

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 8, 1976

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

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN presented a petition signed by 105 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. LANGLEY presented a petition signed by 118 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the present discriminatory position of blood relations be removed and that blood relationships sharing a family property enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to *de facto* relationships.

Petition received.

PETITION: RIVERLAND PLANNING

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition signed by 405 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Planning and Development Act to provide that planning in the Riverland planning area be under the control of local government.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

PINE TREES

In reply to Mr. VANDEPEER (August 5).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The land referred to is section 541, hundred of Caroline, which was purchased for forestry purposes in 1971. The Minister of Forests has informed me that his department intends to plant pines on the area in 1977 and preparatory work has been carried out. As is usual, a firebreak of one chain width will be left unplanted on departmental land and this, with the road reserve adjoining, will provide a reasonable distance between the plantation and the settlement on part section 542, which adjoins Donovan's landing. I understand that a continuing programme of fire protection work will be carried out on the boundary and within the future plantation to control the entry or exit of any fire occurring in the vicinity and, in addition, the practicability of growing some small ornamental trees on the firebreak will be investigated. This landscaping should provide a pleasant view when completed, and the Minister informs me that it is now a standard practice of his department to landscape plantation edges and surrounds wherever possible.

LITTLE PARA DAM

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (August 5).

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

1. Expected completion date, February, 1978.

2. Estimated cost, \$10 400 000.

3. Constructing authority, Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Private enterprise will be involved in contracts to the extent of about \$1 700 000.

AUSTRALIAN FISHING INDUSTRY COUNCIL

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (August 10).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government is sympathetic to the proposal that it should facilitate the provision of administrative assistance to the South Australian Branch of the Australian Fishing Industry Council. The Minister of Fisheries informs me that the matter has been considered by a committee representing the Agriculture and Fisheries Department and the South Australian branch of the council but the issues raised are complex and require further exploration to ensure that any proposed action by the Government is consistent with its responsibilities to the fishing industry. Nevertheless, a detailed report with recommendations is under preparation, and my colleague expects to receive this submission soon.

WATER SCREENING

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (August 12).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Government pumping stations have always been screened down to 25-mm openings, but on recent experience the Lands Department accepts that it is desirable to adopt finer screening where closed pipe distribution systems are being installed. To this end, the Engineering and Water Supply Department is conducting experiments to determine an effective and economic method of screening. A trial screen has been in operation at Kingston for the past 18 months, and on present indications it is satisfactory. However, during that period turbid water conditions without any algaecidal or river weed growth have prevailed. At the present time a concept design is being undertaken for Waikerie and, when an evaluation has been made and costs prepared, further consideration will be given to the availability of funds for a suitable installation. It must be emphasised that any form of primary screening at pumping stations is not the ultimate for spray or low-flow irrigation systems.

NORTH HAVEN HOUSING

In reply to Mr. OLSON (August 19).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No alteration has been made or is contemplated to the North Haven indenture arrangements. Under the indenture, the A.M.P. Society has options to take out leases over parts of the land and water in the North Haven harbor area. The society is currently studying the feasibility of various forms of further development of facilities at the site. Amongst a range of other alternatives, this study has included consideration of incorporating some form of accommodation with other developments west of Lady Gowrie Drive. The study is still at a preliminary stage, however, and it appears that the society will not be in a position to approach the Government with a formal proposal for some time. It

is understood that the society has taken steps to consult local residents at an early stage of the planning process, and no doubt any proposal put forward will take into account the views expressed by them on housing, as well as other matters. The Government does not intend, however, to allow land at the harbor to be alienated from public ownership, or to be subdivided for sale as residential allotments.

SHACK SITES

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (August 19).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is impractical for the Government to issue leases to district councils for subletting of shack sites, and the only way in which shack owners in areas under council control can be given leases is for tenure control in those areas to report to the Lands Department. The Government acknowledges the desirability of dealing uniformly with all shack owners and, therefore, a proposal has been submitted to the councils concerned for the return of tenure control to the department. To ensure that councils are not financially disadvantaged through loss of revenue, the proposal provides that, where councils relinquish tenure control, thus permitting the department to issue miscellaneous leases to the shack owners, councils will be reimbursed to the extent of half the yearly rents raised from sites formerly under council control, for as long as the sites remain under miscellaneous lease. The councils have been informed that, whilst the Government is empowered under the Crown Lands Act to take over control of shack areas presently under council control, it is not intended to exercise that power unless councils do not co-operate in the implementation of the Government policy, and any decisions to hand tenure control back to the department rest with the councils. In these areas where councils elect to retain control, although shack owners will not be able to receive leases from the department, they have the Government's assurance that their occupation will not be disturbed for at least 10 years for sites in non-acceptable areas and 20 years for sites in acceptable areas. They also have the assurance of at least five years prior notice if occupation is not to be extended beyond 10 and 20 years respectively.

GILLES PLAINS DROP-IN CENTRE

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 19).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: This property at 643 North East Road, Gilles Plains, has been leased by the Community Welfare Department, and a contractor is carrying out renovations and alterations. It is expected that the property will be ready for occupation by the end of September, 1976. It will be used as a community based facility to accommodate selected boys from Brookway Park under staff supervision. The boys will be able to attend local schools and other community facilities as part of their developmental programme.

ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say what justification there is for the expenditure of \$13 000 on entertainment, purchase of liquor and working luncheons by officers of his department, as detailed in the Auditor-General's Report for 1975-76, at a time when financial restraint is being

exercised by the community at large? On page 201 of the Auditor-General's Report, a large increase in expenses of \$190 000 is listed for the Premier's Department, including an increase of \$37 000 for overseas trips. The increases are so great that the Auditor-General has specifically broken down the amounts.

The Opposition realises that a certain amount of entertainment is required of the Premier's Department, but \$13 000, or roughly \$260 a week, seems to be very extravagant. It is well known that the Premier's Press Secretaries entertain journalists regularly, and it is assumed that other officers working for the Premier must also do their fair share of entertaining to run up such a bill. In today's economic climate, when financial restraint is being stressed, the Premier has the opportunity to make sure that entertainment by his officers does not reach extravagant proportions, as this figure of \$13 000 suggests.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader were to contrast the entertainment expenses of my department with those of the departments of Liberal Premiers in other States, he would find that they are frugal indeed.

Dr. Tonkin: We're talking about your department.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader does not want to apply the same criteria to the South Australian officers as he does—

Mr. Millhouse: You are getting away from the point.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think I am. Actually, the sum quoted covers entertainment of people who come to the State, entirely apart from such things—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are you sure of that? I don't think that's right.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far as I am aware, it does. The figure the Leader referred to is included under the heading of "Office of the Premier", and the item is, "Entertainment, purchase of liquor and working luncheons".

Dr. Tonkin: It's a lot of liquor.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Numbers of people are entertained in the Cabinet room in the course of the year. It is my duty to entertain many people, as it is in relation to the officers of the department who have to entertain from time to time people who come to the State. With the increasing trade activity of the department it is obviously necessary that this occurs.

Dr. Tonkin: What increase in trade activity?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader is now getting on to another question. If he wants details on that matter, I am perfectly willing to supply them to him, but I suggest that he wait and ask another question. I do not believe there has been any extravagance in my department. I look carefully at every bill that comes in, and I am loath to authorise anything that is not perfectly proper. If the Leader contrasts the activities of my department with those of the departments of the Premiers in Liberal-governed States, he will find that the position in South Australia is shown to be frugal indeed.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say what officers in the Premier's Department are entitled to share in the expense account bonanza, and how much did each officer spend during the year 1975-76? The Premier has just told the House that he peruses every bill that comes into his department. The Leader has asked for justification of expenses incurred for the purchase of liquor and working luncheons. Who, then, is permitted by the Premier to share in this \$13 000 bonanza for working luncheons and liquor?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I pointed out that the amounts shown in the Auditor-General's Report relate to the entertainment of people on behalf of the State. A

certain number of officers in the Premier's Department, some Public Service officers, and some Ministerial officers at times return the lunches which are tendered to them in the course of their working activities.

Mr. Millhouse: That's about \$50 for every working day.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: From time to time there are about 10 to 15 people in the Cabinet room for lunch, so it is not surprising that that can occur. Governors from Siam and their wives are not entertained in the Cabinet room, and their entertainment costs money. South Australia must return the same sort of hospitality that is extended to South Australians. In many cases the hospitality that is extended to people is provided at the request of the Commonwealth Government. In these circumstances, \$13 000 is an extremely small sum. As a matter of fact, members of the Opposition occasionally participate in this expenditure.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader wishes me to say what a certain guest had for lunch or what his liquor bill was, I will not do it.

Mr. BECKER: Will the Deputy Premier, in the temporary absence of the Premier, provide the House with exact details of the sums spent by the Premier's personal staff and Ministerial staff on entertainment in the Premier's Department? I understand that facilities are available in the department to entertain V.I.P. guests, such as business and community leaders; that some lunches are considered to be board-room lunches in the normal course of business; and that, at the same time, not only Ministers but also their personal staff are required to entertain certain guests. After all, the Government is responsible for spending taxpayers' money.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I believe that Opposition members are being a little petty this afternoon. They seem to have decided among themselves that the \$13 000, which has been spent by the Premier's office on liquor and entertainment, would be the source of a good story; undoubtedly, that is the motivation behind this questioning, and nothing more. They are not interested in how the money was spent, but they want to wring as much as they can out of the fact that that sum was spent.

Dr. Tonkin: You believe there's some basis for it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I do not, and that remark is an insult to the Auditor-General. As the Premier has said, the accounts have been audited and the method of accounting has not been criticised. The Auditor-General simply asked for details of the sum (I think it was \$101 000) spent in connection with transport, telephones, entertainment and the like. They were provided, and I suggest to honourable members that that is as far as it will go, because that satisfied the Auditor-General, who otherwise would have complained to Parliament, as is his duty and right. I am amazed that people think that this sum is extraordinarily large, because it is not.

Mr. Becker: It is to some of us.

Mr. Allison: It depends on how it's spent.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That sum would be welcome in my pocket, too. If the Leader has his research officers applying themselves to the task, he should do what the Premier suggested: obtain details of similar expenditure, if he can, from other Premiers' offices in the various States and see how they compare. I agree with the Premier that the amount spent in this State would compare more than favourably with that spent in other States. The Leader should ascertain from Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd.,

or some other company like that, what their expenses for liquor and entertainment would be in the head office of a company of that size: this amount would shrink into insignificance, and honourable members know it.

Mr. Becker: That's shareholders' money.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I suggested earlier, the only motivation for this question is to try to get a story in the press.

WHYALLA SHIPYARD

Mr. MAX BROWN: As a matter of urgency, will the Minister of Labour and Industry try to discuss with the management of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited that company's obvious non-co-operative industrial policy which is causing and provoking industrial unrest, particularly the latest industrial unrest that occurred last week, in the city of Whyalla, whereby the company was prepared to victimise union representatives of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union to the extent of discrediting them on their work record card, which I take as an affront, and depriving them of their usual overtime? The A.M.W.U. had called for a national meeting of all delegates to discuss what it considered was very important trade union business. However, the B.H.P. Company refused leave to the delegates and took uncalled for disciplinary action against the workers' representatives. In my opinion, despite the encouraging efforts by the State Government towards the welfare of the shipbuilding industry, there are very grave doubts whether the B.H.P. Company has collaborated with the Federal Government, on the basis that it is not willing to carry on the shipbuilding industry as a whole. Statements attributed to the member for Alexandra in the *Advertiser* of last Saturday did no good as far as industrial relations are concerned.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not know much about the facts outlined by the honourable member.

Mr. Gunn: You normally don't.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If the member for Eyre would keep quiet I might be able to explain the situation. The honourable member continually interjects whenever a member gets to his feet. I am not sure of the facts; I do not know anything about them other than what has been explained in the House today. I think that statements such as those made by the member for Alexandra on Saturday (this was virtually a repetition of what he said in this House not long after he came into it) do not improve the situation, but only inflame it. If we all took the attitude that the honourable member takes, that all the militants ought to be sacked from the industry, all the militant Parliamentarians would be coming out for all the right wing trade union officials to be sacked. I do not know where we are going when that sort of situation develops. The honourable member said, "Starve these people to death." I know that the Whyalla people are very inflamed about that statement. The member for Alexandra ought to keep out of industrial relations because he knows nothing about them, as has been proved from time to time, even when he was an employer and did not have good industrial relations. I advise him to stay out of the Whyalla situation, as it is alight and ready to explode. We must temper the whole situation, and that can be done only by the two parties getting together.

The situation cannot be improved by blaming the workers for the whole of the economic situation in the shipbuilding industry in Whyalla, or in any other industry. The workers are not entirely to blame, and the employers may

not be entirely to blame, either. We need to get the parties back on the rails talking to one another and examining the industrial relations scene. I would be only too pleased to take up with the company its attitude to industrial relations. I have raised the matter with the unions, offering to go to Whyalla, if necessary, to speak to them when they call a meeting. I have not yet been invited, but that offer still stands. Not only for the benefit of the honourable member for Whyalla am I prepared to talk to unions: I am prepared to talk to anybody about the industrial relations scene in South Australia because I am one of those people who believe it needs improving. There is no question about that and I am not running away from it. I am not going to accept the situation that the workers should accept all the blame, because the employers have to accept their blame (which is warranted) as well.

COMMUNITY CARE PROJECT

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what success the Community Welfare Department has had with its community care project? Some time ago the Minister announced that this project would begin on July 19, with the objective of reducing the number of children being admitted to residential care centres and homes. As I recall the idea, welfare workers were to visit the families of the children involved in order to provide counselling and other assistance, to help parents cope with children, and to deal with family problems.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member has correctly and accurately outlined what is intended under this scheme, which is operating in the northern part of the metropolitan area. The scheme is designed to investigate, wherever possible, if a family at risk is detected where children are concerned, the incipient problem in that family. An investigation at the right time could prevent later problems for the children. If children can be kept at home, obviously the State will not be involved in providing care for them later. This practice could prevent them from becoming delinquent children. Only limited success has been achieved since the operation began a short time ago. I am not criticising the staff involved or the concept of the scheme. The scheme is a relatively new approach to these matters, certainly in South Australia, and community welfare workers involved in this scheme have had to learn some of the skills necessary to approach families. It would be obvious to all members that welfare workers should not barge straight in and give advice. A reasonable approach must be achieved so that the family can reorganise itself for the benefit of the children. An analogy is the crisis-care service, a similar service, which had a slow beginning but which is now functioning in a satisfactory way. I expect that this new scheme may follow a similar pattern, but that it will perhaps not have the spectacular rate of increase that has occurred in the crisis-care service. I am pleased that the honourable member has raised this matter, so that I have been able to provide information about the service. I remind the Opposition that this is one time that the present Commonwealth Government has come to the party: the funding for this project stems largely from that source, and I commend that Government for its interest in this matter.

ARTIFICIAL EYES

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health whether action has been taken

to train an officer of the Hospitals Department in the art of manufacturing glass artificial eyes? I have received inquiries from constituents who are most anxious that the Government should take the action necessary to provide continuity of this prosthesis. Mr. B. F. Middleton, of Semaphore Park, has been required to wear an artificial eye since childhood, and he is concerned that there seems to be a reluctance on the part of any interested person to learn this profession, at present being undertaken by Mr. Scheler, of Tapley Hill Road, Seaton. Mr. Scheler, the only glass-eye manufacturer in Australia, is well past the age of retirement but continues his profession in the interests of the unfortunate wearer of the eye. Will the Government, in this circumstance, use its resources to give the matter urgent consideration?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think I can allay the honourable member's fears almost immediately, although the matter more properly comes within the province of my colleague. A constituent of mine, if I remember correctly, is employed as a maxillo-facial technician at Royal Adelaide Hospital. I think he was a dental technician and, having displayed some interest in these matters, he was subsequently assisted in his studies. I was surprised to hear the honourable member say that Mr. Middleton believed there was only one source of artificial eyes. I think I would be correct in suggesting that Royal Adelaide Hospital has an arrangement with a gentleman in Brisbane (whose name escapes me for the moment), who has a long history of association with the manufacture of this necessary prosthesis for people with this unfortunate disfigurement. He was still operating, and occasionally came to Adelaide on a contract or sessional basis with the R.A.H. I can understand the concern expressed at the prospect of any diminution in the supply of this prosthesis, and I will bring the matter to the attention of my colleague.

DROUGHT

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Lands a report on certain matters which I shall detail? I think the matter is too urgent to be the subject of a Question on Notice. First, what (if any) changes in procedure may be contemplated by the Lands Department in order to streamline the tedious application form presently required for applications for assistance under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act; secondly, is it intended to build up the Rural Industries Assistance Branch to administer drought relief funds, or is consideration being given (or has it been given) to employing banks or stock firms to act as agents; thirdly, following the Premier's statement yesterday that money is to be made available for drought assistance to farmers at low interest rates, can the Minister establish whether the rate of interest will be lower than the 10½ per cent now applying to loans made under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain replies as quickly as possible on the points raised by the honourable member. I had discussions this morning with the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture regarding drought relief assistance following the announcement by the Federal Government. I am pleased to say that the State Government will participate in the bounty payment to graziers who lose stock, in addition to the slaughtering facilities already established. We are anxious to hear from the Federal Government exactly how it expects the scheme to be administered, when payments are to be made, and so on. We expect that the main thrust of assistance to primary

producers will be in carry-on finance. We think this will be the most difficult area, and that is why we have set aside \$9 000 000. I am not certain of the rate of interest to apply, but I know of the form the honourable member referred to in connection with assistance under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act; I think it covers about 20 pages. Whether or not that has been altered, or whether it could be altered, is another question. I think that will be the main thrust of the effort on the part of the Government in providing assistance to primary producers.

Mr. Nankivell: Unemployment relief works?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We have had no word from the Australian Government as to whether or not it will meet the South Australian Government in this matter. We are anxiously awaiting a reply. Treasury officers telexed the Prime Minister's Department this morning seeking further information, because this aspect was not referred to in the points made in the press release by the Commonwealth Minister.

Mr. Nankivell: The Premier mentioned them.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He mentioned some of them. The proposal put forward by the South Australian Government in connection with unemployment relief in drought-affected areas was not referred to in the Federal Government's release. We are anxious to know the attitude of the Federal Government towards it. I assure the honourable member that these matters are well in hand, and I will take up the other points he has raised with my colleague and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

AUTOMOTIVE ENGINEERING

Mr. ABBOTT: Has the Minister of Education any information on the proposed additions to the School of Automotive Engineering at the Croydon Park College of Further Education, and can he indicate the expected completion date of the project?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I shall obtain the information for the honourable member.

POSEIDON

Mr. MATHWIN: On what basis has the Attorney-General called for a report on the affairs of Poseidon, and what action will be taken by the Government in relation to that report?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am not sure to which report the honourable member is referring. The Government has for some time been investigating the so-called insider trading activities of persons who bought and sold Posiedon shares, I think during the mining boom, which may well have been in 1969. These investigations are continuing. Honourable members may have noticed that one person was prosecuted recently arising out of the investigations, and further announcements will be made when these investigations are completed. That is one report I am seeking in this matter. Because of the reference in this morning's *Advertiser* to the question of unusual trading (one might say) in Poseidon shares, I have asked for a report from the Companies Office, and my officers in that section are preparing a report. Today, I have sought information from the Chairman of the Adelaide Stock Exchange. As yet, I am unable to inform the House of the result of these latest initiatives but, when further information is available, I will do so.

PORT ADELAIDE EXHIBITION

Mr. WHITTEN: Has the Minister for Planning received any information from his department as to the success or otherwise of the exhibition held at Port Adelaide, arranged by the State Planning Authority and the Port Adelaide joint committee? Recently, a large marquee was set up in front of the Port Adelaide Council Chambers, containing an exhibition dealing with the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. I have received information that about 350 people a day attended the exhibition, and made comments, and the Minister is to be complimented on involving the public in this joint survey. Has the department given the Minister any information on this matter?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have not had a detailed report from the State Planning Authority, but I have heard the exhibition has been a success, and has resulted in a greater degree of involvement of local people in the replanning of Port Adelaide than was the case previously. That is pleasing. It is obviously important for the success of the Port Adelaide project to have a fairly clear understanding of what local attitudes are, and for local people to have a fairly clear understanding of what are the problems of redevelopment and what can or cannot be achieved. Because of the honourable member's question, I will ask for a detailed report on the matter and provide him with those details.

WATER RATES

Mr. WOTTON: Is the Premier aware of the exorbitant increases in water and sewerage rates being imposed on some residents in Hahndorf and Mount Barker as a result of highly inflated land values following the recent revaluation in that area? Will the Premier immediately take the appropriate action to rescind these accounts and either change the rate in the dollar or alter the method of valuation so that new accounts may be forwarded for the remainder of this financial year that are fair and equitable? I have received several protests concerning increases in sewerage and water rates, and I expect that this is only the start. I list the following examples of quarterly increases of such rates in Hahndorf. Some of the increases are as much as 500 to 600 per cent, from \$32.78 to \$185.00; from \$30.65 to \$169.00; and from \$36.65 to \$148.82. The last example applies to a private house on a block with a narrow 21 m frontage in the main street of Hahndorf. The ironic situation is that sewerage is not yet connected to the house. There have also been examples of water rates having tripled on rural properties in the Mount Barker district, and these properties are not connected to the mains. Very strong arguments were recently put to the Premier at deputations from people in Hahndorf and Mount Barker concerning the problems in these two areas relating to increased rates and taxes as a result of highly inflated land values.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the accounts for the Hahndorf area and obtain a report from the Valuer-General concerning them. Water and sewerage rates are struck on the basis of valuation of properties and the availability of service. If a ratepayer chooses not to avail himself of the service, he is still charged for its availability.

Mr. Wotton: That does not explain the massive increase.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I fear the massive increase has occurred because of the actual massive increase in values in the area.

Mr. Chapman: It is an artificial increase in values. You know better than that!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member should be aware that valuations take place on the basis of current sales in the area.

Dr. Tonkin: That is potential values.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it is. The value of the land under the Act is the value of the land for sale.

