favour of chopping out this line in this vote. The next thing to which I refer is the January 20 editorial in the *Advertiser*, that staid and magnificent journal of South Australia. Although we all complain about it from time to time, it gives a fairly balanced view of most things. Headed "Monarto realities", the editorial stated:

Events are conspiring to make the development of Monarto an increasingly difficult proposition at present. The Public Service Association reports sharply increasing antagonism towards the project amongst public servants. A new survey puts opposition in the Lands Department as high as 94 per cent of all staff due for transfer to the new city. The *P.S.A. Review* says that similar hostility exists in a number of other departments.

The editorial later states:

However, in addition to battling with its public servants, the Dunstan Government must now face up to two important new developments.

The first was the drop in the birth rate, which was canvassed extensively in the Borrie report, and the second was the requirement to rebuild Darwin and the need for money for that. These things were self-evident even when that *Advertiser* editorial was written, yet we have a reply from the then Minister in charge of the project (he has been moved since), the Hon. Hopgood.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: "The Hon. Minister", not "The Hon. Hopgood".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Not "The Hon. Hopgood"?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: No, "The Hon. Minister".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, the former Minister in charge of the project. The *Advertiser* of January 27 contained a letter which was a very weak defence of Monarto by the Minister, apparently in reply to the editorial. He wrote:

I wonder whether the present down-turn—

that is the down-turn in the birth rate—

could similarly be allied to our present economic conditions and consequently change again at some future date.

To abandon Monarto on the present birth rate would be to limit the options open to the Government should they revert to their previously high level.

Whether or not they will is something that none of us knows, but apparently the Government is willing to go on spending dollar after dollar, millions of dollars after millions of dollars, on the off-chance that this will happen. Last evening, we heard the maiden speech by the member for Pirie in this place. He was arguing on behalf of his constituents. Of course, it is unusual for a Speaker to have to make a speech at all in this place. He was arguing for something immediate and necessary for his city, not something theoretical and in the future. There would not be too much trouble about meeting some of those requirements.

The member for Fisher also asked for sewerage in his area. I know how he feels about it, because I lived up there myself and tried for 15 or more years to get it for the people of the area. Yet we are wasting money on some theoretical project at Monarto, when we could properly be spending it now on things that are vitally and urgently required. Following that letter, we had an answer to a Question on Notice that I had asked in the House in March. The question I put on notice was the plain, straight-out one, "What is the justification for going on with the new city of Monarto?" The Premier answered it and, in the course of a long answer, which was obviously painstakingly prepared to make the best argument one could make for going on with Monarto, he said (page 2937 of *Hansard*):

The obvious way to relieve these kinds of pressures is to provide an urban alternative, reasonably close to, but outside, the metropolitan area, which can be developed quickly and relatively cheaply—

It is costing \$40 000 a block to service each house site in Monarto.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Where did you get that? You're making things up.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister can give us the figures later and compare the cost to the cost of servicing a block in the metropolitan area or in Murray Bridge.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How did you make it up?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister says that I am telling a lie I challenge him to say I am wrong. I believe from what I have been told that the cost of the infrastructure for each building block in Monarto will be \$40 000. The Premier's reply continued:

on land not of great value for other purposes . . . This will provide a least-cost development which, if proceeded with quickly, will offer the urban alternative which will reduce existing subdivisional pressures on Adelaide.

We now know that it will not be proceeded with quickly. The Premier also stated:

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

I cannot imagine why not. The Premier continued:

Monarto is being planned to accommodate a population of between 25 000 and 35 000 people by 1983 . . .