Mr. Chapman: It ought to take into account land use, and the quicker the better.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member can devise a system of rating on that basis perhaps he can give us information about it, because no valuer has yet been able to devise such a scheme. The form of rating and valuation now in force in South Australia is a result of legislation enacted under Liberal Governments in South Australia. The only change in the valuation process that has taken place has been to advantage the people as compared to the old system. The only changes in valuation procedure have been the equalisation factors and the fact that you can get a valuation in a lesser time than the quinquennial assessment. I will examine the position concerning the Mount Barker and Hahndorf area, but I point out that it is inevitable in that district, as in mine, that where increases in actual value of land take place an increase in rates occurs.

Mr. Mathwin: Then change the system.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Honourable members opposite are being as irresponsible as I am afraid they usually are.

NATIONAL ESTATE

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Australian Government has yet announced the sum it will be providing towards the national estate programme for this year? In his report the Auditor-General stated that in the past two years the sum of \$1 400 000 has been made available to the State for important land acquisitions, for land to protect our coast, and for restoration work for several of our important historic buildings. From recent reports, the Federal Government does not see the merit of these programmes. I hope that the Minister will be able to say that the Australian Government intends to continue with the programme introduced by the Federal Labor Government.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It is not true to say that the Federal Government has decided not to continue this programme: it operates in a more devious way than that. The Federal Government has decided that it is necessary to make a register of what is to be considered before it can properly spend money on them. That is a laudable idea, but obviously the intent is for the next year or two to compile a list, which effectively means no money will be spent on any projects. In the meantime many worthwhile buildings and objects will be lost forever. That is the effect of the present money-saving policy of the Federal Government. It is causing problems for us, because the Museum is in the middle of a five-year project, which was approved under the scheme and which is aimed at specifically making the most effective use of co-operation between Federal and State Governments and councils in preserving historic relics, and in determining methods of operation that will ensure that money is spent most effectively. Unfortunately, there is the possibility that this programme on which a considerable sum has been

spent by the Federal and State Governments may grind to a halt. The valuable expertise of personnel associated with the project may also be lost, because it may well be beyond the resources of the State Government to continue it. Representations have been made to the Commonwealth Government to at least continue this project to ensure that the value of the money already spent will not be wasted. The brief answer to the question, is that the programme has not been discontinued, it has has only been effectively stalled: in the meantime considerable damage could be done to our national heritage.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CHAPMAN: Does the Minister of Labour and Industry stand by the report in last Saturday's *Advertiser* that stated that all State Ministers of Labour had agreed that the publication of seasonally adjusted series figures should be discontinued because they lead to confusion in establishing the unemployment situation? If so, what steps has he taken to negate the allegations of the ill-informed Federal Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Whitlam, in this regard? In an article in the *Advertiser* of Saturday, September 4, under the heading "Row over change in jobless figures", Mr. Whitlam slammed the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Mr. Street, for his statement on the unemployment situation in Australia. Mr. Whitlam used what might be described as quite serious and defamatory remarks about Mr. Street when he said that the detail in the article represented the gravest example of concealment of essential statistics. In order to have the matter clarified at State level, I should like to hear the comments of the Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member ought to know me better than to ask whether I stand by statements that I make. I certainly stand by the press report. I make no apologies for the fact that all State Ministers agreed to the abolition of seasonally adjusted figures. This has always been an academic argument. The figures can be fixed to get advantages in the mid-term of the year, or fixed to give an advantage at Christmas, when children are leaving school. I have never considered that any method other than using the raw figures gives us a clear understanding of the unemployment situation. There are those people in the community (and probably in my own Party) who could academically argue the point (in fact, we had an argument at the dinner table last night) that the trend is more clear if one has the seasonally adjusted figures to hand when examining the situation. For some time economists (and Barry Hughes is one person who has been having something to say in this regard) have been discussing this matter. I read only recently in the *National Times* an article by Mr. Hughes in which he said that he considered the figures were confusing and unreliable unless they were assessed in some other way. I noticed that, in support of the attitude taken by all Ministers of Labour (and there were seven at the conference last Friday), Mr. Cole, the Director of the Bureau of Statistics, was reported in the *Age* newspaper on Saturday morning last as giving a clear indication that he considered seasonally adjusted figures were unreliable and that therefore some other method ought to be adopted.

I think that that should satisfy the member for Alexandra that I stand by what I said and what took place in the conference. I agree that the raw figures are the ones that one should be able to examine and understand more

clearly. I offer no apology for that action. I have discussed this subject with many people. Some people consider there is a benefit, and others consider there is not. I had to make a decision, I made it, and I make no apologies for having made it. In the second part of his question the honourable member asked what I had done to negate those statements made by the Leader of the Federal Opposition, Mr. Whitlam. I have taken no action, nor do I intend to, nor could I or should I, take any action. Mr. Whitlam is entitled to his beliefs in relation to these figures, and, if he wants to state those feelings publicly, that is his prerogative, as it was mine to make the decision I made last Friday.

MID-NORTH POWER STATION

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether a decision has been made on the site of the proposed coal-powered electric power station to be built in the Mid-North of South Australia? Has the committee appointed to investigate this matter completed its report and, if so, will the Minister inform the House of the committee's findings? On August 13 last year I asked the Minister a question concerning this matter, and in his answer he said:

The position with respect to the site of the proposed power station is that a committee has been appointed to consider alternative sites and the environmental consequences in relation to any particular site. The committee, which was appointed by the trust some time ago, includes environmental representation.

This stage is timed to be completed by 1983. A period of 13 months has elapsed since I asked that question, and many people in the community and in the area are becoming concerned about when a report will be released or a decision made. I have been informed verbally from two sources that Port Augusta is the site decided upon. That could be so, because an article in the *Australian* of August 12 last year stated:

The station, to be in full production by 1984, will probably be built near Port Augusta if an environmental impact report is favourable.

I wonder whether the Government has hoodwinked the people with this investigation, having already determined that Port Augusta is to be the site. In conclusion, may I say that—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You want an extension of time?

Mr. RUSSACK: No, I want the same amount of time as Ministers and other members of this House have. I submit that Wallaroo, with its present resources and established services—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable member's attention to the fact that he is now debating the question.

Mr. RUSSACK: I am relating that this is the opinion of people in the area which has been given to me to present to this House in support of the question I have asked. This opinion is that Wallaroo, with its resources, established services such as port installations and communications, road and rail services (with the suggested standardisation of the rail gauge), water supply, and the availability of a local labour force, would be the ideal and logical site for such a power station.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I should have thought that the honourable member would not allow himself to be hoodwinked by anything that appeared in the *Australian*. It has been my experience that almost any report that appears in that paper with respect to this State is inaccurate.

Mr. Russack: Are you saying that this one is inaccurate?

Dr. Tonkin: There was a good report of what happened in the Premier's Department, a couple of days ago.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader has had his day—

Mr. Russack: Are you saying that this report was incorrect?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The report the honourable member dealt with, from last year, was. The matter is still under consideration. The committee has not reported yet, so no decision has been made. I would not expect that the decision will be very much longer. It is not just the possibility of a Spencer Gulf site that is under consideration: there is also a possibility of siting the power station at Leigh Creek. That aspect of the situation has had to be considered in view of the attempts made by the Federal Minister for Transport to raise the cost of carting coal, which has been increased recently.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister must be allowed an opportunity to answer the question.

Dr. Eastick: What did Coombs tell him to do about coal prices?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know whether the member for Light thinks that the price should be raised just because the Federal Government says it should be. No doubt the Leader thinks the price should be raised, because he supports everything the Federal Government says and does. The score in relation to this matter is that there was a substantial increase last year to \$1.65 a ton. Mr. Nixon tried recently to increase the cost of carting Leigh Creek coal to a figure in excess of \$2.50 a ton and that that new rate would apply unilaterally from July 1. We have had discussions with officers of the Australian National Railways and South Australia has agreed to pay \$1.692 a ton but has refused to pay the additional rate. We have pointed out to the Federal Minister that we have an agreement with the Commonwealth that governs the terms on which Leigh Creek coal is to be carted. That is an additional factor that must be considered by the committee in determining the recommendation it makes. This is further evidence that the report last year in the *Australian* was entirely inaccurate.

Mr. Russack: The situation has altered considerably. Leigh Creek was not in the—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Leigh Creek was under consideration from the first: it was always a possible site. The question of whether a power station is sited on a coalfield or away from it must always be considered. That is the case now. It was also the case last year.

Mr. Russack: Did the committee considering the environmental impact consider Leigh Creek?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. I have just explained that that was the case to indicate the falsehood of the report in the *Australian*. I would advise the honourable member that, if he sees something in the *Australian*, he should disbelieve it, because the truth is usually the exact opposite. If the honourable member disbelieves 90 per cent of what he reads in that paper he will not be too far out. I believe that local papers have a much better record.

GLADSTONE GAOL

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made in determining the future activities of the closed Gladstone gaol? It is almost two years ago

that the gaol was closed. Because the gaol is in my district, I see it from the outside from time to time. Its condition has deteriorated, so I ask the Minister what the Government has in mind for these large buildings at Gladstone, because they must certainly have a potential use.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware of what the future of these buildings will be. Possibly the Chief Secretary is the Minister I should contact about this matter. I shall be pleased to do so and to see what I can ascertain for the honourable member.

LIVESTOCK

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Minister of Transport take steps to frame regulations to allow stockowners to use amber flashing lights on vehicles moving stock along public roads? The Minister would be well aware that primary producers who own two or more parcels of land in different parts of a district could well have to travel some kilometres on public roads in order to get from pasture to pasture (in years when there is a pasture). Tourism is popular in my district and many people, particularly at holiday time, travel through the area not understanding the need that stockowners have to move stock in this way. These people are therefore not on their guard for stock that may be over the next rise in the road. Undulating land produces undulating roads. Many times I have heard of stock having been killed because someone has come over a hill and has run into a mob of sheep. There have also been many near misses. It seems that it would be reasonable to allow primary producers to use an amber flashing light on the top of a vehicle in the same way as such lights are used on tow-trucks, road sweepers and the like, in order to indicate to people using the road that a hazard is ahead. The archaic methods that have been used include red flags on top of long sticks, and so on. These measures do not indicate a warning to people who do not understand the warning. I therefore ask the Minister whether anything can be done to alleviate what can be a dangerous road hazard.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Granting permission to fit amber flashing lights on vehicles is a function of the Road Traffic Board. Indeed, the board has an oversight of all the factors associated with the Road Traffic Act. Over the years, the board has made recommendations on various matters. From time to time requests have been made to the board for authority for vehicles to be fitted with amber flashing lights. The board has always adopted a strict attitude to such requests and has severely restricted the use of such lights to vehicles to which the honourable member referred when he spoke about tow-trucks and street sweepers. He also referred, I think, to vehicles of like nature, but I am not too sure what he means by that. After tow-trucks and one or two other service vehicles are considered, such as Engineering and Water Supply and Highways vehicles—

Mr. Boundy: Road markers.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. For vehicles other than those, the Road Traffic Board has said "No" to applications in the past. In some cases, applications have been made by organisations that run their own breakdown service for their own vehicles. Those applications, too, have been rejected. Without entering into a debate on whether or not those applications should have been granted by the board, that is the decision which the board has made previously and which has always been readily accepted. In the light of the attitude adopted by the board, the

likelihood of its agreeing to the honourable member's suggestion is extremely remote. However, I will refer his suggestion to the board and, if I am wrong, I shall be delighted to let him know.

GOVERNMENT TENDERS

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Works comment on the apparent delay involved in applicants receiving tender documents from the Services and Supply Department? I would much appreciate it if the Minister could investigate the matter for me. Heritage Industries complained to me that, on August 2, it applied for tender No. 991 and tender No. 1010, both of which were advertised in the *Advertiser* on that date. They received documents relating to tender 991 on Wednesday, August 11, and documents relating to tender 1010 on Friday, August 13, with the result that they had only three days to quote on tender 991 and virtually no time at all to quote on tender 1010. The company asked that the Director-General of the department look into the matter on August 18. I believe the Minister will appreciate that it is vitally important that industries such as this industry should receive ample time in which to prepare competitive tenders. The company is worried that it could be precluded from tendering if this practice happens repeatedly.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take up this matter with the Director-General of the Services and Supply Department. That department is now, of course, under the control of the Chief Secretary. It was known previously as the State Supply Department and was under my control but, in accordance with the Corbett report, control has been handed over to the Chief Secretary. I will certainly take up this matter with him, obtain a report for the honourable member, and see whether that matter can be rectified.

LAND TAX

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Land Tax Act, 1936-1974, should be immediately amended to provide a formula for rating which gives due regard to current land use and not possible or potential use as reflected by present assessed value.

The kernel of the motion is contained in the words "a formula for rating which gives due regard to current land use". I have used the vehicle of the Land Tax Act for the purpose of ventilating the grave anomalies existing in relation to landowners in South Australia. I could equally as well have cited the Waterworks Act, the Sewerage Act, the Valuation Act or, indeed, the Local Government Act, because each and every one of those Acts (and there are others) contain an element of valuation that impinges on the person who owns or uses the property, either as a rate that is a charge or as a direct tax. I do not apologise for using the Land Tax Act. I go even further and say that the most recent announcements by the Premier (goodness only knows what they are, but I will come to that later) in no way reduce the scope and the opportunity for members to consider my motion and other related facts.

Regarding what the Premier said yesterday as an aside to the member for Fisher when delivering his Budget address (unfortunately, neither the question by the member nor the reply by the Premier appears in *Hansard*), there was

immediately in the minds of Opposition members a question about the full impact the Government intends in its most recent announcement about the removal of rural land tax. However, I will not dwell on rural land tax, because there are other aspects of this matter which, I believe, have far wider implications, and it is those implications to which I direct members' attention. I believe that the root of the problem lies in the fact that we use what is almost a mythical term, namely, unimproved land value, but what is unimproved land value? I will come to that matter in some detail later. A value is placed on a property, and I do not argue whether that value is the true value or some other value. I do not, by that comment, want to belittle or degrade in any way members of the valuing profession, because they are required to make decisions, based on criteria and guidelines which were handed down over a long period of time by this Parliament and which put into effect certain other policy guidelines given to them by the Government of the day.

I believe that the important issue regarding valuations (whether they be wrong or right in their determination) is that there be a reality between various valuations. If they are all wrong in the same direction, but one is relative to the other, having regard to the area of land, the use of the land, or its geographical location, there can be no argument. Obviously, situations arise in which anomalies occasionally occur, anomalies that are not the desire of the valuer; it may well be in an inter-departmental programme or whatever (and I hasten to mention the recent West Torrens episode where, obviously, errors existed, but we do not attempt to suggest that it was the valuer's fault). I am talking about the system, of which relativity is the important issue. The differences in valuation I will identify are those that arise from the tools that we, the legislators, have given to the valuers—tools, in this context, in the form of words we give them in legislation, in definitions and in guidelines about which we do little or nothing if and when, by way of interpretation in the department or in the courts, a result is produced different from our original expectations. Regrettably, too often when the mistakes produce a financial bonus to the Government in power (as a result of a wider application than was originally intended), they are left in the legislation precisely as they are, no attempt being made to amend them. Whereas, if we find a deficiency in the intention and interpretation identified by the courts or within the department, in a short time so that we may attain the financial expectation of the measure, amendments come before the House so that the Government gets its just desserts (in that sense, being its expected revenue). But in the bonus situation that has occurred on several previous occasions it is not quickly corrected, as I believe it should be.

All Parties must share the blame for this issue, because there have been no amendments to the legislation arising from the determinations in the *H. M. Martin v Commissioner of Taxation* case, which highlighted certain deficiencies; certainly no amendments resulting from the *John Martins v Commissioner of Taxation* case, to which I will refer later. The variations and discrepancies unfolded in those cases have not been corrected by Governments of either Liberal or Labor persuasion. The problem definitely increases when we find ourselves in an inflationary cycle, such as that which is with us now, one which was going ahead unimpeded prior to the change of Federal Government and one which, fortunately for every Australian, is coming back to the field slowly but surely since the change of Government last December. I believe that the current escalation of

prices and values has highlighted the real dangers and difficulties which exist and which were expressed by the member for Heysen earlier this afternoon when he asked the Premier a question relating to sewerage and water rates. They are extraordinary figures, but figures which relate to actual valuations, all of which stem back to the phrase, "unimproved land value". In allowing unimproved value to remain independent and completely unrelated to land use during the years, we have allowed the situation to arise that involves the major problems aired by the public of South Australia in the past nine months to 12 months, whether in relation to water, sewerage, land tax, council rates, or anything else associated with valuation.

Actual value is related, and must be related by a satisfactory formula, to actual land use, and we must depart from a situation in which we are constantly allowing ourselves to be placed, in which we are basing land value on a fictitious and hypothetical price, one which is a possibility but which, in many instances, is not a probability; there the difference exists. In referring to documents to reinforce the points I have made, I turn, first, to the booklet put out by the State Taxes Department headed, "Land Tax, Guide to Legislation" and superscribed "1975". In the summary at page 4, we find that tax is based on a determination of the unimproved value of land made by the Valuer-General under the Valuation of Land Act, and that unimproved valuations are subject to equalisation each year.

I do not want to discuss the broader area of equalisation factors, or indeed go into whether they are legal. Aspects of that matter are at present exercising the minds of some people, as to whether the arbitrary use of an equalisation factor for purposes of this nature falls completely within the constitutional powers of the Government of this State. Certainly, anomalies arise as a result of the use of that equalisation factor. They can be quite serious, but they bear no relationship to a variation in valuation on properties associated with drought, flood, fire, or a series of other natural calamities. Although the chance may exist for claims to be made for special consideration, if the calamity happens after the period of time laid down in the Statutes by which an objection must be lodged, other difficulties arise.

In relation to unimproved value, the crutch on which the Government rests is that relating to the *H.M. Martin* case of 1964. In correspondence dated February 5, the Premier refers to the fact that the Valuer-General has advised that the basic principle of land valuation is to ascertain the sum the owner could have expected a reasonably willing purchaser to pay for the land, if he had been reasonably willing to sell it, with all its existing advantages and future possibilities. This principle was endorsed by the Full Supreme Court in the case of *H. M. Martin and Sons Limited v Commissioner of Land Tax*. Although that was specifically in relation to a case revolving around section 12c of the Land Tax Act, relating to exemptions for rural activities within metropolitan areas, the thrust of the matter is far wider. If we go to the case, reported in the *South Australian State Reports* of 1964, at page 51, we find that the case was heard by the Full Supreme Court, and that those constituting the court were the Chief Justice (Mr. Justice Napier), Justice Chamberlain, and Justice Travers. The case before the court took place on October 10 and November 1, 1963. The report states, at page 54:

By s. 10 of the Land Tax Act, 1936, land tax (according to the rates fixed by s. 12) was imposed on all land in South Australia with the exceptions mentioned in that section. The exceptions may be indicated as (1) Crown

lands, (2) park lands and public reserves, and (3) land used solely for religious or charitable purposes.

That situation has changed. The basic record of the Land Tax Act is as reprinted and as appears in the 1961 volume, and provisions of the exemptions over a period have increased, with the support of members on both sides of this House, having regard to organisations providing services within the community that should be given special consideration: conservation, housing of fauna, and various other exemptions. We need not argue that situation. The report continues:

Section 11 provides that the unimproved value of any land shall be the taxable value, and "unimproved value" is defined as "the capital amount for which the fee simple might be expected to sell . . . assuming the actual improvements (if any) thereon had not been made".

Their Honours, in considering this matter, went right back to the original Act covering these matters before the existence of the Land Tax Act, 1936. They indicated the thrust and the importance put on certain features of taxing and valuation, as referred to in earlier legislation. They came forward with another important decision, as follows:

It seems to us that the plain intention of the enactment is to give "declared rural land" a partial exemption by valuing it without regard to potentialities and possibilities outside the use for primary production, and, in particular, without regard to its suitability for subdivision. In other words, the land is to be valued as though it could not lawfully be used for any purpose not enumerated in the definition. But that, we think, is as far as the exemption goes.

For these reasons the first question in the case stated will be answered in the affirmative, i.e., that, upon the true construction of s. 12c (5) of the Land Tax Act, 1936-61, the taxable value of "declared rural land" is to be based upon the unimproved value of that land, assessed as land put to the most advantageous form of primary production of which it is capable.

That decision concentrates on rural land, and I do not want to rest on that any further. I turn now to the John Martin case, reported in 1965 South Australian State Reports, a case taken following the construction by John Martin's (Elizabeth) Limited of a departmental store at the then developing centre of Elizabeth.

The report clearly indicates that discussions took place between the South Australian Housing Trust and the parent body (John Martin and Company Limited) in relation to the procurement of land. When making the decision to purchase the land, the offer was made by the trust for the walkways, roadways, pathways and the cleaning of the mall to be the responsibility of the trust. The Commissioner of Taxation sought to include the value of those services in the unimproved value of the land. In his lengthy summing up, Mr. Justice Bright cited many arguments that had been placed before the courts of Australia on similar issues in the past. He came down clearly on the side of the appellant (John Martin's) that the unimproved value of the land would not include the appurtenances adjacent thereto, which would enhance its value, but the value of the unimproved land rested in the land itself.

I believe the views of the court on that matter are important. I believe the value of land will be that which relates to the land itself and not to adjacent features. Regrettably one can cite case after case in which features other than the land are included in the value placed on a parcel of land. In many cases a small parcel of land is given a higher value than that placed on another parcel of land valued on a broad-acre basis. It is possible to have cattle grazing on one parcel of land which, according to the Valuer-General has grass three

times the value of the grass through the fence on the same property simply because two titles are involved, one of which is less than 12 hectares and the other is more than 32 ha. One herd is grazing on one property being used for the one purpose, yet the department sees fit, on the guidelines laid down by the Premier and Cabinet, to ascribe to small parcels of land an additional value because it may be sold for residential purposes. I believe that is a value that cannot be ascribed properly to such a parcel of land.

In his summing up, Mr. Justice Bright referred to the Spencer case, which is recorded in *Commonwealth Law Reports* Volume 5 of 1907-8. The case between Spencer and the Commonwealth of Australia was heard by the High Court of Australia. It was heard before their Honours Mr. Justice Griffith, Mr. Justice Barton and Mr. Justice Isaacs as a result of a ruling given by Mr. Justice Higgins. All the questions related to what was a true and realistic value of unimproved land. On page 440 of that report the following was stated:

The facts existing on January 1, 1905, are the only relevant facts, and the all important fact on that day is the opinion regarding the fair price of the land which a hypothetical prudent purchaser would entertain, if he desired to purchase it for the most advantageous purpose for which it was adapted. The plaintiff is to be compensated; therefore he is to receive the money equivalent to the loss he has sustained by deprivation of his land, and that loss, apart from special damage not here claimed, cannot exceed what such a prudent purchaser would be prepared to give him. To arrive at the value of the land at that date, we have, as I conceive, to suppose it sold then, not by means of a forced sale, but by voluntary bargaining between the plaintiff and a purchaser, willing to trade, but neither of them so anxious to do so that he would overlook any ordinary business consideration.

That comment was made by Mr. Justice Isaacs, who also said:

In the result, then, the special adaptability of the land for factory sites is immaterial and the general value of the land as workmen's cottages prevails at a sum not exceeding the amount paid into the court.

I refer to that matter because it is the basis of the argument I want to put before the Government on this occasion. It was contended that the value of the parcel of land was enhanced if it could be sold as a factory block. In other words, the value of the parcel of land was to be greater at some time in the future if it could be sold as a whole for a factory site, not the value it enjoyed on that particular day when subdivided into small blocks for workers' cottages. In South Australia today land is being valued, and therefore taxes and charges are being levied, on the reverse of that situation where the probable value of a block of land is being used to establish an unimproved value, and people are being charged a fictitious price based on a value that the land may never reach.

People with whom I have discussed this matter have all accepted the provisions of section 12c of the Land Tax Act and section 61 of the Planning and Development Act, that, where land that has been used for a particular purpose is subsequently sold for development purposes, the benefit that the seller has obtained by way of a reduction in valuation and therefore of costs associated with rates and charges for the preceeding five years should be paid. I think everyone accepts that situation, but on their behalf I express my fears of the consequences of continuing a method of valuation that permits a future possibly unobtainable value as being the basis on which rates and charges will be applied.

Small parcels of land in the main street of Hahndorf are being valued on an unimproved land value basis at a

figure in excess of \$40 000. These parcels of land, with their existing cottages, give character to the area of Hahndorf. Because one or two similar parcels of land have been sold for commercial purposes, the price based on those commercial purposes is now being ascribed to all of the similar sized blocks in the township. One does not have to stop at the township of Hahndorf to find examples similar to that which I have just related. By using that higher valuation the Government (or, taking it beyond that, this Parliament) is participating in the destruction of much of our natural heritage and many of the aesthetic amenities and values of the community in which we live. By ascribing these values to those parcels of land, we are forcing people to move off them and to sell them for commercial purposes or to speculators.

The member for Fisher, when questioning the Premier yesterday, asked about the position of a person who has Hills face zone land which is natural scrub and which that person wishes to maintain as natural scrub but which has been ascribed a value which, for 65 hectares, incurred a land tax in excess of \$3 200. There is only one answer to a situation like that where there is virgin scrub which has no return; the person is being forced to sell. Is the Government accepting that the only way for a person to meet the costs associated with land tax on that property is to clear it and subdivide it? Does that not completely destroy the purpose of preserving the Hills and creating in the first instance a Hills face zone? Granted that the cost of the land tax was decreased on appeal (but not by much), it does not destroy the argument I have put that we are not as a Parliament benefiting the amenity of our community or State by allowing a system of unimproved land value such as exists at the moment to continue without question.

The Lewis report, headed "Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, South Australia: Rural-urban land use conflict in the Adelaide Hills" (and I stress "rural-urban", and more particularly the urban aspect, because we are not being hung up in this debate on aspects which are only rural), clearly indicates in its introduction that the Mount Lofty Range provides outlets for recreation and places for people to live. The report states:

While such land uses are often conflicting and competitive with one another, it is considered that continued multiple land use is of most benefit to the community.

I agree, but the present method of valuation will force people into the position of having only one land use, that is, subdivisional, because only from subdivisional land can one create a position of reducing the taxation a unit to a point where it can be paid. This is preferable to the problem that exists where a person with a large area is being taxed out of existence because that person can neither make from the land nor put together funds from another source that will allow him to meet his commitments.

A worthwhile report by Messrs. Moore and Hartley refers to land usage by small block holders in the Mount Lofty Range and their aims and achievements. These people make the important point that "in the understanding of the survey group, amenity is the use of blocks as a means to obtaining a preferred way of life". In all respects of our future planning and of looking at these matters of valuation, we must realise that we owe it to the community in which we live to permit a variety of land uses and of living methods which allow people to do their thing in their own way without interference to other persons' use of the general amenity.

I do not want to canvass this matter any further, except to mention the serious problem that arises in respect of urban land price legislation as a further indication of the

type of problem which has arisen in the valuation confusion in this State. The title of legislation passed in this House in Act No. 64 in 1973 was as follows:

An Act to provide for price control upon certain land; to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1972; and for other purposes.

In that Act, provision is made that a parcel of land, having been purchased, may be resold only subject to increases which bear relation to a determined interest factor and to other directly related charges on the land. There was a situation in Gawler recently where a parcel of land purchased in January, 1974, for \$3 100 now has a permitted maximum resale value of \$4 250. Seven weeks ago, two adjacent blocks were on the market. One of them was sold for \$5 500. That block was directly adjacent to the block previously valued at \$3 100. The block next to the one that was sold was sold for \$5 750. This afternoon, when answering the member for Heysen, the Premier said:

Those are the values which will be used as true and realistic market values to determine the value of all blocks in that vicinity and all blocks elsewhere in South Australia of like kind, having regard to accessibility to markets and facilities such as schools and roadways.

Those values will allow an unimproved value to be attributed to land that cannot be sold at more than \$4 250, land that is identical to that where the value attributed to it was \$5 750. In other words, a person is being denied the chance to sell a block at its going rate but is expected to pay taxes such as for water and sewerage, and land tax, council rates, and other rates and charges that could apply, as if it had the higher value. That is completely anomalous. It is a situation that this Parliament should have foreseen when the legislation was passed.

Perhaps the legislation which the Minister for Planning gave notice this afternoon that he would introduce will overcome that situation, and provide in future that a parcel of land can only be valued for taxing purposes at the value it can bring on the market subject to the pressures or the requirements of any Government Act or direction. Whilst we have the anomaly of imposing a "probable value" on land that is not necessarily its "possible value", there will be continuous turmoil. I believe this motion is the vehicle whereby the necessary alterations will effect a rational and proper approach to the taxing and valuation system in South Australia. I therefore seek unanimous support for the motion.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion. The motion, which has been referred to twice in relation to the provision of a land tax formula for rating that gives due regard to present land use and not possible or potential land use as we have with the assessed values, is of significance to the present problems of valuations and taxes. Many times I have referred to this problem. Today, I referred to water and sewerage rates, and I presume the same will apply to other taxes that will result because of highly inflated valuations. I do not intend to dwell on the rural situation, but rather to refer to valuations that have occurred in the metropolitan and rural areas. Recently, in reply to a question about land tax, the Premier stated:

The basic principles of land valuation are to arrive at a figure the owner could expect a reasonably willing buyer to pay for land with all its existing advantages and future possibilities. In areas where the market value for land is steadily rising, land can realise prices far in excess of the capitalised value of its immediate use. Sales of both urban and rural land do tend to rise significantly as the parcels of land decrease in area.

As the member for Light said this afternoon, our main problem is the potential use of the valuation. Many references have been made in the media and, indeed, by members in this House about high land valuations in the metropolitan area, and many examples have been given of increased valuations. The member for Light referred to Hahndorf. People living in several towns in the Adelaide Hills are experiencing the same problem as a result of highly inflated land values. Although the Premier's recent announcement about land tax is welcomed, the statement was brought about because of protests throughout the State and efforts that have come from this side of the House in making this matter known to the Government. Many Hills' people are being forced off the land because of high taxation. Until the Premier (or the Government) clarifies the position about people living outside the metropolitan planning area, there will still be examples of people paying land tax in the Adelaide Hills.

Mr. Evans: It is doing nothing but encouraging the destruction of the Adelaide Hills.

Mr. WOTTON: That is so. Older residents in Hahndorf, people who provide tourist attractions in the town by continuing with their traditional German habits, and by living in traditional German houses, are being forced to sell their properties because valuations are based on future speculative gambles rather than on the producing potential or the actual value of the property. Some people on adjacent blocks are being taxed on the basis of what certain residents have done by using their initiative in the main street of Hahndorf to turn old sheds into attractive and well-paying restaurants.

As the member for Light said, people with small acreages who wish to remain on those properties are being forced off their land. I quote a letter from a person in Hahndorf who has been affected by a valuation. He states:

As I have just received my notice from the Valuation Department, I am now requesting you as our representative in Parliament to strongly protest at such big increases in values. The increases on my home at Hahndorf are as follows:

	Unimproved Value	Annual Value
	\$	\$
1970	800	680
1973	2 300	960
1976	8 500	2 150

The point I wish to stress is this: I have lived in Hahndorf over 60 years having been born here. My home represents my life's savings, and as I have no intention of ever selling my home, all I ask is that I be able to spend my last few years living in my home, without being taxed more than I can afford and be forced to sell out. I believe that this situation has occurred as a result of the Government's legislation in the Land Tax Act and the Valuation Act. In no way can we blame the people who work in the Valuer-General's Department, whose valuers are carrying out the rules that have been set down for them by the Dunstan Government. A desperate need exists to examine individual cases on their own merits concerning valuation. We have had many examples of properties being retained for rural use, but being taxed as though they were able to be sold for subdivision. However, in many cases this is not so: properties that have had massive increases in valuation are unable to be subdivided in any way. One property near Hahndorf not being used for rural production is owned by David Heyesen, the son of the former South Australian artist, Sir Hans Heyesen.

The property consists of 39.3 hectares. The unimproved value in 1973 for one section of the property was \$27 740; in 1976, it was increased to \$78 300. The overall property

in 1973 was valued at an unimproved value of \$39 000 and, in 1976, a value of \$128 500 was placed on the same property, which is not being used for rural production, nor is it being used for subdivision. It is being retained purely as an area for sentimental reasons and virtually as a memorial to one of South Australia's most famous artists. Yet, these people in the past have paid massive land tax, and they are continuing to pay increasing taxes in all shapes and forms.

Cases such as this one should be examined individually on their own merits. In East Torrens, especially in the foothills section, is another area not used for rural production, but in which landowners are being virtually forced off their land. They are unable to subdivide their properties. All they want to do is to retain the house on the property on which they live. I have received several letters in my electorate office from people in this area, and I will quote from one I have received from the Montacute area, as follows:

A short time ago you invited me to call upon you for any information I may need. So I now bring to your notice the following matter. On the 19th instant I received a valuation from the Land Valuation Department assessing the property on which I live. The details are as follows.

The area is 3.21 hectares. The unimproved value for this year is \$14 500: the unimproved value at the most recent valuation was \$2 380. A quick calculation shows that the land tax payable will now be about \$50, instead of \$8. About \$60 was charged for land tax in that area. The letter continues:

The particular area in which I live is, as far as I am aware, zoned only for agriculture and/or recreation and has neither reticulated water, sewerage, nor public transport. It cannot be partitioned into building allotments, so it is a logical assumption that possibly a mistake has been made in the area of calculation or there is a lack of geographical awareness.

There was no mistake in the valuation. The letter continues:

As an inquiry to the department would be more productive from your side, rather than from mine in the quest for elucidation and confirmation, could you spare a few moments from your time to do so, as the time allotted for protest, if entered, is rapidly diminishing.

After consulting the Valuer-General, I received the following reply:

I refer to your letter of March 25, 1976, concerning the valuation of Mr. Adam's property at Montacute. The property comprises 3.21 hectares of elevated land situated on the high side of the Montacute to Marble Hill Road in the Hills face zone approximately 10 km from the Montacute Post Office. As subdivision of the land in this area is prohibited, the property has been valued as a single rural living area and calculated at \$14 500 unimproved value. The valuation of the land was made having regard to recent sales of similar land in the area as follows.

Four examples were given of land sold recently near this property, showing massive increases in the sum people were willing to pay for small acreages on which to build a house, and for no other reason. These cases naturally arise when people are willing to go into an area and pay exorbitant prices for land, thereby increasing the value of property. I believe that, if that property had been based on its present land use instead of on its potential, a more realistic attitude would have been taken in regard to that property, and that person would have been able to remain on the property rather than being forced off by having to sell at that time in his life when he should have been able to remain in the area.

This is a matter of concern not only to people in rural areas: people in urban areas through the Hills and in the metropolitan area are also concerned. As the member for Light said earlier, there have been several examples of this

happening because of the confusion caused by this Government in what the valuers in the Valuer-General's Department should be doing. There have been blatant inconsistencies in valuation in adjoining lands of similar production potential and market value. Sometimes there has been complete confusion in the department, because valuers were uncertain of what they were supposed to be doing in this regard. The member for Light also referred, as I have done many times, to the necessity to preserve the Adelaide Hills. If we are to preserve the Hills, and if we are to preserve rural properties near the metropolitan area, we must study land on the basis of its present use value rather than its potential value. Many problems raised in this House relating to massive increases in State taxation, especially from members in this side, have resulted from this form of valuation. I support the member for Light in moving this motion, and I ask for the support of other members. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

DEFENCE PROGRAMME

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I move:

That this House congratulate the Federal Liberal Government and in particular the Minister for Defence in taking action to upgrade the Australian Armed Forces and return to them the high morale and self respect they enjoyed before 1972; further, this House congratulate him on his promise to reinstate the school cadets which will encourage initiative and self reliance to the youth of Australia wishing to take advantage of the scheme.

Members will be aware, as will the public generally, that under the Whitlam Commonwealth Government, Australia was heading for a situation similar to that which prevailed in 1939, especially in the United Kingdom. The defence situation then existing was brought about by the socialist Labour Government of Ramsay MacDonald, with its disarmament programme. At that time, the nations of the free world were undermanned and ill-equipped, and the armed forces were completely demoralised. Those who were involved well remember trying to face the crisis. We had no vehicles, no equipment, and few planes, with which to guard the free nations. We were given a breathing space when Hitler and his Nazis did not attack immediately, and we were able to re-arm to take on the brunt of the war.

When it was all over, we were told that it would never happen again, and yet we have the present situation in Australia. The Federal Liberal Government inherited an economy that was on its knees, a deficit of about \$5 000 000 000, with unemployment at its highest ever level; and the defences of the country were at their lowest ebb. It is difficult for the aims and policies of the Liberal Government to be put into immediate operation. I refer honourable members to a report in the *Advertiser* on July 8, 1976, which states:

The Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser) yesterday criticised senior defence experts for preparing defence assessments which were "not adequate" for formulating defence policy. He told the National Press Club that recent assessments of the world situation did not go far enough. They did not go into many world questions in sufficient depth to provide an accurate assessment of their impact on Australia.

The report continues:

Mr. Fraser said wider questions were now being asked and more information was now available. "The assessments of the past are, in our view, not adequate for the formulation of defence policy today," he said. "They do not represent the present assessments of this Government which basically accepts the conclusion reached by all the NATO powers."

The former Federal Government did not take heed of the warnings of the NATO powers, and followed a policy similar to that of some other Governments before the Second World War. We are all aware that the Whitlam policy brought about the decrease in defence capabilities over the past three years, and that defence preparedness was given a low priority.

A ceiling was placed on the strength of the Australian Regular Army; training activities were curtailed; and support was reduced for forward planning for new equipment. The Army Reserve was reduced and, against all recommendations, the school cadets system was disbanded. Many people were concerned about the situation. In the *News* of November 3, 1975, under the heading "Cadets decision against report", a report states:

School cadets were axed by the Federal Government this year in defiance of a report calling for their retention. The report was commissioned by the Government in 1973—

of course, that is the Whitlam Government—

It is finally recommended that: "The present Army Cadets be retained with modifications, and on a totally voluntary basis during peace time." Slightly more than 12 months after the report was tabled, the Defence Minister, Mr. Morrison, announced the units would be disbanded.

Dr. Millar, who was the Chairman of the committee that brought in that report, stated that the Government had chosen to ignore the social value of cadet training and had seized upon the words "school cadets have a small military value". The Government declined to read further. The main part of the phrase was left out, and the Government seized on that to condemn school cadets. Quoting Dr. Millar, the report states:

Other recommendations the Government chose to ignore were: The Army should decide the strength of cadet units and be relieved of more of the training burden.

It means that the Army should decide matters of strength, not politicians. The report continues:

All secondary schools should be invited to form units. Training for cadet officers be made more thorough and the system be thrown open to girls.

The report states quite plainly that the cadet system should have been open to girls who wished to join. The air cadets were disbanded at the same time, with resultant uproar. In the *News* on December 2, 1975, a report states:

A bid by Air Force Reserve Officers to save Australia's air cadet training scheme has been thwarted—by an order requesting their resignations. The officers have been told to resign or seek a transfer from air cadet training by the end of this week.

The then Labor Government reduced our defence system to its lowest ebb. The Millar report recommends that the total strength of the Army cadet units and allocation to States and Territories should be decided by the Army, within Government policy. The report also stated that the present school cadet system be retained, with modifications, on a totally voluntary basis during peace time. Recommendations were also made in the report on the number of air and navy cadet units. The report claimed the following assets for cadet training:

It teaches discipline, the capacity to accept and to give commands, and the first must precede the second. It fosters self-discipline.

We all know the beliefs of the Labor Party about discipline: it does not believe in discipline. The report continues:

It teaches boys to work as a team, and to sublimate personal consideration in a common objective and to share experiences.

It fosters comradeship among the boys, crossing class or educational barriers.

It fosters loyalty to one's country, to the school, and to the group.

That is another thing with which the socialists and extreme left wing would not agree; it fosters loyalty to one's country. The report continues:

It teaches self-reliance and self-confidence, enabling boys to cope with situations they would otherwise find difficult or impossible.

Many people within the community objected to cadet units being abandoned. In my district a cadet unit had just begun to operate at Glengowrie High School, and an excellent unit had existed for many years at Sacred Heart College. I believe the discontinuance of the cadet system was a tragedy for the Sacred Heart College, because of its long-standing and excellent reputation. I believe this action has severely diminished the effective operational operation, leaving the morale of those serving in the Armed Forces at rock bottom. That situation is not acceptable to the people of Australia, nor can it be. We read every day of defence build-ups around the world. The only information the library could obtain about defence forces in communist countries came from American sources, and it stated that military spending in China had declined by 25 per cent during the period 1971 to 1975.

No official defence estimates are published in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, although estimated defence expenditure in 1974-75 is put at \$96 000 000 000. The general trend in the communist countries is a continuing emphasis on nuclear weapons, but without any reduction in the level of conventional arms. I believe we should be able to defend our country should the situation arise, but our forces must be provided with modern equipment as a means of doing so. We must not totally rely on our allies for defence assistance, especially from the geographical point of view. If we are willing to accept defence assistance we must do something ourselves.

Apart from weapon capabilities it is also necessary to provide for our defence forces, an area for which this country has in the past relied heavily on allies. The defence of one's country is a proud attribute of nationhood and the present Federal Liberal Government had accepted this responsibility: it is to be congratulated. To this end the Minister for Defence (Mr. Killen) has recently announced a defence programme that will involve an expenditure of more than \$12 000 000 000 in the next five years. That may be a large sum, but when balanced against the \$96 000 000 000 to be spent by the U.S.S.R. in one year, we are not going as far as the communist countries. This expenditure is required to give Australia a credible defence capacity.

The Minister has also announced an immediate increase in service activities, including greater participation in exercises; and equipment acquisitions, including the British Rapier surface-to-air guided missile system, additional Leopard tanks, the selection of the Land Rover as the Army's light truck fleet, and air defence radar control and reporting facilities of the Royal Australian Air Force. In addition, an order has been placed for 12 Lockheed C130 Hercules transport aircraft for the Air Force. The new H model is expected to be available for delivery in 1978, replacing the A model C130, which has been in service since 1958, and by the time the replacements arrive in 1978 these aircraft will have been in service for 20 years. The cost of aircraft and associated equipment is estimated to be about \$86 000 000, and it will be purchased on a Government-to-Government basis through the United States Air Force. The strength of the permanent defence force as at May, 1976, totalled 68 677. This figure comprised: Navy, 15 994; Army, 31 415; and Air Force, 21 268. Mr. Killen has announced the

re-introduction of the cadet training scheme, which was initiated early this year. The cadet system, which existed previously, cost up to \$12 000 000 a year. The Liberal Government has approved of cadet training while at the same time seeking to ensure maximum efficiency is obtained with the resources available. This encompasses school and community sponsored units. The Federal Government, as well as being charged with the efficient management of Australia, has a responsibility to the community for the quality of youth. The value of the cadet system is as a means of teaching leadership, discipline, self-reliance and loyalty. I ask the House to support my motion to congratulate the Federal Liberal Government on giving assistance and bringing back some joy to members of the Armed Forces, and to congratulate the Minister for Defence for initiating the cadet training scheme.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The honourable member for Glenelg should be commended for bringing this matter before the House, because the defence of this country is something not to be tinkered with: the future of this country is in the hands of young people. We heard the hue and cry about lowering the age of majority to 18 years, and if it is good enough for those kids of 18 to defend this country, one must remember that a 17-year old is only one year younger. The gravamen of the honourable member's motion is that we congratulate the Federal Government. He also referred to the reinstatement of the cadet forces. There is nothing wrong with cadet forces, and their administration is to be on a voluntary basis. We heard last evening, during the adjournment debate, one of our members being upbraided for speaking about "Bolsheviks under the bed". There are subversive forces abroad in this country today, and we have seen nations fall through lack of preparation. It is not my Party's policy to let that slip into limbo.