I do not believe that one member here or anyone else in South Australia believes that that can be attained. During the year we have heard some garbage by way of publicity releases about T.V. telephones being installed in Monarto and we have also heard about a unique education system, an education supermarket, whatever that means. That is about as far as we have got for the money that has been spent on the project. An answer I was given stated that about \$12 600 000 had been spent

on it so far. I think the member for Davenport asked how much the Government had sought from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Dean Brown: It was \$125 000 000 in the next five years, and \$9 200 000 this financial year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was \$9 200 000 this year, out of a total programme being planned for this year of \$10 100 000. Payment to staff will cost \$920 000. That answer was given on August 12. Net expenditure will be \$10 100 000. In reply to me, the Minister stated that it would cost \$12 600 000, of which the Commonwealth Government had paid 79 per cent. Obviously, we cannot get anywhere without Commonwealth Government help. Later the Minister stated that he expected to get \$4 000 000 or \$5 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was \$3 000 000 to \$4 000 000. He talked about a budget of \$4 500 000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What the Minister said on August 12 in answer to the member for Davenport was:

However, a revised programme is under consideration which will involve an expenditure of between \$4 000 000 and \$5 000 000 for 1975-76. This is based on the assumption that the amount requested of the Australian Government will not be received.

What have we got? We got from the Commonwealth not \$4 000 000, let alone \$5 000 000, but \$500 000. We propose to put aside \$1 200 000 under this line (which I hope will be cut out), \$2 000 000 of semi-governmental loans—and we got a paltry \$500 000 from the Commonwealth. It is obvious, as I said in the general debate on this line, that the Commonwealth gave that amount only right at the end, because it is not even put in most of the tables. However, my attention has been drawn by a friend to Budget Paper No. 9, in which it is perfectly clear that the Commonwealth has given no commitment to South Australia for the future. At page 33 of that paper, Mr. Tom Uren says:

In 1972 the South Australian Government established the Monarto Development Commission, and designated 15 400 hectares of land as the site for a growth centre. Some land outside the designated site will be acquired for headworks and recreation purposes—

to the tune of \$500 000, we find out this week from the Minister—

depending on the availability of funds. By the end of 1974-75 over 90 per cent of the land acquisition programme had been completed.

The next sentence is of some significance:

The five-year plan of development to 1979-1980 is currently under review. The Australian Government has agreed to assist the South Australian Government's growth centre initiative at Monarto in the preliminary acquisition, planning and assessment stages.

That is all it has said it will do. The speech continues:

In 1974-75 funds amounting to \$4 100 000 were provided to complete most of the land purchase programme, and further research and development studies. An additional amount of \$1 300 000 relating to commitments entered into in 1973-74, in co-operation with the South Australian Government, was also provided in 1974-75.

There is not a word about any more money from the Commonwealth; \$500 000 is set down there, and that is all we have heard. As we all know, it is impossible for South Australia to proceed with this project without massive Commonwealth help—about four-fifths of the money has so far come from the Commonwealth, as indicated in the Minister's answer to a question asked of him.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When did I say four-fifths?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister said 79 per cent. I am sorry; I am not being entirely accurate. I suppose the Minister will say I am telling lies again, but it is fairly close.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When did I say that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: August 12, I think. If the Minister doubts it, let him look at *Hansard*. I have already quoted it to him. The Government is being obstinate in this matter to the point of utter stupidity. Why? There are two reasons. First, it does not want to admit that it was wrong; it wants to save some face. I point out to the honourable gentlemen on the front bench that the sooner they admit their mistake the less uncomfortable it will be for them, because it is inevitable that sooner or later they will have to admit it, and the longer they refuse to admit it, the more money we are wasting that could be spent on other things. All the money provided in this will be wasted and we will be throwing \$2 000 000 more of semi-government moneys after it as well. We would be throwing good money after bad money. I believe the Government is behaving like a child who will not accept the inevitable. It is for these reasons I moved the motion. I believe this is a project that has been now shown, by the actions of the Commonwealth Government, to be utterly impossible to attain, and the sooner it is stopped the better.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. As the member for Mitcham said, two main reasons were advanced for the establishment of Monarto. The first was the need to control the population growth of Adelaide and the second the rather uncommon, unique and, to many people, totally unfathomable reason that the bulk of the finance for the project would come from the Commonwealth Government. For the first reason I believe there was some basis, but for the second reason there was no basis at all. The first reason was disposed of rapidly by the bringing down of the Borrie report, which indicated that the original population projections for Adelaide were not inaccurate but not pertinent because conditions changed rapidly.