In a report in the *Advertiser* of October 4, 1975, the spokesman for the Liberal Party coalition in Canberra, Jim Killen, upbraided the Government of the day for failing to recognise the importance of the cadet system in Australia, and he said that any Government of which he was a member would reinstate this system, and took the then Labor Government to task for dismantling it. In replying, the then Minister for Defence (Mr. Morrison), said that the cadet system would be abolished, and that the \$11 500 000 needed to fund the Air Training Corp and Naval Reserve was needed to help Australian military preparedness. He went on to say that the Millar committee of inquiry into the Army cadet corp and top military advisers had decided to cease funding these cadet corps.

Obviously, the Government of the day found itself in financial difficulty, and the future defence of this country was one of the things that had to take a knock. We have had a change of Government in Canberra, and the present Minister for Defence has made a firm commitment to reinstate the cadet corps, with an across-the-board increase in defence personnel. The morale of the armed forces had fallen to a low ebb, because people were going on leave, coming back, and then being sent on extended leave.

Mr. Max Brown: Are you talking about the Armed Forces or the cadets?

Mr. RODDA: The Armed Forces. Mr. Morrison had said that the money could be spent to buy a squadron of Hercules aircraft. That was probably a politician's way of underlying our defence needs. This country got into a sorry state in more ways than one regarding matters that could be lined up alongside defence spending. The honourable member highlights this fact in his motion, which we on this side support, and commend him for

moving it. The question of defence is not a State matter, but people of the State are vitally interested in it. If Australia does not have the equipment and the Armed Forces in time of need—

Mr. Mathwin: Like happened last time.

Mr. RODDA: —Australia could be caught with its trousers down. If one is not prepared, one can pay dearly. It is not a question of having a standing army; a country must have modern equipment that can give an account of itself in time of need. A person does not have to be a warmonger to speak about this matter. The price of liberty is eternal vigilance, as has been spelt out by people who have long had an interest in this country. I do not believe that aggressors will come to the shores of Australia. I spent some time defending this country, and can remember being upside down over Frankfurt with nothing on the clock but the maker's name.

I was not much older at that time than the kids about whom we are referring now. However, what I have referred to are the horrors of war. Perhaps we did not do the job we should have done. What the member for Glenelg has brought forward in his motion is the preparedness that will stop this sort of thing happening in future. We on this side of the House, as I am sure members on the other side of the House, too, in their hearts, commend the honourable member for moving the motion.

Mr. OLSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It was introduced originally in another place by the Hon. D. H. Laidlaw. He is to be congratulated on taking the initiative in the preparation of such a Bill. Before covering his explanation, I intend to discuss some of the problems created by the 1973 amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act. There is an urgent need to amend the Act because of the major rehabilitation problems it has caused, the increase in premiums that has occurred, the ridicule directed at the Act by many workers, and the abuse of the Act by a small minority.

A weakness of the existing Workmen's Compensation Act is that the entire emphasis of that Act is placed on compensating the worker for the injury, whilst completely ignoring the important human factor of assisting the worker to return to the work force. As a result, there is a growing number of human tragedies caused by previously injured workers who are unable to find an employer who will risk employing them. To substantiate my claim I have two actual medical case histories of workers who are partially incapacitated, quite able to carry on light work (up to 90 per cent), willing to return to the work force, but who are both unable to find an employer who will employ them.

One of these men has been seeking a job since early 1974, when the existing Act was introduced. I am assured by many medical specialists and persons responsible for rehabilitation that these two cases are typical of countless other cases. A leading orthopaedic surgeon recently criticised the Act and said, "It in no way concerns itself with the restoration of the injured worker to a normal work a day life style." Mr. K. T. Jenkins, Director of Bedford

Industries, and Chairman of the United Nations Vocational Rehabilitation Committee recently joined the long list of critics of this Act.

Another major effect of the Act has been to increase sharply premiums for workmen's compensation. The cost of premiums for every \$100 paid in wages to an employee is now \$16.50 for builders labourers working on buildings of not more than two storeys, \$37.40 for timber fellers, and \$31.40 for underground miners. Increased premiums have resulted directly from increased payments for compensation. A total of \$36 200 000 was paid out in South Australia during 1974-75 under the new Act, compared with \$15 400 000, which was paid out during 1972-73, the last full year under the old Act. This represents a staggering increase of 135 per cent in workmen's compensation payouts under the Act in only two years.

Each South Australian worker is now paying the equivalent of \$64 per annum for workmen's compensation payouts. The cost of building a new house has increased from between \$800 to \$2 000 as a result of the legislation. The devastating effect on costs of manufacture and the competitive position of South Australian industry are obvious. Many workers now openly ridicule the existing Act. Its abuse by a small minority has led to resentment from fellow workers. They know the Act has substantially increased costs and contributed significantly to the high level of unemployment. Employers are often unwilling to employ additional staff because the overhead costs, which include workmen's compensation premiums, are so high.

Abuse of the Act by a small minority is widely acknowledged. A man with a back complaint was found deep-sea fishing. A woman with apparent industrial neurosis went to her local doctor to receive a medical certificate for exemption from work for a three week period to overcome the neurosis. Within two hours of seeing the doctor the woman was on a plane heading for Europe. Other cases are well known. I emphasise that this abuse occurs in a minority of cases.

These problems emphasise the urgent need to amend some of the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act. The proposals in this Bill presented by the Hon. D. H. Laidlaw overcome some of the obvious defects that exist at present. In two areas the Bill provides further benefits to an injured workman. In another area, the Bill will enable the court to apportion liability where a workman sustains injury in the service of two or more employers. I realise that the Minister is not interested in this important Bill, which he should want to hear. At present, the last employer of a person may be held liable for all his injuries, as a result of which some employers are now reluctant to engage a workman with a known physical defect or with a bad record of injuries. If the employer knew that, in the event of an injury being sustained, he would not necessarily be liable for the total compensation payment, he would more readily engage a partly incapacitated man.

The present practice of calculating compensation according to average weekly earnings over the previous 12 months will be changed. Instead, a workman will receive 100 per cent of his basic earnings for normal hours worked at the time of injury. This would include over-award and service payments, but would exclude overtime and certain special allowances. There is also provision to vary this compensation to allow for quarterly indexation, or other award changes.

Under these proposals a workman in South Australia would be compensated at least as generously as under the Acts of the other mainland States or under make-up

agreements within the Federal metal trades. The benefits would be better than those introduced by Ordinance in the Australian Capital Territory in 1975 and accepted by Federal Parliament during the Whitlam Administration. They also exceed the 85 per cent of average weekly earnings proposed in 1974 by the National Committee of Inquiry into Compensation and Rehabilitation. It will be recalled that the Chairman of this committee was Mr. Justice Woodhouse, of the New Zealand Court of Appeal, who took part in a similar inquiry in New Zealand in 1967. He was brought to Australia by the Whitlam Government because of his expertise in this subject.

Under the present legislation, an employee who has worked substantial overtime in months past but is not doing so now can receive more money by being at home than at work. I could quote many examples but will confine myself to the case of a construction employee who received \$224 a week during a prolonged period on compensation but who would have dropped to \$175 if he returned to work. There is no reason to suspect that this man concocted his injury, but the case was widely talked about on the shop floor. Because of poor legislation, this man became the subject of ridicule and envy amongst his workmates.

A great many working people have spoken of the need to change this part of the Act. Both sides of this Parliament also recognise the need to change it, and I refer particularly to a statement by the Premier on June 18 last. He said:

The Government is seeking to ensure that a person on workmen's compensation will not receive more while he is away from work than he would if back on the job. We are very conscious of the cost to employers of workmen's compensation.

I refer also to a statement by the Minister of Labour and Industry when presenting the second reading explanation of an amending Bill on February 11 last, which was subsequently withdrawn. He said:

The Government is concerned at the increase in the number of workmen's compensation claims that have been made since this Act came into operation in 1971. Although in the last four financial years the number of wage and salary earners in the State increased by just over 10 per cent from 408 000 to 449 000 the number of workmen's compensation claims increased by 50 per cent from 56 000 to 84 000.

I said when beginning this second reading explanation that there is urgent need to amend this Act. I remind members that in July, 1975, the Governor, when opening Parliament, said that the Government would introduce measures to revise the Act. Eight months later the long-awaited Bill was introduced but, to the complete dismay of the House and the public, it did little to correct anomalies. After the second reading explanation, even more so to the dismay of the House and the public, the Bill was withdrawn without debate.

The Governor, in his Speech on June 8, made no reference to workmen's compensation, but the Premier and the Minister of Labour and Industry stated subsequently that some legislation would be introduced during this session, although they did not say when this would happen or what facets of the Act would be changed. Therefore, I think it is appropriate to introduce this Bill at this early stage of the session.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3, which amends section 8 (1a), is consequential on the amendment of section 51 by clause 6. Clause 4 amends section 9 (2b) and (2e). Clause 4 (a) is of a drafting nature. Clause 4 (b) enlarges compensatable journeys to cover a journey to obtain a medical certificate in connection with an injury, not only

for which a workman has received compensation, as in the existing Act, but also for which he is entitled to receive or is seeking compensation in connection with any such injury. The additional cover proposed in this Bill is of significance to a workman in a decentralised area like Whyalla who may have to make a lengthy journey to Adelaide to seek special medical attention.

Clause 5 inserts section 32 (a). Under section 32 of the existing Act, an employer is bound to disclose his medical reports to a workman at any time before or during proceedings. This clause inserts a corresponding obligation on a workman in any proceedings under the Act, but not prior to such proceedings.

Clause 6 amends section 51. In the existing legislation where total or partial incapacity results from the injury, the amount of compensation shall be a weekly amount during the incapacity equal to the average weekly earnings during the period of 12 months immediately preceding the incapacity, or some lesser period if the workman has not been employed for so long a time. Clause 6 provides that an incapacitated workman would receive his current weekly earnings. This, as defined, would include his award wage, over-award and service payments, plus any leading hand, first-aid, tool, and qualification allowances.

If a workman is employed on incentive work, he would receive in lieu of incentive benefits 10 per cent of his award and over-award payments. The Hon. Mr. Laidlaw selected 10 per cent because some awards provide that, if an incentive scheme is introduced, it should be possible for an average workman to earn at least 10 per cent above his award rate. Weekly earnings as defined under clause 6 would exclude overtime and bonuses as well as shift, industry, disability, weekend and public holiday penalty, district, travelling, living, clothing and meal allowances. Disability is intended to cover allowances for dirt, danger, weather, confined spaces, heat, height, wet conditions, cold rooms, call-back, camping, etc. Clause 6 (d) provides that the changes to the weekly rate of compensation shall not operate retrospectively. To give comparisons with other States, I point out that under the existing Victorian Act an adult workman receives a minimum of \$70 a week rising to a maximum of \$107, depending on the number of his dependants. However, the Government has announced that it intends to introduce amending legislation, and a committee of inquiry is preparing recommendations. I was pleased to present evidence to the Victorian committee of inquiry and to enlighten it on some of the weaknesses in some of the existing South Australian legislation. Meanwhile, a workman in Victoria employed under the Federal Metal Trades Award does receive, as a result of an agreement between employers and unions, make-up pay whilst on compensation. This brings his benefit to a level equal to his award rate plus over-award payments. Make-up pay does not apply when an injury is suffered during the first two weeks of employment, nor does it apply during the first two working days of any incapacity. Furthermore, the maximum period of make-up pay for any one injury is 39 weeks. Make-up pay agreements apply in Victoria in some other Federal awards, in addition to metal trades.

Under the New South Wales legislation, a single adult receives as compensation \$64 a week plus \$14 for a wife or *de facto* wife and \$10 for each child between three years and 16 years, and up to 21 years for a student. However, there are make-up agreements under the Federal Metal Trades Award and other awards. In the metal trades the make-up is to normal pay, which is defined as the

award rate for 40 hours plus over-awards and, if a workman is employed under an incentive scheme, these are averaged over the three months prior to incapacity.

In Western Australia, a workman is entitled to receive the ordinary wage, including any over-award payment that he would have received for ordinary hours worked. However, because of confusion regarding interpretation of the term "ordinary wage", an amendment was passed in November, 1975, which specified that it included over-award payments but excluded bonus or incentive payments, weekend or public holiday, penalty and other special allowances.

In Queensland, a workman receives his average pay over the previous 12 months or his present award rate, whichever is the lower. If he is not covered by an award, his rate will be based on the rate in the South-East Queensland Fitter and Turners Award or his average pay, whichever is the lower.

In the Australian Capital Territory, under an Ordinance of 1975 which was accepted by Federal Parliament, a workman receives full pay for normal hours excluding overtime for the first six months of injury. After six months the benefit reduces to \$67.68 a week for a single adult, plus \$17.81 for a spouse and \$8.31 for each child. Provision is made for these amounts to be varied owing to indexation.

In Tasmania a workman receives average weekly earnings similar to the benefits applying at present in South Australia, under the existing Act. However, I understand that the Labor Government in that State is, like the Government here, concerned with the high level of claims and has set up a committee of inquiry to recommend modifications to the existing Act. Honourable members will note that the benefits proposed in clause 6 conform closely to the amended Western Australian legislation and to what employees under certain Federal awards are now receiving in Victoria and New South Wales.

Clause 7 inserts a new section 51 (a). It introduces a new scheme whereby the Industrial Court will have the power to apportion liability between employers where a workman sustained injuries whilst in the service of two or more employers. At present the last employer may be held liable for the total injury and, as I mentioned earlier, this amendment would help to minimise a serious social problem, namely, the reluctance of an employer because of full liability to engage a new workman with a known physical defect. Clause 7 (3) will enable two or more insurers, who covered an employer at different times, to have their respective contributions determined by the court. This would overcome the delays which occur at present when a workman has had a continuing or series of injuries, and different insurers dispute liability. At the moment, a court case is trying to sort out such a problem.

Clause 8 amends section 52 (a) and inserts an additional reason for an employer to give notice to discontinue compensation payments, namely, the failure of a workman to present a continuity of medical certificates. If an employee on compensation fails to supply those medical certificates, that is a justifiable reason to discontinue payments. Of course, there would be a time period in which to notify the employer that that discontinuance had occurred. New subsection (3) provides that, where a workman issues an application challenging his employer's right to discontinue weekly payments, at the expiration of the period of notice, the weekly payments to the workman shall be suspended from the expiry date, pending determination of the merits of the claim if the employer can demonstrate to the court that he genuinely disputes his liability. The court must hear summarily any such dispute. The period of the notice remains at 21 days.

Clause 9 repeals sections 54, 60, 61, 62 and 63. The repeal of section 54, which should be considered with the amendment of section 68 by clause 14, means that an injured workman will no longer receive certain preferential treatment compared with a person at work. At present he receives, whilst absent on compensation, average weekly earnings, as well as payment for public holidays and credit for annual leave and long service. This means that he is at present entitled to double pay on public holidays. The repeal of sections 60 to 63 inclusive is consequential upon the amendment of section 51 by clause 6. Section 62 provides that where a workman is engaged in two or more jobs concurrently with different employers his earnings shall be aggregated for the purpose of computing average weekly earnings. The employer for whom he is working at the time of injury shall be liable to compensate him for the loss of earnings in two or more jobs. I referred to the case of a person who was on two jobs and the payment that that person would have received. By repealing this section the workman will in future receive compensation for only one full-time job.

It is undesirable at a time of high unemployment to condone the practice of more than one job. The safety factor should also be considered because an employee working long hours is more prone to injure himself or his fellow employees. Under section 51, as amended by clause 6, the injured workman with two or more jobs would receive the wages for ordinary hours which constitute a week's work in the employment in which he was engaged when injured. Suppose, for example, that he works full time as a welder during the day for Smith and part time at night as a barman for Jones. If he is injured during the day he receives as compensation average earnings as defined previously for that one job. On the other hand, if he is injured at night he would receive average earnings on the basis that he was working full time for Jones. This provision applies only to the workman with two or more jobs and not, of course, to a workman with only one part-time job. Clause 10 repeals and replaces section 64 and is consequential upon the amendment of section 51 by clause 6. It deals with a workman under 21 or an indentured apprentice who is injured and whose injury, whether total or partial, is permanent. As in the present Act, he will, for purposes of compensation, be treated as if he had reached 21.

Clause 11 amends section 65. It provides that the right to have an absence on compensation counted as service for the purposes of sick leave and annual leave shall be qualified in the following ways: first, the absence on compensation to be counted as service shall be limited to maximum of 12 months and, secondly, the right to obtain payment for such service shall not vest in the workman until he returns to work, ceases employment, or dies, whichever first occurs.

This clause also removes the existing provision that absence on compensation must be temporary before that absence can be counted as service. This is of benefit to the permanently incapacitated worker who is not temporarily absent and cannot accrue service under the present legislation. This amendment would overcome the situation of a workman who, say, after three years on compensation, takes an additional 12 weeks annual leave on pay before returning to work. However, a workman can accumulate leave for up to 12 months whilst on compensation to enable him to have the funds to pay for a holiday with his family after recovering from injury.

Clause 12 repeals and replaces section 66. It is related to clause 11 and caters for Federal and other State awards in respect of which South Australia has no legislative competence.

Clause 13 amends section 67. It inserts a requirement that the existing obligation upon an employer to provide suitable employment to a partially-incapacitated workman or, failing that, to make weekly payments at the rate as for total incapacity, will not arise unless and until the workman has given to the employer a notice in the prescribed form that he is fit for suitable employment. This is an important provision. This covers the present anomalous position where a workman may be fit for light work but has not advised his employer of this fact. The employer is liable to pay full compensation for failing to provide light work, even though he is ignorant of the true facts.

Clause 14 amends section 68. It provides in new subsection (1) that, subject to the provisions in section 30 and clause 11, amending section 65, if during an absence on compensation a workman receives, say, payment for public holidays, annual leave, long service leave, Christmas or profit-sharing bonus, his weekly payments of compensation shall be reduced accordingly. However, an injured workman who has retired and receives a pension will not have the amount of pension deducted from his compensation benefits.

Clause 15 amends section 71. It provides the machinery for an adjustment from time to time of the weekly rate of compensation to reflect, first, the past or present condition of the workman, secondly, any variation due to indexation, in award, over-award or the other items included in weekly earnings by the definition in clause 6. The adjustments can be made by agreement of the parties or, failing agreement, upon application to the court. Clause 16, removes the word "accident" in section 88 which was left in by mistake when the concept of injury by accident was removed in 1965.

Clause 17 ensures that the amendments effected by this Bill shall not be given retrospective operation. Until recent years compensation payments were inadequate and many workmen suffered hardship when injured because of insufficient benefits to maintain their families. However, the community does not want an injured man to receive more pay at home than at work. This and other anomalies have crept into the present legislation and must be corrected. Workmen's compensation is a complex subject, and the proposed amendments are designed to be fair to all parties. I hope that the Government will recognise the merits of the Bill. Any reasonable amendments to it will be treated with respect.

The Liberal Party gives this Bill a high priority. I look forward to the co-operation of all members to ensure its rapid passage through this House. When the Government takes the adjourned debate, I hope it will not attempt to continually defer the Bill so that no vote is taken. I urge all members to support this important and urgent legislation.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It requires the electoral commissioner, within three months of the return of the writ in any election, to publish in the *Gazette* the votes for the last two unexcluded candidates, so that in each electorate where more than two candidates stood for election the allocation of preferences will be undertaken, whether any candidate has 50 per cent plus

one of the vote or not, at any stage of the count. It has become the practice of many political writers and political scientists to assess after each election what is termed a two-Party preferred vote, so that the public may be informed of the overall State support for the Government or the Opposition.

For example, in the previous election, the two-Party preferred vote in South Australia is given by most writers as being 49.2 per cent for the Government and 50.8 per cent for the Opposition, but to produce this figure, a determination has to be made, in many cases, by estimating the probable flow of preferences. Requiring the count to continue will substantially reduce speculation and will produce a reasonably accurate figure for the State-wide support on a two-Party preferred basis.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 125 of the principal Act, adding to that section new subsections (14) and (15), requiring the electoral commissioner to publish in the *Gazette* the votes attributed to the final two candidates in each electorate.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): The Government supports this measure, although we cannot see any great need for it. If there is any advantage in this Bill for anybody, I think it will lie with the Government because the traditional voting patterns in South Australia indicate that people of this State have, for some years, overwhelmingly supported the Australian Labor Party. In saying that I support this Bill, I do not want that to be taken in any way as an indication of the fact that this Government, or the Australian Labor Party, supports the proposals that have been recently submitted by the Liberal Party to the Electoral Boundaries Commission that that commission should take voting patterns into account in determining boundaries. This Bill will be of some advantage to the permanent Electoral Boundaries Commission in South Australia.

Dr. Eastick: It has asked for it.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It has not asked for this Bill, it has asked for the figures, and the Government has already agreed to provide those figures: that is the point I am making. The Bill is therefore superfluous, but because the Opposition has promoted it I will be happy to allow it to have its one day of glory, because it is a rare occasion in this State when the Liberal Party has any success, even of a minor nature such as it will have through the passage of this Bill. It is interesting that the Opposition has chosen to introduce this Bill and to seek its passage, because it seems that any reading of comparative figures of elections in recent years will indicate that the figures sought by this Bill will indicate more clearly that the Labor Party enjoys a continuing majority support of people in this State. That is a continuing support we will be looking forward to having for many years.

The figures sought by this measure are available for the Legislative Council election, and it is possible from the Legislative Council figures to gain fairly accurately a two-Party preferred vote, and if those results are compared to results in House of Assembly districts, one will find some interesting statistics. In most seats the House of Assembly vote for the Labor Party was greater than the Legislative Council support for the Labor Party. I think this result occurs in recognition of the excellent candidates the Australian Labor Party puts before the people. I quote some of the primary figures for the July, 1975, election. In Brighton the A.L.P. received 48.2 per cent of the vote for the Legislative Council, and the Minister of Mines and Energy, to his great credit, received 51.3 per cent of the

vote. That is a clear indication of the intelligence of the people of Brighton in recognising that they have an excellent and hardworking member of Parliament.

In Coles, the Labor Party in the Legislative Council received 49.7 per cent of the vote: the Deputy Premier received 52.4 per cent of the vote in an election where he was facing the people in Coles for the first time. In all the circumstances it was an excellent result. It clearly indicates the recognition by the people of South Australia of the work of the candidates put before them by the Australian Labor Party. Moving to my own stamping ground, Elizabeth, I am pleased with the result there. In the Legislative Council, the Labor Party received 65.8 per cent of the vote, and in the House of Assembly 68.2 per cent voted for the Labor Party candidate. I could go through the list with a fine tooth comb, but I will not because the embarrassment to members opposite would be such that I do not want at this stage to put them through that ordeal.

I know some of them are looking for pre-selection, and to draw any attention to their sorry record would be doing some of my friends on the other side a considerable disservice. If honourable members want me to refer to individual statistics, I can do so: there is silence from the Opposition benches. To refer to one further district represented by a member opposite, it is interesting that in Glenelg the sitting member has not done particularly well when comparing the figures for the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council.

Mr. Mathwin: Come down and take me on.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is probably an indication—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In answer to the honourable member's interjection I value the loyalty of the people of Elizabeth for too much to go down to Glenelg. The statistics I am quoting are shown in Dr. Jaensch's statistical analysis of the 1975 election in South Australia, and that is available in the library for members opposite if they care to avail themselves of it. Unfortunately, it is regrettable that many members opposite would have to be pointed in the direction of the library before they would know where it is. I recommend to many Opposition members that they examine these statistics to see what they are endorsing when they vote for this Bill, because that will serve to illustrate the strong support that the people of South Australia have given to the Australian Labor Party for several years.

I am pleased to say that the passage of this Bill will ensure that, for the next several years, the statistics will continue to indicate strong support by people of South Australia for the Australian Labor Party, and will be readily available for all to see. It will be an interesting set of statistics that will be available after the next election. Of course, those statistics will be available only to the remaining few members of the Opposition. I conclude by saying that the Government finds it is somewhat amusing but certainly pleasing to know that the Opposition is at last promoting the ideals of democracy, ideals that they have only recently discovered after listening to many lessons from the Australian Labor Party. I hope that the Bill will be passed. As I cannot see any reason for delaying its passage, on behalf of the Government I indicate its support for the measure.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): Had the Attorney-General completed his speech after saying that he supported the Bill, he would have done himself, the people of this State, and his

own Party, a great service. However, at some length he gave us a lesson in history by speaking about the wonderful Australian Labor Party candidates. I should like to refresh his memory, and perhaps that of some of his colleagues in the A.L.P., about some of those candidates. If one looks around this Chamber, selects one or two members opposite, and considers their activities in the House, I am sure people in their districts, if they had these matters drawn to their attention about the member for Albert Park, the member for Salisbury, the member for Gilles—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot agree that this matter comes within the ambit of the debate on the Electoral Act Amendment Bill. The behaviour of members in this House in the opinion of any member is not a matter that should be discussed at this juncture.

Mr. GUNN: Mr. Speaker, I was about to refer to their electoral results and the results of the future. The Attorney spoke about the excellent A.L.P. candidates, so I wished to reply to the comments he made, which I thought was my right.

The SPEAKER: The way the honourable member commenced he was casting certain aspersions against members, and that I cannot allow. The honourable member must refer only to the figures.

Mr. GUNN: Very well, Sir. Anyone who reads the *Hansard* index will know to what I am referring. They would know that the member for Salisbury in a session of Parliament did not make a speech. The Attorney referred to the value of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. We certainly support the commission, and wish to assist it in its duty, so that it is able to assess the voting patterns of this State. This measure sets out to do that. The Attorney has placed on the record of the House his view that he does not believe in the principle that the Party that wins 50 per cent plus one of the votes should form a Government, because he supported the most wicked gerrymander of which anyone has ever dreamed.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member's comments are as irrelevant to the Bill as the honourable member is irrelevant.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! We can deal with only one point of order at a time. The point of order by the Attorney-General is upheld. At this juncture we should not be discussing the merits or demerits of the electoral system as designed by the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney-General spent much of his speech discussing gerrymanders and distributions. I believe it is entirely competent for the member handling the Bill to rebut those matters. The member for Eyre is not introducing new material into the debate; he is simply rebutting remarks made by the Attorney in the course of the debate.

The SPEAKER: As far as I can recall, the Attorney at no time used the term "gerrymander". He quoted certain statistical information that he had before him relating to figures that showed voting trends. Obviously, the adoption of this Bill will indicate that in some type of record.

Mr. GUNN: It is really rather difficult, Sir, to reply to a debate when there seems to be some difference about the way members should address themselves to the matter under discussion. However, I make one or two other brief comments. The Attorney referred to voting patterns over the past few years. For years members on this side have listened to nonsense that has flowed from the A.L.P. in

this State about how that Party was denied Government because it received more than 50 per cent of the vote when the Playford Government was in power.

Mr. Langley: So it did.

Mr. GUNN: What the member for Unley and other members have indicated is not true. I quote briefly from figures that are relevant, because of what the Attorney has said. I am referred to figures that were prepared in 1956 by the Hon. Dr. Jim Forbes. What the Attorney and the Labor Party should consider is that, during the Playford era, several Independent candidates stood for election, candidates who were traditionally supporters of the then Liberal and Country League. In 1938, 83 413 people voted for the L.C.L., 76 093 voted for the A.L.P., and 65 780 people voted for other candidates.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: How many seats were contested?

Mr. GUNN: At that time the Labor Party obviously did not receive 50 per cent of the votes cast.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: How many seats were contested, though?

Mr. GUNN: In 1941, the L.C.L. received 81 116 votes; the A.L.P. received 70 244 votes; and other candidates received more than 57 000 votes. In 1944, the L.C.L. received 144 317 votes; the A.L.P., 157 115 votes; and other candidates received more than 57 000 votes. The Labor Party did not receive 50 per cent of the vote at that time. In 1947, the L.C.L. received 180 595 votes; the A.L.P. received 159 421 votes; and other candidates received more than 61 000 votes. In 1950, the L.C.L. received 193 962 votes; the A.L.P. received 162 318 votes; and other candidates received more than 55 000 votes. In 1953, the L.C.L. received 182 279 votes; the A.L.P. received 181 447 votes; and other candidates received more than 59 000 votes. In 1956, the L.C.L. received 185 502; the A.L.P. received 188 730; and 32 712 voted for other groups. Each time the Labor Party did not receive 50 per cent of the vote, and that gives the lie to what the Labor Party has been saying. This Bill will allow people who analyse political results the chance of making a proper judgment. The Opposition supports the principle that the Party which receives 50·1 per cent of the votes should govern. The Labor Party's proposition, which it has put before the people, is not guaranteed by law. The Labor Party wants to entrench itself by the most wicked gerrymander ever put into operation in Australia. I thank honourable members for their support of this long-overdue measure and, as usual, when initiatives are required, they normally come from the Opposition.

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

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 714).

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): The Government supports the measure.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I thank the Government because, after seeking this measure for a second time, I have at last succeeded.

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

PRE-SCHOOL TEACHERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mrs. Byrne:

That this House express its satisfaction with the present Commonwealth 75 per cent funding arrangements for pre-school teachers' salaries and approved support expenditure. It notes with concern recent statements attributed to spokesmen for the Commonwealth Government to the effect that this arrangement will be renegotiated, and calls upon the Commonwealth Government to adhere to the existing system, or if it finds this proposition unattractive to at least make funds for childhood services available to the States on a block-grant basis which would be consistent with its much vaunted Federalism policy.

(Continued from August 18. Page 719.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): First, I point out that the motion was moved before any real indication was given by the Federal Government of what action it finally would take. Will the arrangement definitely be renegotiated? Is there any doubt about that? I believe that there is. Will the arrangement be any worse or will it be improved? We may have a better result than the existing situation.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You misread the statement.

Mr. EVANS: I did not. In moving her motion, the honourable member said:

From information filtering back to the States from well-informed sources, there is every reason to believe that the Fraser Government is seriously considering a substantial reduction in support from the present 75 per cent of salaries of pre-school staff to 50 per cent.

Whereas the Minister for Mines and Energy said earlier today that one cannot believe anything one reads in the *Australian*, another Government member speaks about things filtering back (not official statements) and says that support will be seriously reduced and that money will be reduced. The mover and the Government knew when the motion was moved that the Federal Government was still examining many expenditures within the Commonwealth structure, and all decisions have not been made. At this stage, the position is no different from what applied four months ago.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: We want to keep it that way.

Mr. EVANS: We should wait and see what may be the result of any discussions and representations made to the Federal Government by members of State Parliament and by people in the community who may have heard of the filtering-back statements. For that reason, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

IMPOUNDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 720.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): Even though I represent a metropolitan district as defined by the Electoral Commission, I was brought up in an area of primary production for at least part of my working life; to some degree I have some regrets, because the type of animal to be controlled under this Bill took the life of my father. The Bill relates mainly to the protection of the stock of a farmer who has set out to improve his herd and, by proper breeding, to control the quality of his herd, his profitability, and the produce available for sale in the country or, if in the case of bloodstock, the type of horse available for racing or trotting, as well as for equestrian events. Under this Bill an obligation will be placed on the owners of male

stock to keep proper control over their stock to ensure that it does not enter farmers' properties and cause problems by affecting the quality of stock that is born and reared on the property, at least to the stage of making an assessment of whether such stock is worth keeping.

One provision of the Bill concerning someone in close proximity acting as the contact point if stock break through a fence on to a neighbouring property or on to the roadway could cause difficulties for some farmers with several properties if stock strays from one property. A farmer has to find an agent, and the member for Alexandra visualises an agent as being a neighbouring farmer or a stock agent. My first reaction on considering this matter was that I was not fully in support of this proposition but, on considering the argument advanced by the member for Alexandra about the specialist farmer and the importance of his keeping up the quality of his stock (he should be protected), that is the point we should support. For that reason I support the legislation and trust that the Government will see the benefit in guaranteeing the quality of stock for the farmer seeking to undertake the action most people are advocating, that is, to improve stock, to improve profitability, and to keep the primary production side of our economy on the highest possible level. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

INFLATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Goldsworthy:

That this House condemn the Government of South Australia for the continual attack by its Ministers on the Commonwealth Government, and support the Commonwealth Government in its responsible efforts to curb inflation and to restore economic stability to this country.

(Continued from August 18. Page 725.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): The motion carries much substance, as it attacks the basis of the operation upon which the Australian Labor Party thrives; that is, to criticise and condemn the Federal Government before it has been given an opportunity to prove the worth of its policies. For three years we heard State Labor Party members praise the Federal Labor Government while it was tearing the Australian economy to its lowest point since the 1930's. When the Australian people dramatically decided to elect a Liberal Government with the biggest majority of any Government since the depression years, the State Labor Government set out to attack the Commonwealth Government and its Ministers against the people's wishes.

The State Government attempts to use this coward's castle (and this is the term the Government has often used) to abuse the Federal Government. At the same time as the Government did this, its New South Wales colleague, Premier Wran, said that he was willing to give the Commonwealth Government an opportunity to prove whether or not it could put the Australian economy back on the right road. Not only is Premier Wran saying that: newspaper editorials, businessmen and even people in the education field accept that responsible decisions have to be made, that we have to front up to the problem that Australia is not as productive as it should be, that we have priced ourselves out of world markets, and that we have created unemployment by creating inflation.

Australia has been producing money as if it grows on trees. Indeed, it can be said, in a time of drought, that the trees could not bear the produce needed to keep the

economy going. Doubtless, the State Government was willing to see Australia carried even to lower ebbs to achieve its socialist objectives. I am pleased to say that I know of no group in Australia, other than the South Australian Labor Party, extremists and the communists that is attacking the present Federal Government. People are giving the current Federal Government the opportunity to prove its worth.

Mr. Langley: It will prove—

Mr. EVANS: It will prove its worth, and the member for Unley knows that. He is afraid that his Federal colleagues will not win power, whether with Hawke or Dunstan, for a long time. The State Labor Government delayed the introduction of its Budget to see what was contained in the Federal Budget. The State Government was set to make an attack on the Federal Liberal and National Country Party Government. The State Budget was delayed for the first time and, in fact, we received the Auditor-General's Report before the Budget was brought down. That is a change.

Mr. Langley: Did Sir Thomas Playford ever do that?

Mr. EVANS: Normally members have a week to consider the Budget. True, we have a week's delay now to do that. However, the State Labor Party was so shocked at the Federal Budget that it went back into its shell, because it realised it could not attack the Federal Budget. State Government members know, too, although they do not have the courage to say it, that the Fraser Government is attacking the problem, it is keeping a sense of balance within the economy, and it has not been too drastic in its budgetary measures. It has given the opportunity for Australia to progress.

Mr. Becker: It has acted responsibly.

Mr. EVANS: I agree with that. The Deputy Leader was proper in moving this motion, and I believe this House should condemn the South Australian Labor Party's Parliamentary representatives, not only in this House but in the other place, for their continual abuse (and I use the term "abuse" in relation to the statements by A.L.P. members in the other place more strongly than in this House) of our Federal Parliamentary colleagues. It would be to the benefit of the A.L.P. members, both Parliamentary and rank and file, the whole Australian community and the children of the people of the future to back the Fraser Government, because it will put Australia on the right road, where we can maintain our standards of living and have opportunities for employment and to progress by using our own initiative. I support the motion as strongly as possible and say I condemn the attacks that have been made, unnecessarily, on the Fraser Government.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I strongly support this motion. In my opinion, the Deputy Leader has clearly voiced the opinion of the majority of the people of this State and of Australia, because on December 13 last they decided they would no longer tolerate the dictatorship of the A.L.P., when we had at the head of our affairs a group of people prepared to destroy the economy, destroy the nation, and inflict on the people their socialistic views, which were totally unacceptable to the average Australian.

As the member for Fisher rightly pointed out, the Fraser Government received a mandate to rectify the problems of this nation. It inherited the worst financial mess probably in the history of this country, and yet day after day in this House members of the front bench of the A.L.P. continually attack the Fraser Government. What they have been advocating is vicious taxation, because, no matter what project or proposal is mentioned, they are blaming the

Commonwealth Government for not giving them more money. The Labor Party is a Party of high personal income tax and high company tax, because, if all their requests and propositions were put into effect, people would not have one dollar left in their pay packets because it would all end up in the coffers of the Federal Treasurer. The member for Unley tries to interject, like a parrot, as he always does, but the cold hard fact is that every dollar that the Government spends has to be taken from the people, and the people want to spend their own money. We on this side believe the people know how to spend their own money better than the Government does, but it is obvious from the attitude of the A.L.P. that it does not think the people have the intelligence to be able to spend their own earnings. It wants to put its hands into the pockets of all taxpayers in this country and tell them how to spend their money. No responsible Government could allow the situation that had developed in Canberra to continue.

I turn now to a document dealing with the promises of the Fraser Government and what it has done in nine months. It promised to restore Australian prosperity and growth and to introduce far-reaching social reforms. What has it done in nine months? This is well worth reading. First, it promised to get the economy moving again. It tackled inflation as its first priority in getting people back to work. The Budget was designed to do that. It has introduced an investment allowance, initially of 40 per cent, to get people to buy new plant and equipment, to create new jobs; it has relaxed the conditions under which interest on convertible notes is deductible. It has suspended quarterly tax payments. That is certainly a step in the right direction. I have pages here of the great things the Fraser Government has done. I will take them at random. I will quote a few of them so that members can digest them. I will read the lot next week, and I am sure the House will be interested in what I have to say. I shall also say something about the Governor-General. The Fraser Government has increased tax exemption where an estate passes between husband and wife, up to \$50 000. It has improved Medibank; it has helped single-income families.

Mr. Max Brown: You're going too far now.

Mr. GUNN: It is interesting to hear the member for Whyalla interjecting. The Government promised to reintroduce the superphosphate bounty and it has done so. The member for Whyalla says it was wrong for the superphosphate bounty to be reintroduced, but it was right to give a subsidy to the shipbuilding industry. He cannot have it both ways. The superphosphate bounty was designed to assist the greatest export earner that this country has.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You started to talk about Medibank.

Mr. GUNN: I was making a passing reference to it; I will refer to it next week.

Mr. Abbott: May we have a copy of that document?

Mr. Max Brown: Get back to Medibank.

Mr. GUNN: I should like to have it incorporated in *Hansard* so that everyone who reads *Hansard* could have the benefit of knowing the tremendous things the Fraser Government has done for this country. I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, would appreciate what has been done, as someone with an independent view. I am sure you would endorse everything in this document.

I have marked one or two matters in it, because it is very pleasant reading; my constituents are pleased with what the Fraser Government has done.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: They still want the Ceduna area rebuilt, don't they?

Mr. GUNN: It was in 1973 when the Minister's colleague went over to try to make a good fellow out of himself. He made the promises—it is up to the Government to justify what was said on that occasion. The Fraser Government has made promises and it is carrying them out. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 7.30 p.m.]

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from September 7. Page 857.)

First schedule.

Environment and Conservation, \$1 250 000.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Last evening the Minister had made clear that stations acquired for national parks were not to be used for grazing purposes but that they would be used for national reserves. What is meant by "other improvements"? The area north of Chowilla is predominantly a grazing area and contains much station land. Doubt has been expressed in the community about whether or not this area can be converted effectively into a national park: it can be converted into a conservation park, but it is not within easy access to the public. The public is concerned to know exactly what use will be made of these facilities, when they will be able to visit and travel on the area.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment): The purchase of these properties is being completed. We have a ranger at the park, and provision will be made in the Estimates for a second ranger. The area is extensive—about 250 000 hectares for the four parks. A certain amount of work is necessary. Only in the past week or so approval was granted to upgrade two of the existing home-stead buildings for occupation by departmental officers. The upgrading will cost about \$50 000, partly because of the isolation of the areas. As is the case with nearly all the areas we take over, a fair amount of run-down fencing must be repaired, and many wild goats on the properties must be thinned out. As soon as the property can be dedicated, the public will be able to visit it. Considerable expenditure will be necessary to put the area in a reasonable condition.

Mr. BOUNDY: The criticism I hear most about national parks in my area is that, once acquired, the department does not look after them adequately and provide for the fauna that is supposed to live thereon. Windmills and troughing facilities for kangaroos and emus should be provided on reserves so that these animals will not encroach on adjoining farmlands. It is this encroachment that is creating some antagonism towards the National Parks and Wildlife Service. I would therefore be interested to know what provision has been made to provide water facilities in my area.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It was typical of the Australian environment before farmers and other settlers arrived that kangaroos, emus and other similar fauna managed to exist comfortably without windmills. The philosophy behind setting aside conservation parks is to retain the country in its normal state so that animals can live in it without the benefit of windmills. The most common complaint I have struck since becoming a Minister

is that farmers in the Flinders Range say that we have not maintained windmills. This annoys them because they would prefer to see their sheep grazing and being watered in our parks. As the department does not have to graze large numbers of sheep in conservation parks the need for windmills has been reduced. I accept that many complaints have been made about fauna from conservation parks getting out of the parks and into surrounding farming and pastoral areas.

Dr. Eastick: Especially in drought conditions.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It is impressed on me mainly by members opposite that each weed and animal or fire that starts in a national park can be stopped from getting out by fencing the park. We are trying to do something about this situation. The Committee will appreciate that, for three of the past four years since the department has been created, the Government in Canberra made available considerable sums to acquire land for national parks. There was an unprecedented growth in national parks when the member for Henley Beach was Minister.

Dr. Eastick: Weren't there cut-backs in August and September last year? Who was the Government then?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: In August last there were cut-backs of funds by the Commonwealth Labor Government but, because of representations by the former Minister, a considerable sum (about \$600 000) was recouped subsequently from that Government. The total expenditure last year on this item was about \$1 800 000, largely because of Commonwealth assistance, and that was appreciably more than we managed this time.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: There's been no assistance this year.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: That is not quite true. The Commonwealth Government has made available \$300 000 this year. Unfortunately, because of the present Government's refusal to honour all the commitments made by the previous Commonwealth Government, State Treasury has had to provide almost \$1 000 000 in order to keep faith with people whose properties the department is buying. That practice was adopted on the basis that any money recouped subsequently from the Commonwealth would be reimbursed to the State Treasury. The sum of \$300 000 provided by the Commonwealth has unfortunately been used to pay back a minor part of the money made available by State Treasury because of the Commonwealth Government's failure to provide funds that were promised last year.

Mr. WOTTON: The Minister will be aware that I have written to him several times in relation to the fire hazards in the conservation parks in the Adelaide Hills. Can the Minister tell me how much of the \$1 250 000 will be spent on maintaining these properties, rather than making further purchases? Further, can the Minister give information about Black Hill, or conservation parks in the Montacute area? There have been rumours of Government acquisition in these areas.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: As I think I said last evening, of the \$1 250 000 allocated for my department this year, \$250 000 was pre-empted for the Wilpena development. Of the \$1 000 000 left, \$600 000 has been set aside to maintain existing parks. As I have said, money was available in the past three years from the Federal Government to extend the parks system, and that has now almost entirely dried up and the department has a chance to divert energies to providing more adequate facilities in the parks.

An amount of \$600 000 is on the programme for this year. This is part of a three-year programme. We intend to spend next year, in terms of present prices, \$700 000, and to spend about \$850 000 in the next year. This will enable an impression to be made on the backlog in maintenance. We have taken over properties that urgently need upgrading. For example, the Hyperna-Canopus area cost us about \$500 000. This month I have approved of the letting of contracts for, I think, about \$50 000 to upgrade those two homesteads. This problem has been inherited whenever acquisition has been made.

I expect that we will spend more than \$2 000 000 in the next three years in upgrading existing parks. I contrast that with the position where, as a matter of deliberate policy this year, \$230 000 has been set aside for acquisition. The department has on offer top priority land that we would like to have. The total cost is \$731 000 but, given the availability of finance, it seems better to restrict ourselves to spending about \$230 000 and put the main emphasis on upgrading the parks.

I do not know the exact plans for acquiring land in the Black Hill area. This is part of a big Black Hill native flora park, and I understand the State Planning Authority will provide some land. I understood that practically all the acquisition of land in that area had been completed, but I will get further information for the honourable member.