The Liberal Party does not favour an uncontrolled sprawl of the Adelaide metropolitan area and believes development must take place elsewhere. However, it must have a firm industrial base, be well planned, viable and able to stand alone as a separate entity. As far as the money for the project is concerned, the member for Mitcham has dealt with it extremely well. About \$10 000 000 was needed for the project, about \$4 000 000 to \$5 000 000 was expected from the Commonwealth Government, and about \$500 000 was received from the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not true! At no stage was it stated that \$4 000 000 to \$5 000 000 was expected from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Millhouse: They are your own words in *Hansard*.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has had his say.

Dr. TONKIN: With every respect to the Government, we have had so many great expectations recently that I suppose the Budget must be considered full of expectations. I believe everyone else interpreted that the Government expected to receive either \$4 000 000 or \$5 000 000, regardless of what the Special Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff says. I should like to put on record now my appreciation and, I believe, the appreciation of the electors in the district of Murray, for the concern and plain hard work that has been put into the whole matter of Monarto by the member for that district.

Mr. Duncan: Here's the sop.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Murray has been intimately concerned with the whole project from start to finish; he has spoken in his district, in Parliament, in the Party room and he has spoken publicly about it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But will he vote for it?

Dr. TONKIN: Indeed he will. He will vote for his area and for his constituents; he will vote for their best interests and will protect their best interests, as he has always done. He is concerned about the future of the area, about the effect that the development of a new town would have on the area itself, and on the effect that the new town would have on Murray Bridge. He, as are many other people in the area (and this shows the Government's total lack of concern that their high-flying plans have gone astray), is greatly concerned about this matter. He is extremely concerned and bitterly disappointed that the project will not go ahead as it was originally planned. He is as disappointed as are other people who were taken in by the high-flying, glowing, glossy pictures of the project contained in that beautiful annual report that was produced in such an expensive way by the Monarto Development Commission.

The hopes of the people of the area were inflamed by the pictures painted by the Premier and the Minister, not by this Minister at the time, true, but by the Minister concerned, and they have every right to be bitterly disappointed that the project is no longer viable, because it is no longer viable. It may be necessary to develop Murray Bridge as an alternative growth centre in a minor way. Certainly, I believe that the land that has been acquired at such an expense should be maintained and kept and, if necessary, be used as a national park for the time being until we can see what the future holds. However, I thoroughly agree with the sentiments that have been expressed, that there is no future for the development of Monarto as a town at present, with no financial support whatever, with no funds to start it off with, and no prospect of funds. I support the motion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Special Minister of State for Monarto): The Borrie report needs revision in a number of respects so far as South Australia is concerned.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Every such report is never 100 per cent correct.

Mr. Millhouse: That is no justification for ignoring this one.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Am I being allowed to reply in a short space of time or not? Several modifications must be made to the Borrie report in respect of South Australia because of the incorrect assumptions made in the report about, first, mortality rates; secondly, the report's accuracy will depend on the existence in future years of a continuing low rate of migration; and, thirdly, its accuracy also depends on an assumption of there being a net loss from South Australia interstate of about 3 000 people a year. I am told that that assumption with respect to last year or the latest estimates have already turned out to be incorrect. I believe work is currently proceeding in Canberra which suggests that even the upgraded South Australian Government's estimates of future population are too low, because those projections use the Borrie assumption of a net loss of population from South Australia to the other States. The latest information on that is that that does not seem to be showing up in the last year.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you saying that the Borrie report is wrong?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Millhouse: You are disregarding it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am saying that certainly one must take into account changes in the birthrate but, in order to make population projections, one must do a little more. A moment's reflection by the honourable member would have convinced him that one must make assumptions about future rates of migration, and that the Borrie report's assumptions are that those will continue at a low rate. One must make assumptions about mortality rates, and one must make assumptions about the net interstate movement of people. In the case of the Borrie report, the assumptions that were made were of a low rate of migration, an interstate movement of people out of South Australia that was negative by about 3 000 people a year, and a mortality rate that was equal to the Australian average. In fact, South Australia's mortality rates are lower than the Australian average rate, which has something to do with the age distribution of the population. In the South Australian exercise that was undertaken, the main variation in the assumption related to the mortality rate. Since then, more recent information suggests that the assumption that has been made about the net movement of people interstate may also be wrong. Nevertheless, the main point to make is that if one assumes that what is going on at the present time will keep going on for evermore, one is bound to be wrong.