Mr. BLACKER: I hope that the Minister was being jocular when he said, in reply to the member for Goyder, that kangaroos and emus could survive without windmills in earlier days. Watering facilities involve probably one of the biggest animosities between landholders and conservation people in relation to developing conservation parks. Every landholder is a manager and farmer, and he knows what it is to cultivate and provide for the management of stock. Conservation parks require similar management. At harvest time, when the grain crops are becoming ripe, the moisture dries out of the reserves and within about a week emus migrate from the reserves. If we are to develop a relationship between the department and the landholders near these places, we must provide for watering the natural livestock.

I ask the Minister whether he has considered providing fire grids in connection with the fire aspect of the management of the parks. I raised this matter earlier this session, particularly in regard to three fires started by lightning in the Hincks reserve. Those fires burnt out probably about 25 000 hectares with loss of vegetation to the conservation park and the wildlife. If we had a grid barrier, with a grid of about 6 000 ha, fire fighters could burn out that grid and save the remainder of the park.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Fire management is an important and serious matter, and I have given much consideration to it since I have been Minister. The first fire protection officer appointed in the department was appointed by my predecessor and commenced duty in August last year. He has had to deal with all the trouble at Belair last summer, when I think 22 fires were deliberately lit there. It was obvious that there, as in other places, the facilities available to the department were not commensurate with the new areas acquired in the past few years. I do not think anyone can cavil about the policy of acquisition taking place. The money was available, and there certainly was a need to preserve these areas before they were lost.

The fire precautions were not up to scratch, and the fire officer has done something about that. Since February this year I have diverted, I think, about \$56 000 of Loan

Funds to provide equipment for fire fighting, as well as providing between \$35 000 and \$40 000 for maintenance equipment. Nearly \$100 000 has been spent in the past six or seven months to fight fires, and that shows the importance that I and the department place on the matter. The fire officer is inspecting all parks. I was in the South-East recently, and he had been there to talk about putting in an access track on the fence line, enabling us to renew the fence at the same time. A national policy of providing access tracks is being carried out.

Of the \$600 000 that is provided this year for these improvements, \$91 600 is for fencing, some of which is being provided by the department by subsidies, and for access tracks. I believe \$15 000 is for access tracks and \$76 000 is for fencing. The department is doing as much as it can to provide fencing to keep our fauna in the parks, where it belongs, and also to provide the necessary firebreaks outside parks. I do not think a wholesale provision of firebreaks within parks will be carried out, as it is considered that it runs contrary to the policy in relation to parks to criss-cross them with firebreaks and access tracks. However, I hope enough will be done to enable us to contain fires, especially with the increased equipment and manpower that we are gradually getting into the system.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister may think that I am one of those persons who has over the years attacked Government departments for not controlling their pests and noxious weeds. At no time have I suggested that the departments are the only ones at fault. However, I believe that if Parliament makes laws, and the Ministers are responsible for those departments, the departments should set an example. I still hold that opinion and, if the Minister is now to take action to try to control pests and at least control, if not eradicate, some noxious weeds in our recreation parks, I congratulate him. However, we cannot say that neighbouring landholders must control their land although the Government, which is responsible to Parliament through the Minister, can march on and do nothing about its land. I have always been of that opinion during the eight years or more that I have been a member of this place.

I should like to know the cost of work undertaken at the Belair recreation park golf course, which was originally to cost about \$90 000 and take a year to build. That work was started more than three years ago, and I believe that it has still not been completed. I should like to know what is the total cost of that park to date and what its eventual cost will be. Also, in land that is already owned by the department, has any provision been made for off-road vehicles, be they four-wheel drive vehicles or trail bikes? This is a healthy, popular and modern form of recreation for many people in the community. Areas must be set aside for these people, so that they will not offend neighbours and destroy a large part of the environment. They need areas in which they can operate in a manner that is acceptable to society. It is the department's responsibility to find those areas, just as it would be its responsibility to find areas for any other form of recreation if land was not already available in the community.

The former Minister was looking for land so that it could be made available. About five years has passed since the first request was made for such land to be set aside. It is the Minister's responsibility to find such land and to make it available at the same time as he introduces legislation to control and restrict the activities of this group of people to certain areas. I should like the Minister to tell the House where these areas are.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The proposed legislation to control off-road recreation vehicles will give effect to the principle, set out in the Green Paper issued last October, to the effect that off-road recreation vehicles shall be regarded as a valid form of recreation, and that areas should be set aside in which people who choose to participate in this activity can operate. To that end, provision will be made for the acquisition of and setting aside by the Government of specific areas for off-road recreation vehicles.

I hope that soon after the legislation is passed substantial areas of land will be made available. I do not think they will be made available beforehand, as part of the legislation is necessary to provide the funding and, indeed, the administration to run these activities. One aspect of the proposed legislation is that a committee, consisting among others of users of off-road recreation vehicles, will have the task of deciding which areas should be set aside, how big they should be and how they should be run. It is not practical to pass legislation, and then say that we will immediately open up parks for the benefit of these people. However, I hope that this will be done quickly and that, within a few months, we will have substantial areas of land available in which off-road recreation vehicle enthusiasts can operate in accordance with the principles set out in the Green Paper.

On the other hand, I do not think it is the function of conservation parks to provide for this sort of activity. Unfortunately, our recreation parks are such that it is difficult to enable them to operate in this manner, bearing in mind that the honourable member has raised the question of pony trails at Belair recreation park. This is a matter to which we are giving attention, and it has been shown fairly conclusively that pony trails and motor cycles do not mix very well.

A week ago, I was in Canberra, when I went to see the Mount Stromlo forest, in which Canberra people have been given permission to operate. Certain areas are set aside for use by off-road recreation vehicles to the exclusion of others, including pedestrians, as are other areas in which horses can be ridden. That is the only practical way in which this operation can be run. However, it is not intended to allow off-road recreation vehicles to operate in recreation parks, as that is contrary to the very purpose for which those parks are set aside.

Regarding the Belair golf course, included in the allocation is \$164 500, the sum that the committee, which has just brought down its recommendations, considers necessary to complete the construction of the golf course. This allocation is additional to Loan funds that have been expended earlier. The total revised Loan funding in respect of this park will be \$323 000.

There was an initial Commonwealth Government allocation. Although we hoped to obtain \$41 000 from the Commonwealth Government for the unemployment relief scheme, only \$21 000 was obtained from that source. Money has been spent on a maintenance-type activity. Because the course has been under construction for some time, obviously there is no point in setting out greens, as has been done in the case of 12 holes, if we are not going to maintain them; that will add to the total cost of the course by the time it is open for use. The present allocation of Loan funds will bring the total to \$323 000, and \$21 000 worth of initial Commonwealth Government money was used.

The honourable member made the point that three years ago an estimate of \$93 000 was made, I think, for the construction, based on the upgrading of existing facilities. In the event, the final product will be more satisfactory

than that: it will include some facilities that were deemed unnecessary at the time the original decision was made. In addition, a measure of inflation has added considerably to the cost. Certain improvements not originally contemplated will be included so that, when the course opens, it will be of a high standard and able to command the kind of appropriate fee that will make it completely self-supporting.

Mr. ARNOLD: Last evening, the Minister said that wildlife would survive whether or not water, feed, and fencing were provided. Before the development of agricultural areas, in periods of drought wildlife in the area generally perished from starvation. Today, when feed and water have disappeared from parks, the wildlife moves on to agricultural land where the farmer has provided abundant feed in the form of grain and water in the form of storages and dams. It becomes essential that the department provide water, especially in conservation parks, together with feed. Is the Minister's department willing to enter into some form of contract arrangements with neighbouring farmers to crop certain parts in the conservation parks in order to maintain a reasonable level of wildlife? No matter how good fences are, with a population of kangaroos and emus in a conservation park dying of starvation, no fence I know of in rural areas will keep the wildlife in the park. Undoubtedly, they will live in the farming areas. I am particularly interested in the Minister's attitude toward providing feed in conservation parks, because this is something we must seriously consider if we are to conduct a wildlife management programme in distant areas.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I did not mean to imply that no provision would be made for supplying water in conservation parks. Taking the Flinders Range National Park, for example, last December I was criticised by some adjoining landowners because we had allowed windmills to fall into disrepair and, as a result, water was not being pumped into the troughs. Much of the criticism arose because landowners were deprived of the chance of putting their sheep in that area because there was no water supply. It is important to provide water in national parks, not only for fauna but also for fire-fighting purposes. In that national park we are maintaining seven windmills and we will use a mobile motor to take around to the various wells to pump out sufficient water to ensure that fire tanks are properly filled, etc.

In a drought, with insufficient water or feed in conservation parks, there will be a tendency for fauna to try to escape into the surrounding areas. This is on the assumption, which, I think, is not correct, that surrounding areas are in better shape than are conservation parks. The member for Eyre has been making representations, and I wrote to him yesterday about a proposal that, on the far West Coast, we should allow stock into a conservation park, even though there has never been any water in that park.

Mr. Arnold: It's more the pastoral areas than the agricultural areas.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Yes, I accept the difference. My department is not unmindful of the problem of farmers. Recently, an application was made by a farmer in the South-East for a permit to take some rare birds. He was reasonable about it: he was not doing it for the sake of killing them, but he wanted to take about 10 per cent of the birds on his property. He had a problem with the corella-type birds, which are unusual and which were playing havoc with his barley crop. The department

recognised the situation and, by agreement with the landowners, I authorised a trapper to take 1 000 birds of five different species in that area, some of which will be relocated in a conservation park where they will not cause trouble. Some may well be sold to add revenue to the Wildlife Conservation Fund. We accept that we have a responsibility to keep fauna in conservation parks, and that will be done.

Mr. VENNING: Is the Minister aware of the park known as the Mundoora Park, also commonly known as block F, which is situated between Merriton and Port Broughton on the main road? I approached the previous Minister some time ago at the request of landowners. Because there was no water in block F, kangaroos and other wildlife were going into neighbouring properties, especially when the paddocks had been cropped, to obtain water. The approach to the previous Minister was ineffectual. Has the policy been changed to ensure that all areas within the reserve have water so that the whole area is self-contained, or must wildlife go to outside areas to obtain water?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: One of the problems involved in having relatively small areas of national park is that we come up against the difficulties referred to by Opposition members. In the natural condition, if there is a big enough area, natural waterholes can be included that are suitable for fauna. Once we get down to relatively small areas, there may be no natural water on the property. I know block F, the Mundoora Park, but I have not set foot on it. When flying north recently, the pilot pointed it out to me, because it stands out markedly in a generally cleared area. By some freak, it remained untouched, and it is therefore a conservation park. I have not had any representations made to me since I became Minister, but I will examine the whole question raised by Opposition members.

I will ascertain whether there is any way in which we should be making adequate provision for water in those relatively small areas where there is little natural water. The whole philosophy is, as far as possible, to get large areas of national park, for this reason. I would imagine that, in a time like this, our native fauna will suffer some effects from the drought: that is a natural way of controlling their numbers which we must accept. Generally, I do not think the number of kangaroos would put anywhere near the same strain on the land as would stock as part of a grazing operation. Therefore, one would hope that kangaroos would suffer relatively less diminution in numbers than would sheep in the present unfortunate circumstances.

Mr. BOUNDY: Regarding the question of a grid pattern of fire breaks in national parks, the Minister has said that a fire prevention officer has been appointed, but we need to examine the whole question of fires and natural regeneration in national parks. A grid pattern of fire breaks in national parks would allow controlled burning, to permit regeneration. The impartial justice that is nature brings along lightning, which causes whole areas to be burnt out. The grid pattern would allow controlled burning; this would be necessary in all national parks ultimately to allow regeneration. During his official visit to national parks in my district, the Minister's attention was drawn to the situation at Burner's Park on the northern coast of the "foot" of Yorke Peninsula; this is a tea tree area which needs burning-off now. People in the area of beach houses are concerned about what the position will be in the coming summer. It is necessary to burn

off that area now for the safety of people there and for the sake of regeneration in coming years. Has this matter been considered?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Considerable thought has been given to this matter. On May 1, I attended a seminar in Sydney organised by the New South Wales Parks Commission in connection with preventing fires in national parks. I noticed a division of opinion on the efficiency of burning-off operations as a fire prevention management tool. Even those who believed in this method, believed in a hot burn. I thought it would not be attractive to members opposite, if I suggested that the most appropriate way to use fire as a management device was to have a rip-roaring bush fire. When I was in the honourable member's district last summer, I saw a fire that was caused by burning-off operations. Soon after, a serious fire nearby did some damage in a conservation park. It occurred when burning-off operations got out of control. So, this problem is common in the countryside in summer. I hope the measures we are taking will provide effective control over the spread of fires in our national parks, as they will be aided materially in the coming summer by vastly improved equipment.

Line passed.

Other Capital Advances and Provisions, \$38 090 000.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): It has come to my attention from a reliable source that there is an unfortunate design defect in boilers at powerhouse "A" on Torrens Island, resulting in the output of the powerhouse being only 70 per cent of its design capability. I understand, too, that in the second powerhouse, boilers of the same design have been installed. They are being paid for, and I imagine that part of the allocation of \$8 700 000 is for payment for that plant. I understand that the same design fault has been perpetuated. So, 70 per cent is the output that can be expected from the second powerhouse, too. It seems inconceivable that, when a fault has been found in one powerhouse, the same fault should be perpetuated in the second powerhouse. I hope my information is not entirely correct. Adelaide University experts have been asked to ascertain whether the design fault can be overcome. We are being asked to approve an allocation for equipment that is not up to design standard. This is not a criticism of the Government or the Electricity Trust officers, but it is a matter of considerable concern to the people of South Australia.

Can the Minister of Transport say for what purpose the allocation of \$9 000 000 will be used in connection with non-metropolitan works of the Rail Division of the State Transport Authority? A large part of the State railways deficit will be met by the Commonwealth Government, as a result of the railways transfer agreement. If these are country works, why are they not covered by the Railways (Transfers Agreement) Act? Has the agreement not yet been consummated? I refer to non-government hospital and institution buildings, and note with pleasure the sum of \$4 270 000 allocated to the Home for Incurables, the \$191 000 allocated to the St. John Council for South Australia and the \$3 815 000 allocated to Adelaide Children's Hospital. All these projects are worth supporting.

Is the Christies Beach Community Health Centre designed to overcome the shortage of a hospital in that area? When can the people of Christies Beach expect the establishment of a hospital for which they have been battling for so long? A community health centre is a

valuable facility for any community, and I note that community health centres are planned for many areas such as Ingle Farm, Clovelly Park, Christies Beach, Angle Park, Port Lincoln, St. Agnes and Western Region Rehabilitation Service. I understand that \$200 000 is to be spent on the centre based in the western suburbs and related either to Mareeba or Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Will the Minister provide details of those developments?

I refer to the Osmond Terrace Regional Referral Clinic, in connection with the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Board. What development is being undertaken there? Is rehabilitation going even further? I hope Ministers are noting these questions because, under Standing Orders, it is necessary for me to put these questions before I move deliberately a motion of no confidence in the Government when referring to the line "Monarto Development Commission".

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Before the Leader proceeds with his motion, I point out to the Committee that Standing Order 315 provides:

(4) 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. When several amendments are offered, they shall be taken in the order in which, if agreed to, they would appear in the estimates.

(5) 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.

Therefore, before the Leader proceeds with his motion I point out that it is in order for honourable members to speak only to the line before the Committee, that is, "Monarto Development Commission" and, on a decision being reached, debate can continue only on the remaining two lines of the vote. Does the Leader wish to proceed immediately with his motion?

Dr. TONKIN: If it is of any value to the Minister's involved, I will delay moving my motion for a short period in order that they can give their replies to the questions posed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): On the various matters raised concerning hospital and health centres, I will obtain the necessary information for the Leader. Concerning the Electricity Trust of South Australia, I do not believe that the Leader has his information correct. Torrens Island power station consists of A and B stations, and A station comprises four 120-megawatt machines, all of which are capable of operating at capacity or near capacity. Torrens Island A station has a capacity of nearly 480 megawatts, while Torrens Island B station is planned to comprise four 200-megawatt machines. The first of those machines is the one now being commissioned, and the commissioning has gone on for a considerable period.

Dr. Tonkin: Are these machines from the same place?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The machine under discussion is the first one. The second machine we are also committed to get from the same firm, because the contract was entered into and that machine is being installed but is not ready for commission. The machine in the process of being commissioned can now operate at about 70 per cent of its designed capacity. It has not yet been accepted by the trust. No doubt the penalty provisions in the trust's contract will apply if the makers of the machine cannot bring it up to scratch.

Dr. Tonkin: I understand the trust owns the machine.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I assure the Leader that the machine has not been accepted as satisfactory by the trust: it is still subject to contractual arrangements and is still in the hands of its makers. True, its output is fed into

the power grid, but the machine is still in the hands of its producers: it is not in the trust's ownership at this stage. Often there are grave difficulties in commissioning such large boilers, and this is not the first time that this sort of difficulty has been encountered.

Dr. Eastick: It happened with the gas turbine at Dry Creek.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: True, but it is now functioning satisfactorily, and there were certain problems with them. As far as I know, the next two 200-megawatt machines for Torrens Island B station have not been finally ordered. I will have to check in detail on the various statements I have made, but that is my understanding of the situation. I assure the Leader that the trust is concerned, and is always careful in these matters, as it must be when acting in the public interest. Moreover, some provisions give it certain authority regarding such contracts. The impression that the Leader created that the whole power station can operate only at 70 per cent of capacity is not correct.

Dr. Tonkin: I am pleased about that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Those were the matters I was asked about. The Minister of Transport can deal with other matters.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I refer the Leader to page 4 of the Loan Estimates for the information he has sought.

Dr. TONKIN: I thank the Minister of Mines and Energy for his courteous replies and the way in which he had explained the matter. Although I am reassured by his comments, I hope that the problem at the power station will be resolved. An immense sum is involved and we depend on power. I move:

That the vote "Monarto Development Commission, \$1 400 000" be reduced by \$100.

When I considered this rather serious move, which amounts to a motion of no confidence in the Government, it was suggested that perhaps I should move that the whole line for the Monarto Development Commission be omitted. I deliberately did not take that course of action. There are people who currently work for the Monarto Development Commission who have been carrying out their duties in a fine way and have been carrying on with a plan which I believe is doomed to failure, but nevertheless giving their best attention to it, and it would be totally unfair to leave those people completely in the lurch. If Monarto is to fail and not go ahead at present, which should be the correct course, those people must be given every opportunity to be phased out and found new employment. Some of them may have to go to other Government departments where they can be well used in planning divisions of, for instance, the Housing Trust. That is why I have adopted this course.

I repeat it amounts to a motion of no confidence in the Government. If the South Australian Government persists in its present aim of developing Monarto, it deserves to fall. Monarto has become an irrational, inflexible, and irresponsible obsession, designed as a memorial to the Dunstan Administration. The money so far spent on or allocated to Monarto, from both Federal and State sources, amounts to about \$21 000 000, which includes the amount in the Loan Estimates for this year of \$3 700 000. This sum of over \$20 000 000 represents nearly 20 new primary schools or four new high schools, or an increase in the State's welfare housing programme for this year by about 30 per cent (which means that 30 per cent more needy families could be housed this year with that money), or double the State's sewerage programme for this year.

These figures do not take into account the need there would have been to convince the Whitlam Government, if it had been in power, that the money should have been spent on projects other than Monarto, but it also clearly shows the tremendous advantage which the present system of Federalism gives to this State and the great disadvantage which the tied grants system imposed upon this State during the term of the Whitlam Government. During the term of the tied grants system, the Treasurer was wont to say that the State Government had no option but to go along with the Federal Government's schemes and therefore no option but to go along with Monarto, because Federal funds were available.

One of the two main reasons given by this Government for proceeding with Monarto was that 85 per cent of the funds for the development of Monarto would be likely to come from Federal sources. The attitude of the Government seemed to be, "If this money is going, we may as well be in it." This was one of the two major reasons for proceeding with Monarto. But, now that the Federal Government's control over the State has been broken with the change of Federal Government (and I heartily welcome the breaking of that control), the Treasurer still lives in the past and, by and large, still persists in pouring funds into Monarto. It is apparent he has in no way given up his desire to forge ahead with Monarto, come what may.

Mr. Mathwin: It is an obsession.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and it is now left to the people of South Australia to ask these very questions. How much sewerage work could be provided by these funds? Is the metropolitan area fully sewered? Is there enough welfare housing? Are our schools, and particularly our primary schools, of an adequate standard throughout the State? Obviously, the funds spent on Monarto will be spent at the expense of these developments. Not all schools meet the high standards shown in the Government's propaganda film. There are many schools in this State, and particularly primary schools, that have been shamefully neglected; they need help and funds urgently. Yet the Treasurer complains vocally and bitterly that he has not enough money to build houses and schools and provide sewerage or filtered water. What nonsense that is! He is wasting money that should be spent in those areas; he has wasted it in promoting an impossible dream.

Mr. Mathwin: Gone and lost forever.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. The entire history of Monarto has been unhappy. The Treasurer introduced the Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Bill into the House in 1972. As well as the availability of funds, he quoted the predicted population trends for Adelaide as the second major factor influencing the Government's decision to proceed with the scheme. We saw a change of name and the projected town became "Monarto", and at that time it was predicted that Adelaide would have 1 500 000 people by the year 2000. These predictions, although they gave on the surface an adequate reason for proceeding with Monarto, were almost immediately questioned, and the latest estimates provided by the Treasurer only recently in this Chamber are that Adelaide, with or without Monarto, will have 1 130 700 people by the year 2000—in other words, a decrease of some 369 300 people on the original estimate. In fact, the population of greater Adelaide is levelling out far more rapidly than anyone could have predicted, and is nowhere near the 3 per cent growth rate it was said justified the need for Monarto.

Figures released by the Bureau of Statistics on August 9 show that the growth figure for South Australia for 1975 was .02 per cent. The Minister will undoubtedly say this makes no allowance for Darwin evacuees. We have done our sums and made allowances for them, and, when allowances are made for them, the figure is still less than 1 per cent: .94 per cent is the growth figure for South Australia in 1975, corrected for the Darwin evacuees. This is well down on the previous year's similarly adjusted figure of 1.53 per cent, which in turn was a far smaller figure than originally predicted.