One has to be in a position to plan on a flexible basis. I think that the Borrie estimates, so far as South Australia is concerned and so far as the position taken by the Government on this matter, are too low. We are not committed to a certain population by 1983. My position has always been that Monarto has to be planned on a flexible basis.

So, the first general point is that the Borrie estimates were too low. It would only require an increase in immigration to demonstrate that they were very much too low. I do not believe that development based on Murray Bridge can provide the kind of growth centre that is ultimately required if the size of Adelaide is to be limited. Certainly Murray Bridge can take further growth, but current planning suggests that the Murray Bridge population should not increase significantly above about 20 000 people. It would be only with great difficulty that a population very much greater than that could be supported in that vicinity.

The member for Murray knows that there is insufficient suitable land for building in the Murray Bridge area, and there are drainage problems; these problems are worse at Murray Bridge than they will be at Monarto. Be that as it may, it is also relevant to note that the cost of infra-structure for each block of land, whatever that may be, is not the appropriate measure to compare the relative costs of land at Adelaide and at Murray Bridge; that was the completely illegitimate and fallacious argument that the member for Mitcham was trying to put before the Committee.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member for Mitcham received the courtesy of being heard in relative silence. We do not want to go on all night.

Mr. Millhouse: We will go on until we have finished this subject.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member can please himself on that matter.

Mr. Millhouse: You will have to stay here, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member would have us believe a completely fallacious argument, because he wants to put down all the costs of infra-structure to the cost of each allotment. In connection with education costs, a group of 500 houses requiring a primary school for 500 students costing at least \$1 000 000 involves an education capital cost of infra-structure of \$2 000 for each allotment. If we capitalised the cost of running the school, we would add a further \$5 000 for each allotment. If we start to consider all the community services provided by the Government outside of sewerage, water, electricity, and roadworks, we get a high sum indeed. If we really started to calculate the sum, it could go much higher than \$40 000. Let us be clear on one point, however: the cost of an allotment in Monarto to the house buyer will be lower than it is in the fringe areas of Adelaide, and in many respects the cost of land in Murray Bridge already exceeds the cost of land in Adelaide. Blocks of land are available in Murray Bridge for about \$10 000, which is a high cost indeed. So, the member for Mitcham may care to explain how that would be a more effective alternative.

I think the Opposition generally is demonstrating that it is not in favour of any kind of decentralisation whatsoever because, every time a decentralisation proposition comes up, Opposition members turn out, after paying some lip service to it, and go against it. It was Redcliff yesterday, where the spokesman for the Opposition came out completely in opposition to decentralisation, and the Leader of the Opposition did the same. Today, it is Monarto. The two most significant examples of decentralisation in recent times are being opposed by the Opposition, which has demonstrated its true colours in this matter. I have on previous occasions gone through the basic arguments that apply regarding Monarto, such as the question of the size of Adelaide and the quality of life in Adelaide, and I have considered those arguments previously with regard to future and current estimates of the population of Adelaide.

I have said that it does not really matter whether by the turn of the century there are 50 000, 100 000 or 200 000 people in Monarto, so long as during that period Monarto can work effectively as a means of limiting Adelaide's growth. Regarding the immediate future, certainly the original plans submitted to the Commonwealth Government assumed a certain population by 1983 of about 25 000, whereas on the planning now being undertaken it is clear that that figure is no longer achievable. The population that can be achieved by 1983 is probably between 12 000 and 15 000, and that has certain consequences on the dates when Government departments may have to move to Monarto. One way or another, that kind of modified programme can be achieved and, clearly, we must live within the budget available at any one time. I will clear up certain mis-statements the honourable member made: at no stage was it said that we expected to get between \$4 000 000 and \$5 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, what did you say?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Let me read out specifically what was said as follows:

However, a revised programme is under consideration which will involve an expenditure of between \$4 000 000 and \$5 000 000 for 1975-76.

At that time, the Government had already provided (and I am not sure whether the Loan Estimates had been presented at that time) \$3 200 000 under the State Loan Estimates as part of the Budget. Any idiot, even a prize



idiot like the honourable member, could have worked out the implication that we were not requesting between \$4 000 000 and \$5 000 000 from the Australian Government. Let me come to the next misleading effort by our friend from Mitcham. He said that we expected 79 per cent of the money from the Australian Government. The question he asked was how much money had been spent on Monarto and how much of it had come from the Australian Government. The position at present is that, of the \$12 600 000, \$10 000 000, or 79 per cent, has come from the Australian Government. Therefore, he puts words into my mouth that I never expected from now on to get 79 per cent of the funds from the Australian Government. That is a *non sequitur*.

One would think that a lawyer, who is supposed to be trained in logical reasoning, the honourable learned member for Mitcham, would know that, because 79 per cent has been received so far, that is not a figure immutable for all time. But not he! He has a lousy case and he was nit-picking in the worst fashion throughout the whole of his speech, fixing on things, misinterpreting them as hard as he could, and generally attempting to mislead the public of South Australia. That is the general standard of the contribution of the member for Mitcham. But, however low that was, it was a darned sight better than the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition, because the only concern of the Leader was to get up and go against decentralisation and then say, "There, there" to the member for Murray.

It was a disgraceful performance and if I were the member for Murray I would simply get up and say, "I can do without that sort of patting on the back. You have stabbed me in the back so far as my own district is concerned, you have embarrassed me in the city of Murray Bridge, and then you say, 'You have done a tremendous effort and studied it carefully.'" The Leader will have to do better than that. I am sure the member for Light could teach him a thing or two. I oppose the motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I support the motion, for four reasons. The first is that the funds are not available from the Commonwealth Government. Secondly, the population will not be available even in the entire South Australian area to give the projected sort of increases the Minister has so clearly said he wants. All the reports clearly state that a certain minimum population is required urgently and quickly at Monarto to make it a viable proposition, but those people will not be available. Thirdly, I support the motion because, in reply to a question by the member for Mitcham on Tuesday, it was clearly indicated that a further \$200 000 would be spent this year to buy land outside the declared area of Monarto. To use the Minister's own words, it was "to create a future recreation area on the Murray for the residents of Monarto". I believe it is a sheer waste of Government funds to be creating a recreation area for people who simply will not be there; obviously there will be no need for the area.

Fourthly, I support the motion because, also on Tuesday, the Minister, in replying to a question I asked, indicated that at that stage no budget for the Monarto Development Commission had been prepared for 1975-76. I see no reason whatsoever for allocating further money to the Monarto Development Commission when the Government itself does not know how it will spend that money. It has admitted it has no budget at this stage.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It has not.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister himself must have prepared the answer.

Mr. Millhouse: That is what he said on Tuesday.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The reply the Minister gave me on Tuesday was this:

A budget for 1975-76 has been prepared by the commission for presentation to the State Cabinet shortly. Here is the Government asking for funds, and it does not even know how it wants to spend them. I come briefly to the comments of the Minister. He claimed that the Borrie report was inaccurate, but in March of this year the Treasurer, based on figures from his own department, quoted the same sort of growth predictions for Adelaide by the year 2000. Why does not the Minister say that those predictions are incorrect?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They were different regarding the Borrie report. You have made this up.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The prediction from the Premier's Department was for 1 000 000 people in the Adelaide metropolitan area by the year 2000. That is not greatly different from the Borrie report; if anything, it is slightly less than the Borrie report. The revised figures given to the member for Light two weeks ago indicated that the figure had now been revised to 1 100 000. That in itself is still quite inadequate to produce the number of people required for Monarto. On the Minister's rather irrational logic, one would say that, just because we cannot predict what the population will be by the year 2000, we should make no predictions at all and go ahead and perhaps supply the facilities for Adelaide with a population of 1 500 000, which it could be by the year 2000. What a ridiculous line of logic for the Minister to use.