In other words, we have virtually stopped growing in South Australia, although this certainly has not stopped the South Australian Government from increasing the size of the Public Service, and particularly the Premier's Department. Our Public Service has been increased at the highest rate of any State in Australia during the last three years: it has increased by 19.4 per cent over that period. The argument for Monarto, based on population projections, has just not stood the test of time. It is totally invalid at this point, yet the Government either has not woken up to it or will not accept it. It seems to me that it will not accept it. The argument for Monarto based on availability of Federal funds has also not stood the test of time. This Government will not accept that, either.

Mr. Mathwin: Mr. Whitlam knew where he was going.

Mr. Venning: How do you get through to the Government?

Dr. TONKIN: It seems to me that this Government will not deviate from any course it has charted for itself regardless of where that course takes it, whether on to the reefs and rocks or rocky coastline where the ship of State can founder. Doctrinaire courses are all that matter to it. In its failure to accept the changes that have occurred in the basic arguments for Monarto, this Government is grievously at fault. The Whitlam Government's decision to cut support for the scheme was not unexpected, although the Minister for Planning said that he was grossly shocked by that decision. The message came through loud and clear—\$500 000 instead of about \$9 000 000, which was the sum requested. Nothing could have been clearer than that message, a message delivered by a Government in the Commonwealth Parliament of the same political complexion as this Government.

The Whitlam decision was well based. Obviously the Federal department had done its research well. It knew exactly where it stood. The decision was made at the same time it was decided to pour more funds into the Albury-Wodonga area and other growth centres, yet \$500 000 was all that was allocated for Monarto. The initial selection of the site was made by a group of senior public servants under the chairmanship of the Minister Assisting the Premier. When the decision was made no completed definitive or independent reports on completed feasibility studies were available to that committee; just a series of preliminary reports was available. In fact, the General Manager has been reported as saying that the decision to build Monarto was made without a detailed economic analysis of the site factors.

Although the Treasurer subsequently denied that statement, there must have been some basis for comment. It was not made out of the blue or made with any degree of viciousness. Not even the Minister would accuse the General Manager of that sort of attitude. Several studies

have been completed. I refer to some of the findings. Bremer valley is not suitable for irrigation with effluent water because of high salinity factors and the type of soil. The Monarto Development Commission report "Environmental Study Progress Report (April, 1975)" states on page 70:

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

More salinity for the Murray River is just what we least need. Already millions of tonnes of salt each year comes across the border from the Eastern States. There is no point creating a situation whereby the water to be delivered to the metropolitan area could suffer increased salinity. Another finding states that the bedrock is too close to the surface, making the installation of underground services expensive. In the past, members on this side have said that a series of explosive charges will be necessary to lay deep-drainage pipes in some areas.

The soil layer has a low water permeability and is susceptible to water and wind erosion. An Engineering and Water Supply Department report shows soil in the area to have a high corrosive effect on sewerage pipes. Monarto has a greater extreme of temperature than Adelaide has, and has a high incidence of temperature inversions in the area. If the Government could attract industry in real proportions to the area, smog would be an almost insurmountable problem. However, the Government has not been able to attract or even interest new industries to come to Monarto. That is a fact of life that the Government knows full well. The Government suggests that Government departments should be moved to Monarto even though 94 per cent of Lands Department officers do not wish to be forced to live there.

Mr. Mathwin: Employment by direction!

Dr. TONKIN: It is typical of a socialist State. The South Australian Council of Social Service has criticised Monarto planning on the basis that it was predetermined and theoretical, and that it did not leave scope for the future population to participate in the planning of the community. Is it any wonder that the Whitlam Government decided not to support further this project? The Whitlam Government sounded the death knell of Monarto, yet this Government is deaf to that sound and deafened by its own obsession with Monarto.

Many learned authorities on planning have expressed views about the Monarto project. Professor Scott, Professor of Geography at the University of Tasmania (a former adviser on urban and regional development), said:

The Monarto site and terrain do not seem suitable. Monarto will not be viable in the short term. There are other areas which could have been considered more seriously than Monarto. A very big question mark hangs over Monarto.

Professor Jensen, at the time Professor of Architecture and Town Planning and Dean of the Faculty of Architecture and Town Planning at Adelaide University, described Monarto as a fundamental blunder of the first order. I do not believe anyone could have put it better.

Mr. Mathwin: It's like a Gilbert and Sullivan comic opera.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, except that there is nothing comic about it, because the money being spent and the planning could have been used to provide other facilities for the people of South Australia. That is why it is not funny! The recently resigned Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission correctly summed up the situation when

he said he was being paid \$30 000 a year and that he did not have enough to do. He knew the complete and true situation. He has been given a golden handshake of astronomical proportions by an obviously embarrassed Government.

All the people concerned have accepted that Monarto is just not on at present. The only people who do not seem to accept this are the members of this Government. Some Government members (even the Minister in his heart of hearts) accept that it is not now possible to continue with this project. Most South Australians have accepted that Monarto is, at this time, not what is wanted, not what is necessary, and not what is viable. The Government is obviously unwilling to face facts: to face the realities of the situation. While it cries out that it does not have enough money to carry out the construction programmes in education, health and in other spheres (including those mundane services such as sewerage), it continues to pour money into Monarto. While the Government cries out that it cannot possibly make any further worthwhile concessions in State taxes and charges, even though in this years Budget the total sum has increased by \$50 000 000, it continues to pour money into Monarto. This Government does not deserve the confidence of the people of South Australia or of this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition has moved to reduce the line "Monarto Development Commission, \$1 400 000" by \$100. The motion does not have to be seconded.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would be pleased to second the motion if—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have said that it does not have to be seconded.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I support the motion with some enthusiasm, because it is a fact of life that Monarto has become an expensive experiment that has been visited on the public of South Australia. It is high time that the experiment ceased. The Government has no real programme mapped out for the development of Monarto. The Federal Minister said recently that it is rather unrealistic for the South Australian Government in these circumstances to expect the Federal Government to make large sums available when the time table for the development of Monarto is far from clear. It has been pointed out that the death knell of the project was sounded by the Whitlam Administration in the last sorry year of its office, when the South Australian Government was seeking about \$10 000 000 and ended up with \$500 000. Obviously, the Whitlam Government had come to terms with reality. The State Government has seen on several occasions that the new city is not a goer without a major infusion of Commonwealth funds. The State Government stated initially that it expected the Commonwealth to build Monarto for it. We understand the point that the Federal Minister has made in recent statements. The State Government has no firm timetable for the development of the city. We have only to cast our minds back to the initial announcement by the Premier to see what a fiasco Monarto has developed into. The population projection has proved to be unsound. As has been pointed out, by the year 2000 the total population of the metropolitan area will be slightly more than 1 100 000. The most recent projections are far short of the Premier's earlier figures. The question of the growth of Adelaide has no certain answer, but present projections indicate a far smaller population for Adelaide than the figure given by the Premier in trying to delude the people into thinking we should develop this city.

On the question of industry, we are not attracting industry to South Australia to any degree, let alone to a mythical new town some distance from Adelaide. Anyone with elementary intelligence in these matters realises that there can be no viable city of this kind unless a firm commercial or industrial base is established. We have become a high-cost State, and we do not now live as we did in the Playford era, when costs were significantly lower here than in other States and we could manufacture goods, export them to other States, and beat other States on their own markets.

This State is now the pace setter. We have the most generous conditions in many of these areas, but we are not competitive. The only proposal to populate Monarto was that certain Government department employees would be forced to live there. Monarto was to be a sort of new Canberra, the administrative centre. The Agriculture Department was to be located there, and that proposal went over like a lead balloon with the employees. The ultimatum was that, if the employees did not go there, they would be out of a job. This does not seem to be a firm basis for the establishment of a new city.

Mr. Evans: Would it be a cheaper place than the Trades Hall?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I can imagine what the people on South Terrace would tell the Government if it told them to go out to Monarto. The Leader has referred to the matter of salinity, and we know the massive tomes and reports that have been prepared, but the Government has acquired expensive farm land and many trees, and the trees have proved to be expensive. I will quote now from a tome that members have received on the question of salinity. It is a draft of the Monarto environmental impact statement, phase I, and it states:

Two distinct forms of soil salting, namely, valley and hillside salting, present actual and potential problems in parts of the study site (Map 10.5). Areas of high, moderate and low salinity have been identified. In areas of moderate and high salinity, foundations, damp courses and provision of underground services will need special consideration. Methods for ameliorating salinity have been recommended, but development of high salinity areas should not proceed until the results of current studies by C.S.I.R.O. Soils Division/Department of Agriculture joint investigation and the Department of Agriculture Experimental Farm become available. Many of the amelioration guidelines outlined in this report are being tested in these studies.

That showed that the homework had not been done before the Government, for some obscure political reason, decided that we needed Monarto. More and more problems are becoming obvious. One afternoon I read in the *News* that a competition was being held about building one's own house at Monarto. That is no basis on which to build a new city: that would be a blueprint for a slum. The public will not swallow this gimmickry. I refer now to the sorry episode about the former Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission. At page 201 of his report for the year ended June 30, the Auditor-General states, in the section dealing with the Premier's Department, as follows:

The payments recorded in the foregoing statement rose by \$204 000 to \$607 000 for the year. This mainly resulted from increases in salaries (\$95 000) and expenses in connection with the position of Industrial Consultant to the Premier's Department from August 29, 1975, when the then Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission transferred to this position still retaining his chairmanship of the commission in a part-time capacity.

The following is a summary of payments made in connection with the employment of the consultant until his resignation on March 12, 1976:

	\$
Payment on termination of services	100 000
Salaries and related payments	13 500
Rental subsidy, superannuation, and other payments	1 500
Expenditure incurred by the Public Buildings Department for provision of office accommodation, including \$5 500 from Loan funds	13 500
	128 500
Less—Net contribution from the Monarto Development Commission for the position of part-time Chairman . .	3 000
	125 500

That is a sorry chapter in the continuing saga of Monarto. There was a \$100 000 golden handshake and other expenses, towards which the commission contributed \$3 000, and so the people are \$125 000 worse off over this episode.

If one looks at page 320 of the Auditor-General's report, which relates to the Monarto Development Commission, one gets a picture of how much money this is costing the long-suffering taxpayer of this State. Let me examine the statement of the commission's financial operations as at June 30 this year. One finds that, in effect, the only real income that the commission is deriving amounts to \$175 000 from rents and leases from the land which the Government acquired from the former owners and which it has now rented back. There is income from interest, but that is interest on Loan money. It is really dead money, not money that the commission itself has generated. The only real income which it is getting and which is of benefit to the long-suffering taxpayer of this State is the \$175 000 to which I have already referred.

On the expenditure side, one sees where the commission's money is going. Salaries and fees for the commission for the financial year just concluded amounted to \$792 000. I ask what the public is getting for that money. The commission has planted a few trees at Monarto, and it has made some glossy reports. However, do we know when the first house will be constructed, when the first industry will be attracted there or how many people will be forced to leave the city and live at Monarto? In effect, last year \$792 000 was spent on salaries and fees to keep the commission going.

The Government has had to pass a Bill through this House to give the commission something else to do. We know that the Government does not have a clue when Monarto will get off the ground. The commission has done something for Port Adelaide, and it is about to do something, for a fee, in the Adelaide Hills.

Dr. Tonkin: What about Darwin?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is so. If anyone pays the commission, it will do a job. Indeed, I think the Government paid it \$300 000 to investigate the Adelaide Hills. The interest on loans is almost \$1 400 000. As the Leader correctly pointed out, there are many urgent priority projects in South Australia crying out to be undertaken by the Government. I repeat that we could have had 20 new primary schools and four major new high schools with the money that has gone down the sink hole since this scheme was first conceived by the Premier. The Premier was vehement (in fact, he was almost apoplectic) when it was suggested that the Government should cut its losses and scrap the scheme. He almost had a fit when it was suggested during Question Time that this was an expensive exercise, and that it was time the Government came to its senses, cut its losses and spent the money in areas of this State that are crying out for attention.

It is high time that the Government came to its senses in this respect. I am sure that, if a poll was taken of the general public in this State, the Government would find that there was little support for a project that is not materialising. There would be little support in the community for this pipe dream. The public likes to see something for its money. As the Leader pointed out, the growth of the public sector has been astronomical under this Administration: about 19 per cent in three years. The Monarto Development Commission (and this is no reflection on its team of workers, who are highly skilled) has nothing to do, because the city is not a goer. To keep these people semi-employed in this way on the public pay-roll is an absolute waste of public funds.

We know that the Government is not particularly concerned about this aspect of expenditure. The Opposition has tried many times to stress the importance of getting value for the taxpayers' dollar. South Australia is a highly-taxed State, and it grieves the Opposition to see large sums of taxpayers' funds being frittered away on a scheme that obviously has no chance of success in the short term. Indeed, I doubt whether it has much chance of success in the long term. For that reason, I support the motion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Planning): We have listened so far to two speeches which, if I might be excused for describing them in this manner, were dripping with insincerity and poisonous misrepresentation of the position. Let me deal first with the alleged point about the money which is being spent by the Monarto Commission and which could have been made available for other purposes. Of the \$18 700 000 that has been made available so far, \$10 500 000 has come from the Commonwealth Government by way of a tied grant. Therefore, it is simply not true to say that that money would have been available for other purposes. So, the statement of the Leader and Deputy Leader that this money could have been used in some other way is incorrect.

Secondly, the major part of State Loan funds that has been made available to Monarto has come from semi-Government borrowings. The Leader and Deputy Leader would be well aware that no expenditure on schools, Government hospitals and many other projects comes from semi-Government borrowings, so that the sum that has been allocated to the project from Loan funds to the end of the financial year just completed is little more than about \$3 000 000. Therefore, all the remarks by the Leader and Deputy Leader about how many schools and other things could have been built are inappropriate.

The second complete misrepresentation of the Opposition case so far relates to the Commonwealth Government's attitude. The fact is that this Government's submission has been with the Commonwealth Government since last November, and we have not yet received a reply to it. Although no Commonwealth allocation has been made for Monarto this financial year, the present Commonwealth Government has not yet decided what its future attitude to Monarto will be. That was confirmed initially by Senator Greenwood before his unfortunate illness, and subsequently, only a few weeks ago, when the Premier and I met with Mr. Newman, the present Minister,

Mr. Dean Brown: Was it confirmed exactly?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No decision had been made, but it would be made shortly as to what support, if any, would be available from the Commonwealth. I am not saying that the Commonwealth Government has indicated that there will be future support: what I am saying, and it is completely incontrovertible, is that the Commonwealth Government Minister responsible has said that, in relation

to our submission, no decision has been made, and we should know shortly what the Commonwealth attitude is. Because the Opposition continues with misrepresentation, I point out that the actual facts are that, when the Minister was quoted in the press as answering a question in the Commonwealth House recently, I sent him a telex asking for certain information, and I obtained the following reply yesterday:

Your telex message of August 26 refers. My remarks were in response to a question on my personal feelings on the future attitude of the Commonwealth to Monarto. My reply focussed on the short-term future and should be read in the context of the recent Federal Budget. In this connection you will appreciate that the Commonwealth has indicated clearly its intention to exercise rigid control over the level of its own spending.

The support for any growth centre has been cut completely in the Commonwealth Budget. The only commitments entered into for this financial year relate to the carry-over of existing commitments, for the same reason as we in South Australia for this year are getting \$6 000 000 from the Commonwealth for the Land Commission under an existing commitment the Commonwealth had prior to the last Federal election. There is some money under previous commitments—small amounts available for Bathurst-Orange and Albury-Wodonga, but none for—

Mr. Dean Brown: You've been trying—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member will have his chance to speak. I know that he does not want to listen but, out of courtesy to others who may want to listen, he should shut his mouth for once.

Mr. Mathwin: Well, you put out the carrot when you talked about the Land Commission. That is a shocking socialist plan.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We are getting \$6 000 000 from the Commonwealth for the Land Commission this financial year. The telex from Mr. Newman continues:

Let me stress that I was not concerned to debate the concept of Monarto or your Government's commitment to the project. My intention was to inform Parliament of my personal reservations about the prospect of further financial assistance, given that we have not agreed on a development programme for Monarto and advice to my officers that the State Government is examining the timing priority of Monarto against the background of your State's other metropolitan development plans.

The submission made last November is still current, and that specifically provides for a year-by-year expenditure relating to the commencement date for Monarto. The telex concludes:

It is relevant to note that Monarto is at the stage where further progress will lock participants into a significant ongoing construction programme. Such a step at this time would be clearly at variance with the Budget strategy outlined by the Federal Treasurer and would be totally unacceptable to my Government. Merits of Monarto as a planning proposition is one for the State to determine in the light of its own priorities and financial resources. Concerning the long-term attitude of the Commonwealth to Monarto and other growth centres, this will be announced at the conclusion of the current review of urban programmes.

I am willing to admit that the kind of noises Mr. Newman is making is not very encouraging, but he does say that, regarding the long-term attitude of the Commonwealth—

Mr. Dean Brown: That would be the understatement of the year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That may be so, but the honourable member presumably is going to make his judgment on guesses and hunches and not on the actual facts, which are (and they have been confirmed personally by Mr. Newman) that some time about the end of

September or early October the Commonwealth will announce its attitude to growth centres, including Monarto, and what it is willing to do and what it is unwilling to do, but it has not given us any proper indication of what that will be. The honourable member may reckon that he knows more about it, and he may well be completely associated with his Leader in trying to knock every application for support from the Commonwealth that this State makes. No doubt the honourable member could be in the same kind of position as the Leader was over shipbuilding. He made a special submission to Canberra and came back saying, "I'm dreadfully sorry, there's no money for shipbuilding," and within a day or two—

Mr. Gunn: What's that got to do with the Loan Estimates?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —the Prime Minister announced that certain support would be available for shipbuilding under certain conditions. We are aware that Opposition members, in their blind support for the Federal Government, want to knock every special project more or less to avoid embarrassment to their Federal colleagues. However, I point out again that we have not yet had a formal reply from the Commonwealth to our submission and that it is reasonable to wait for such a formal reply. I know the Opposition would not so wait, but its attitude to the whole question of growth centres is, to say the least, highly questionable. At no stage has it suggested any alternative strategy other than to try to suggest that Adelaide is virtually static. The Leader has pointed out that the current rate of increase in population is .94 per cent in South Australia; the bulk is in Adelaide, more than proportionately in Adelaide, and, with that rate of increase, by the 1990's Adelaide will extend well beyond its current limits. In those circumstances, there will be serious difficulties in terms of traffic movement and the overall quality of life. I ask the Leader and any of his supporters for their answer to those difficulties.

Dr. Tonkin: Existing growth centres, decentralisation policies and something you haven't thought about.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader has just demonstrated his complete insincerity on the matter. He suggested decentralisation, but any suggestion that any Government office might be decentralised—and he talks about the conscription of labour—

Dr. Tonkin: What has that to do with the price of eggs?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader talks decentralisation without any particular efforts to get anything going. All the Leader is doing when he makes those statements is paying lip service to the proposition. There is no genuine commitment to decentralisation on the Leader's part, just as there has been no effective commitment to decentralisation by most of the Governments that have been in power in South Australia this century.

Dr. Tonkin: Will you explain that in some detail?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I offered the Leader the courtesy of listening to him, much as I was tempted to interject, and I suggest that he might at least be willing to show me a similar courtesy. I believe that the Liberal Party's answer to the growing problems of Adelaide will be the kind of answer the Hall Government gave: build freeways.

Mr. Becker: Come on!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Hanson says that his answer would not be to build freeways, but what would it be? If we build freeways, they will cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Will the Leader or some responsible member of his Party, if there is such a member,

please indicate what is the Liberal Party's policy to meet the future problems of Adelaide? How will they get effective decentralisation? I believe that the Leader is simply playing politics on this question. He does not really intend to do or propose anything which would give rise to effective decentralisation. In response to the kinds of demand that exist in various parts of the State, members should be aware of the place outside the metropolitan area where there is the highest demand for Housing Trust accommodation; it is no longer Whyalla or Mount Gambier—it happens to be Murray Bridge. It is clear that, once the South-Eastern Freeway is near completion, there will be a substantial boost.

Dr. Tonkin: The freeway—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I listened to the Leader without interrupting him. The Leader claims that he is not dripping with insincerity, but his refusal to extend reasonable courtesy to me is an exact indication of his insincerity. The fact of the freeway to Murray Bridge means that, without some growth centre along the route, there will be pressure for development at virtually every possible point along it and there will be extended pressure for development at Murray Bridge itself. It is clear that the capacity for Murray Bridge to grow is limited.

Whatever difficulties there may be with the Monarto site, I assure members that further expansion of Murray Bridge will create even greater problems with respect to construction and salinity. The problems of run-off of saline water into the Murray River will be greater with any development near Murray Bridge than with Monarto. The Leader and the Deputy Leader completely misrepresented the work of the Monarto Development Commission in relation to the Monarto environment. The Leader indulged in a disgraceful quoting of snippets out of context. The Deputy Leader gave a longer quotation which he claimed meant something that it did not mean. The plain fact in connection with the environmental studies is that on balance, in terms of the overall soil conditions for building and the overall salinity problems, the Monarto site is better than most parts of Adelaide. The site of Adelaide is not the greatest, from the building viewpoint. Certainly Monarto is distinctly better than a continuing expansion of Murray Bridge. One of the options open to the committee set to work by Cabinet to select a site was to recommend an expansion of Murray Bridge. It was the difficulties of that site that pushed the committee against that conclusion.

Over the next 20 years there will be an expansion of Adelaide's population, without any action being taken to counteract it, of well over 200 000. It is not a question of Adelaide ceasing to grow; Adelaide is an elongated city, and further growth will be north and south. If members care to experience the problems of north-south movement in Adelaide as they exist even today, they will begin to recognise the kinds of problem that this city will experience as a result of further expansion northwards or southwards.

Dr. Tonkin: Can you be sure that the figures are accurate?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: One can be reasonably confident. Professor Borrie's figures can be shown to be an under-estimate. The previous predictions were obviously too high. The work being carried out, subject to regular review, by the economic intelligence unit of the Premier's Department suggests growth rates (they give low, medium and high forecasts, depending on different migration rates)

which are likely, even on the low to medium side, to give an expansion over the next 20 years to 25 years of over 200 000.