Mr. Millhouse: It's not logic at all.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It certainly is not. The second point the Minister raised was the cost for each block. Sitting down and carefully assessing this matter on the figures produced by the Monarto Development Commission, I worked out the cost at between \$25 000 and \$30 000 a block. The Minister says that the land is cheaper, but what is the purpose of having the land without the infra-structure that should go with it? There is no point at all. The land could cost 5c an acre: it is the cost of developing it to the point where people can be put there that is important.

Then, the Minister came to this proverbial argument: decentralisation. Let us look at the Government's policy on decentralisation. For Redcliff, it has produced nearly 3 000 hectares without a person living on that land. At Monarto, it has produced about 6 500 ha with about a dozen people living on it. That is the Government's decentralisation policy! I suggest that it is not worth the paper on which it is written. Finally, the Minister referred to a figure of \$4 000 000 to \$5 000 000. Originally, the Commonwealth Government was to give \$9 200 000, with the total expenditure being \$10 100 000. This suggests that the State Government was giving \$900 000. Before the Loan Estimates were introduced, the Minister gave a revised prediction of \$4 000 000 to \$5 000 000. If one takes \$900 000 from that, it means that the Commonwealth Government was expected to give between \$3 100 000 and \$4 100 000. I support the motion.

Mr. WARDLE: I would have found it difficult, before the Commonwealth Budget was introduced, to support a motion such as this. Before I say anything else, I should like to correct what the member for Davenport said. He stated that a dozen people live in this area. However, I know that 18 people live there, as I got the total vote in the Monarto box without any of my

four opponents getting one vote. As for the Government's electoral prospects in the Murray District, there is none and, as for the attitude of my colleagues, I will go about wooing the people of the Murray District in my own way.

The Commonwealth Budget has made the establishment of Monarto a completely different matter. Before that Budget was introduced, I thought the whole matter should be reassessed, as I could not believe the project as originally planned was a goer. I say this because of the present industrial climate (which, as I understand it, and from research carried out on it, is not one of expansion), because of the lack of money not only from the State Government's point of view but also from that of the Commonwealth Government (and surely that is where the money must come for the establishment of this project), and because of the indications of zero population.

The Commonwealth Budget has clearly pointed this out. It has also shown that what my colleagues and I have said previously is correct. What has happened now is something in the extreme. If the Minister refers to the *News* of April 30 and the *Advertiser* of May 1, when Mr. Uren came to South Australia to negotiate with the Monarto Development Commission, he will see that the Government believed it needed \$10 000 000 for this project. It is all very well for the Minister to refer to figures which are only half that sum and which have been negotiated over the last few weeks. However, earlier, when the Budget discussions were taking place, the figure was \$10 000 000.

I have always said that I believed in the site. The best argument for the development of Monarto is the nature of the development of Adelaide. I have not seen anywhere else the development of a city quite like Adelaide, in its strip fashion. Some day it will be necessary to provide a new growth centre to retard the development of Adelaide northerly and southerly, but designating a paltry amount such as has been designated for 1975-76 is no way to begin a new city. Probably land costing at least \$2 000 000 will have to be purchased this year and payments to staff will amount to almost \$1 000 000, giving about \$3 000 000 of the \$7 000 000 provided for the project this year.

New cities must come into being without financial inhibitions. This is borne out by the fact that the Commonwealth Government has made available large sums of money for development in the western suburbs of Sydney and in the Albury-Wodonga area. However, that Government has told South Australia that it is making a caretaker situation out of Monarto for the next 12 months. Many people in Murray Bridge will be affected. Many have established industries there because of the development of Monarto. I agree with the Minister that there is a limit to the development of the new city, but it is wrong to start the development with this small amount of money. At this stage, the land should remain with the Government.

Dr. EASTICK: I draw the Minister's attention to the reply given on March 25, by the former Minister involved in Monarto. That reply, which debunks the garbage we have heard from the Minister a short time ago, states:

A programme for the development of Monarto for the five-year period 1974-75 to 1978-79, which indicated a net expenditure of \$125 000 000, was presented to the Minister for Urban and Regional Development (Mr. Uren) at a meeting of Ministers in November, 1974. He supported the estimate of \$125 000 000 as being acceptable for such a programme. A firm commitment will be sought from the Australian Government when the Ministers meet in April of this year to consider a programme of development that will cover the five-year period 1975-76

to 1979-80. Agreement was reached on the funding of 1974-75 expenditure on the basis of the Australian Government's input of \$6 000 000 or 80 per cent of the commission's approved budget of \$7 500 000, whichever is the lesser amount. The moneys will be available by way of grants and loans, grant moneys being in land purchase for non-urban use, planning studies, and tree planting.

Clearly there was a commitment and an agreement on the basis on which the moneys for this purpose would be funded. Notwithstanding what I have just read out, as being for the period 1974-1975 at 80 per cent, in subsequent questioning and discussion that percentage was the basis for all further discussion. It is when we start to turn theory into practice that the real story begins, and the real story is starting to reveal itself at present, with a Government that is unable or unwilling to realise the mistake it has made and is not prepared to acknowledge that mistake.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will now reply to the debate if no other member wants to speak. I was not consulted about the sitting of the House; I just went on and took my chance when it came, so I cannot be blamed for delaying the House. I make one or two points in reply to the Minister, who is the only member who has spoken in opposition to this motion. First, I listened to him with much enjoyment, because I know that, when he indulges in personal abuse, he has no argument; that is his substitute for argument, and this evening I got from him as much abuse as I have ever had. It showed conclusively that he had no argument against what I had said.

Let me take up one point that he mentioned, about Murray Bridge. Do honourable members know that the State Planning Authority has been refusing permission for subdivisions in Murray Bridge because of Monarto? Let me cite one case. A firm called Newell Plastics, a manufacturing concern in Murray Bridge, has been refused permission to expand in that city because it would prejudice Monarto. I am told that some subdivisions in Murray Bridge have been refused by the State Planning Authority on the same ground. Will that continue now? We hear all this talk from the Minister and the Government about decentralisation, but they are deliberately preventing decentralisation in Murray Bridge here and now. I challenge them, even at this late stage in the debate, to get up and deny that they are doing this. They will hear more about it later, of course, if they do not deny it, but I believe that is the case. Let them follow up Newell Plastics in Murray Bridge and see whether or not that firm has been allowed to expand as it wanted to do or whether it was prevented because of Monarto, which is never going ahead.

I base my case for this motion on the refusal of the Commonwealth to support Monarto by any more than a derisory, paltry sum of \$500 000. Not one word did we hear from the Minister about why this Government could not sell Monarto to its Commonwealth colleagues. The whole of his case ignored that, and that was the linchpin of what I said. If it is so good, why did the Commonwealth Government give \$500 000 to us, but \$40 000 000 to Albury-Wodonga and \$8 600 000 to Bathurst-Orange? Why is that the case? The answer is that the Commonwealth knows, as we know, that Monarto is not a goer. Let the Government deny that if it will. If it will not deny it now, it will have plenty of opportunities later in this session to do it.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allison, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepaar, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Keneally, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Wells, and Whitten.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, and Nankivell.  
Noes—Messrs. Jennings, Virgo, and Wright.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 20 Ayes and 20 Noes. The votes being equal, I give my casting vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived; line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$6 000 000—passed.

First Schedule passed.

Second Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 11 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SEX DISCRIMINATION)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 6.34 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 9, at 2 p.m.