Mr. Dean Brown: With or without migration?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The low to medium range assumes low to medium rates of migration, and no rate of migration anywhere near what we experienced in the 1950's and 1960's. Even without further migration, there is a significant potential for expansion that arises from the fact that Adelaide's existing population has a bias towards the younger age groups. The continuation of the existing birth rate, without an increase, will still produce an expanded population; that is a fundamental proposition which members should understand.

Dr. Tonkin: The rate is decreasing.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The rate is static at present, and it has been static for a couple of years. It is certainly not increasing. Some argue that it is likely to increase because people have been postponing having children, but I do not believe that. I would prefer to make a forecast on the basis that the current birth rate will continue without further reduction. Having said that, it is still the case that, even without any migration, Adelaide's population will expand significantly, because of a bias toward younger age groups, particularly with people in the late teens, the twenties and early thirties. The number of people dying off at the end of the age scale is not as great as the number being born; there is a significant growth in this way. High traffic densities are now experienced on the Main South Road. Further, high and growing traffic densities are experienced along Brighton Road. The problems of movement are becoming more difficult. The solution to these problems, if they become incredibly more difficult, will cost this State millions and millions of dollars. We know what was involved in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study; that was not expenditure to make the quality of life better—it was expenditure to prevent the quality of life getting worse.

There are costs of excessive growth in a city like Adelaide, and it is about time members opposite indicated what their policies are to meet these problems. They have done nothing except mouthe platitudes and make trite remarks; for example, we got misrepresentation by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition when he said that the Government would make everyone who was transferred to Monarto live in Monarto, but that is completely untrue. The Government has never said that, and the Deputy Leader knows it. The fact that that has not been stated has been made clear in this House, yet the Deputy Leader continues with his misrepresentation. It is perfectly possible for someone who may work in Monarto to live in the Hills or at Murray Bridge. People will not be compelled to live in Monarto.

The member for Glenelg, in a fit of his usual great intelligence, said that it was something about socialism. I suppose a Liberal Government would not tell teachers to go to Whyalla, Coober Pedy, or Mount Gambier! I suppose a Liberal Government would not tell policemen to go to certain places, because that would be socialism! The Deputy Leader said that South Australia had a growth problem and was worse off than other States. If that is the case why, despite the actions of the Federal Government, has South Australia the lowest unemployment level of any State? The Deputy Leader suggested that South Australia had special problems but, in fact, South Australia has the lowest rate of unemployment of any State, and is the only State in which the housing industry is fully stretched. In Perth in the last month that industry has

taken a nosedive. What explanation do honourable members opposite give for Australia's economic problems having less impact in South Australia than in any other State? Do they attribute it to the railways agreement against which they all voted?

The position in relation to Monarto has already been dealt with. In the initial years of that project the amount of private employment that needs to be attracted is not large. Government and service industry employment will take up most employment requirements, and only about 700 jobs would be required from private sources in the first eight years of Monarto. That is independent of the construction process, Government employment, service industries and the like. It is not a great number and, until a construction date is determined, one cannot expect a definite commitment for anyone to establish at Monarto.

No honourable member opposite has ever suggested what would be a better place for industry to go outside of Adelaide or the Monarto area if it is to serve markets in other States, have relatively close access to the port, have availability of flat industrial land, and have availability of water, and, at the same time meet all those problems within a reasonable degree of cost. Opposition members have never suggested a reasonable alternative. I challenge the Leader to do so, because I believe his statements concerning decentralisation are just so much poppycock. They amount to nothing. Moreover, if Adelaide expands without any growth alternative, serious costs will be faced by the people of the State in relation to additional roadworks, in terms of time of travel, in terms of air pollution and in terms of the deterioration of the quality of life.

Dr. Eastick: But the roadworks problem exists now.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The roadworks problem will become greater as the population increases.

Dr. Eastick: But it exists now.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: True, but the problem is tolerable now, but is not far from becoming intolerable, and it is not far from requiring large amounts of expenditure.

Dr. Eastick: Is that why you have the freeway land at the Sturt triangle?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. The honourable member knows the Government does not intend to build freeways that involve knocking over many houses. The Government has stated the position about transport corridors and future transportation requirements. The position regarding the future of the motor car cannot be determined at this stage. However, it is known that present methods of travel are likely to be subject to great modification by the end of the century. We would look foolish indeed to someone 20 years hence who saw hundreds of millions of dollars now being spent on freeways to cater for the passenger car when by the end of the century some alternative fueling method for vehicles would have to be found that could result in such a cost that we would have a reversion to public transport or a complete modification of present transportation methods.

Opposition members have never bothered to answer this argument. Instead, they merely want to play with Monarto as a political proposition, as it may be worth some votes, and as there is nothing much else about which they can criticise the Government. If Opposition members examine any other large city of the world, they will realise the effect size has in making transportation so much more difficult. If the Liberal Party wants such problems in South Australia, it should say what its policy is. I believe that certain Ministers of the previous Liberal Party regarded freeways

as necessary to allow farmers to get their produce to market. Whether that is true or not, the Opposition should indicate its position in this matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you not accept that goods must be transported across metropolitan Adelaide?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: How many hundreds of millions of dollars is the Deputy Leader willing to spend on freeways?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know of a situation in which a freeway system reduced the traffic problem. The general proposition is that as one improves roads by widening and the like, traffic increases more than proportionately to the improved access. I thought honourable members opposite understood that.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did they make life pleasant for people?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Of course, freeways contribute to the quality of life! They certainly improve it for those who spend many hours each day on freeways; they don't improve the quality of life for those who live near freeways and who suffer from noise and air pollution problems!

Mr. Mathwin: Such as the Parkholme overpass; that's a beauty.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Glenelg will cease interjecting.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It has nothing to do with it. The general point I make is that, even if the Monarto project were to be wound down now, one would still want to complete the study and would still have, as the Leader pointed out, the problem of the continuation of the employment of staff. Obviously, a decision to be made about the future of Monarto cannot be made until we know the answer from the Commonwealth Government. It would be interesting to hear from responsible members opposite why it has taken so long for the Commonwealth Government to give us any sort of answer. It has spent the entire period in developing its policy on growth centres and concerning the long-term attitude of the Commonwealth towards Monarto, Mr. Newman said, "This will be announced at the conclusion of the current review of urban programmes." Until that review takes place, we cannot get a final conclusion out of the Commonwealth Government. I suggest that, until we get a final answer from it, it is not proper to reach a final conclusion on Monarto.

We believe that Monarto is necessary for the future and that, unless it is started early, Monarto will not be in a position to take off when it is required. It is necessary to the future quality of life of the people of Adelaide that something like the Monarto project should proceed. We understand the lack of understanding and vision of members opposite, and we apologise for it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The important question here is: is Monarto needed? Before answering that question, I should briefly rebut some of those trivial points raised by the Minister. First, he developed at some length the traffic problems of Adelaide. We shall not overcome them by building freeways to Monarto for keeping people here in Adelaide. The important issue is that the Minister of Transport in this State has failed, for the past six years, to adopt any comprehensive transport policy for Adelaide, and of course we have transport problems here; that does not justify having a new town. It simply indicates that the Minister of Transport has failed to carry out his responsibilities.

Secondly, he dwelt greatly on what was the Federal Government's policy and the fact that there is now a review, and that, unfortunately having been in office for 12 months, the Fraser Government still has not given a commitment on Monarto. After three years of the Whitlam Government, South Australia still did not get a commitment on Monarto, and the Fraser Government will not give one, either, because it realises that Monarto is a dead concept, that there has been a change of circumstances that no longer justifies the need for Monarto. I was in the House of Representatives when the Commonwealth Minister, Mr. Newman, gave his explanation, and I spoke to the Minister immediately afterwards. They were his personal views, that Monarto was not needed at present, but that Minister will be the Minister who decides how much money will be needed for Monarto. I should have thought that those personal views that the Minister tried to push aside here were important, because that Minister will be making the overall political decision on whether Monarto proceeds.

Mr. Newman made it clear that, owing to a change in population growth and in circumstances here in South Australia, there was now, at least in the short and medium term, no need for Monarto. I heard that both in the House and in a personal conversation with him. The Minister spoke at length about the population projections for Adelaide and how the important ones we should listen to are those from the Premier's Department.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have been listening intently to the speech by the honourable member, but at no stage has he addressed the Chair. I wish that at some stage he would address the Chair.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you; I think I have referred to you three times.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If that is the case, I hope the member does not turn his back on the Chair.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was referring to the population projections coming from the Premier's Department. The Minister has to reject those from the Borrie report and accept the ones from the Premier's Department. Eighteen months ago, the Premier's Department predicted that the entire population of Adelaide by the year 2000 would be just over 1 000 000 people: in other words, an increase of 100 000 people. That projection was based on a growth rate of 1 per cent a year. Last year, the growth rate in Adelaide was .2 per cent, not 1 per cent, and yet even on the old projections of 18 months ago, if we put the entire population increase of South Australia at Monarto, we still could not have come up with the population projection for Monarto that this Government has, so apparently the population of South Australia will decline at Whyalla, Mount Gambier, and other places.

That is ridiculous. If the Minister is honest with himself he knows that, if he accepts the Premier's Department projections, the people will not be here even by the year 2000, let alone before that time. The Minister also raised the point, which can be accepted as valid: where will industry go in South Australia? Where can it go? Our industry is already starting to go not to Monarto but to other States. In the past 12 months Adelaide had a negative increase in the number of people involved in manufacturing industries of .25 per cent; that was the decline. Industry is certainly going, not to Monarto but to other States, and figures show it. That is a ridiculous argument for the Minister to raise.

Every time he speaks about Monarto, he refers to the problems of large cities. He did not this evening, but he usually refers to the Tokyos, the Sydneys, the Melbournes, and the New Yorks. The smallest of those cities has a population of 3 500 000 people; Adelaide is still under 1 000 000 people. By the year 2000 it may have reached the 1 000 000 mark, although there is almost a projection that we will be below that, so the Minister cannot class this as a big city. He cannot put the problems of Melbourne and Sydney on to Adelaide, because in 100 years time we still shall not have their population.

The final point raised by the Minister was that the town that really had the population boom now, with the greatest demand for Housing Trust houses, was Murray Bridge. Apparently, the argument and rationale that he uses as the whole reason for using Monarto is that Murray Bridge is developing so quickly; it has a population of 7 000 people! We hope that Monarto, on the say-so of the Government, will have a population of between 100 000 and 200 000 people within the next 25 years, yet the Minister by his concept this evening is to create Monarto not as a satellite city to Adelaide but as a satellite suburb to Murray Bridge, which has a population at this stage of only 7 000 people. One can now see the sort of light in which the Government sees Monarto: it sees it simply as a small overflow for Murray Bridge. Surely a city of 100 000 people is not needed for that purpose. The important question is, "Do we need Monarto?" Other issues relating to the availability of finance, the suitability of the site and soil, employment opportunities that could be created at Monarto, social welfare problems that are created in an entirely new city, and lack of public support for a new town, are all important issues. However, they are side issues, because the key issue is whether we really need Monarto.

When one considers the population projections for South Australia for the next 25 years and considers our industrial development, one realises that that development is leaving the State rather than coming here. When one considers all the other factors that would encourage the building of a town like Monarto, the reply to that question in the short and medium term is, "No, Monarto would be a disaster." Unfortunately, the Government has been rigid, inflexible, and irrational in its policy on Monarto. I do not doubt for a moment that, five or six years ago, with the sort of growth rates we then experienced that there was a need to question where the extra Adelaide population would go. Circumstances have changed dramatically, however.

Six years ago our population growth rate was 3 per cent a year: it is now less than a tenth of that rate. The rate of growth by the year 2000 will be less than the stated population for Adelaide: it will be below zero population growth. Unfortunately, the Government has its head in the sand on this issue, whereas everyone else realises that Monarto is finished as a short or medium-term project. The Chairman of the Monarto commission has resigned; many consultants working for the commission disagree with the Government's policy; the Whitlam Government disagreed with that policy; the Federal Department of Urban and Regional Development eventually disagreed with the policy; and the Fraser Government will, within three months, reinforce its policy that Monarto is not necessary.

Everyone knowing the facts has changed his mind except for two groups: the Government of this State, which is simply trying to save face; and the people who work for the Monarto Development Commission, who are obliged, under the Public Service Act, to be loyal to the Government of the day. That is the most minute nucleus

of people supporting the project. They are hell bent on sticking to a policy irrespective of changed circumstances. The Government cannot see the facts: it is unable or unwilling to admit that circumstances have changed. Unless the Government realises quickly that circumstances have changed, South Australia will suffer. Unless the Government pulls its head out of the sand the State will continue to decline under a poor administration. I support strongly the motion.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): My colleague, the member for Davenport, has rebutted effectively the weak arguments put forward by the Minister for Planning. The Minister was clutching at straws and did nothing whatever to convince the members of this Chamber—

Mr. Coumbe: He was not too enthusiastic about it.

Dr. TONKIN: He was not at all enthusiastic. It is obvious that he does not believe in the project.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

Noes (21)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold and Evans. Noes—Messrs. Jennings and Keneally.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. OLSON (Semaphore): Earlier today I referred to the Minister of Community Welfare the need to train a suitable officer of the Hospitals Department in glass-eye manufacture. As this matter has concerned several of my constituents for some time, I am sure they will be delighted to learn that the Government intends to investigate the possibility of an officer learning the art of this profession. I pay a tribute to the work performed by Dr. Scheler, who was invited to this country from Austria many years ago to provide a service for the less fortunate members of society who, through accident or disease, had lost an eye and needed an artificial replacement.

I understand that, whilst it has been possible to import plastic eyes, Dr. Scheler and another person are the only two people in Australia capable of manufacturing glass eyes. Because of his devotion to safeguarding the interests of wearers, he has continued in his profession well after the age at which many other members of the community decide to retire. Artificial eyes have been manufactured in both glass and plastic. Glass has advantages in being more scratch resistant and more resistant to attacks from body chemistry.

The disadvantage of glass is the problem of breakage, which may be an important consideration, particularly where children are concerned. We must consider that, as many children now are following television programmes involving violence, the incidence of eye injury is much

more pronounced, and there is every reason to think that, in the foreseeable future, the demand for this prosthesis will be much greater. It has been found that the plastic material scratches more readily, and some people cannot wear the plastic eye, because the body chemistry attacks the plastic. The manufacture of the eyes must be done on a personal basis, because of the colour difference.

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. OLSON: In addition to the colour difference and the need to match the colour on a personal basis, there is difficulty in being able to shape the eyes to the differing eye socket requirements. This results in an enormous combination of matching and the need for manufacturing expertise. Such requirements are difficult to meet by selecting from a stock or by having the eyes made overseas. A poor eye combination may have undesirable psychological effects on a patient.

We must not forget that the life period that the wearer of an artificial eye can expect is no more than six years; in other words, sometimes it is necessary to provide a replacement in less than six years. In the case of children, replacements are necessary more frequently. One can readily understand the desirability of organising, without undue delay, the training of a suitable officer, as the training involves a comprehensive study. Apart from the actual skill involved in the glass-blowing technique, it is necessary that the manufacturer understand both plastic and glass technology, the studies in research and evaluation of new materials and techniques, colour chemistry and product testing, that is, the safety of the product. In addition, it is necessary to have an understanding of biology sufficient to understand the requirements relating to the tension of muscles, the socket, and so on, that the apparatus must fit and, at the same time, to eliminate the possibility of disease occurring because the materials or the design are inadequate.

This poses a question whether a guarantee can be offered to private enterprise in this regard, bearing in mind that the service is of a continuous nature, and whether private firms would be justified in providing or willing to provide the capital necessary for the training of staff, particularly as there may not be sufficient demand to justify that expenditure. Research has established that the Public Service was instrumental in appointing a splint maker, physiotherapist, dental mechanic, and oculist prior to the need for this service being generally accepted throughout the community. In other words, it was bold enough to go into this venture to see whether the services of this profession were warranted. For that reason, the Minister is to be commended for being willing to investigate the necessity for having these prostheses available and, at the same time, being willing to invest the capital necessary to ensure that the wearers' demands are fully met.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I bring up this subject, which is directly related to the preceding Monarto debate, mainly at the instigation of the Mount Gambier City Council, the Mount Gambier District Council, and the Portland council in western Victoria. They are anxious because the concept of the green triangle, which was referred to by none other than the Premier as the green square, because of the inclusion of Portland, Victoria, seems to have been relaxed somewhat over the last two or three years.

It is significant that in May, 1974, the Premier, after visiting the Leader of the Opposition in Victoria, and after having discussions with that gentleman on the development of regional growth centres, released a report

to the Melbourne *Herald*, stating that it would be impossible to develop regional growth centres without substantial Federal assistance. Since then, we consider that the concept of the green triangle project has been neglected. I also point out that the Premier, in that press release, said that decentralisation was something to which Governments all too often paid lip service only. He may not have said that in quite those words, but that was certainly the gist of his statement. It has been pointed out tonight that the Monarto concept is being developed at the expense of other growth centres. I know that the Minister for Planning has on previous occasions denied this. He said that Monarto would go ahead as one project, and that other growth centres would go ahead simultaneously. However, this has not proved to be the case. There is further evidence that that is unlikely, too, because the Federal Government (both the Whitlam and Fraser Governments) have said that, as long as the Monarto project was given first priority by the South Australian Government, that would be the one project for which Federal money would be provided now or in the future. Therefore, other regional growth centres will go ahead not anywhere nearly as quickly as the Minister intimated if Federal money is not forthcoming. The Premier himself said this in his statement to the Melbourne press. There is a strong chance that country growth centres which are already potentially sound will be neglected.

I further criticise the Monarto centre for a variety of reasons, which were propounded by experts in Adelaide at the same time as others were putting forward the Monarto project as a sound one. Any school geographer-geologist would be able to come up with the same answer. I am sure that students in various schools have analysed this situation almost *ad nauseam*. These are some of the conclusions to which even children have come. Monarto is in a rain shadow. It already has a water deficiency, and it has poor soil. If we are going to build a city on poor soil it may be sound, bearing in mind that one uses one's best soil for market gardening and agricultural purposes, but there is also the converse theory that reasonably good soil must be provided for parks, gardens and beautification so that people can have some sense of pride, such as an attractive garden to come home to in the evening.

One has only to look at the smaller towns on the rain shadow side of the Adelaide Hills to realise that, although garden pride and personal pride may be present, it is not evident in the gardens themselves because of the lack of the basic facilities of good soil and adequate water. The soil itself at Monarto is open to erosion, and this is not the subject for a massive development. One can see it as one drives through Callington and Kanmantoo. One heavy rainstorm in about 1911 gutted out the whole hillside, which has still not been regenerated. There are still massive gullies, and few people over there are engaged in soil conservation, because of the difficult economic situation in cultivating that area.

It has been proved that the area is subject to a temperature inversion, so what do we do? If we introduce heavy industry, the temperature inversion will give something like the conditions prevalent in New York and London, with heavy smog coming down. The moisture droplets and the chemicals in the air will come down as smoke and fog (smog), and that is detrimental to satisfactory inhabitation. London has had its problem

cleared up by the introduction of smokeless fuels. What would happen if we introduced tertiary industry instead of heavy secondary industry? The tertiary industry people are looking for something different. They are not the type of people who would be going along to a cultural desert or wilderness. They are the type of people who would prefer to settle in an area where there is already some strong cultural heritage. We have had the same problem to some extent in Mount Gambier. We would certainly have it in Monarto, where people would prefer to come back to Adelaide.

If we are going to make Monarto into a dormitory centre, let us say so. Let us put in a rapid transit system, forget the industry, and keep the place relatively clean; use what water there is, not for industry but for the people and gardens, and then move the people back again into the city. If we wish to protect the Adelaide Hills from desecration by over-population, we have achieved one aim. It is a potential solution to over-crowding of the Adelaide plains area, and we can retain what is left of the Adelaide plains for market gardening and agriculture. It is not the obvious solution, because the people in the South-East are looking towards the development of that area as a green triangle development area, and it does have some considerable advantages. It would not involve compulsory movement of Government departments, which is not acceptable in any case. Monarto does not seem to have many natural resources that could attract any industry. I cannot think of many solutions Monarto would offer that we could not have in any other area such as the South-East. For example, one would have the same transport problems at Monarto as in any country area. The South-East has adequate road and rail transport and an airport; it is near a seaport, Portland. Monarto does not have an airport; the rail facilities are there. The Minister has already criticised a previous Government's attempts to establish freeways; that is a red herring to which I will refer later.

Supplying water to Monarto is a problem, just as it would be if the people were in Adelaide. Murray River water is committed to the year 2000, so it does not matter whether the people are established in Adelaide or Monarto, because the same water supply would be involved. There are no additional reservoir resources in Monarto that could not be utilised for people in Adelaide. The South-East has the most precious commodity of all—plenty of good, clean, clear water, which the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation and the Engineering and Water Supply Department have researched. They have estimated that the water supply could support a population of about 250 000 throughout the South-East, which does not suffer from excessive fire or flood. It has a stable, equable climate which would attract people. Further, it does not suffer from drought or from being in a rain shadow. There are plenty of recreational areas, and it is an acceptable region for tertiary establishments, because it has an increasingly sound cultural base as well as an industrial base; this attracts people going into tertiary establishments.

Some experts think that the redevelopment of the centre of Adelaide would be sounder and less expensive than the development of Monarto; that would be an alternative solution. Some overseas cities like Los Angeles (with a 130-kilometre sprawl), London, New York, and Tokyo could accommodate the whole of Australia's population. This puts Adelaide's problem into perspective: it is of a miniscule nature, even compared with that of other large

Australian cities. We sometimes exaggerate the problem, just because Adelaide is the largest city in South Australia.

Of course, we do not want the problems that exist in large metropolises in other parts of the world. If we consider the possibility of the South-East being given the same concessions that would have to be offered to industry at Monarto (the same concessions that western Victoria is already receiving from the Victorian Government—freight subsidies, assistance with rents and rates, remission of pay-roll tax, land subdivision, housing for employees, assistance in the establishment of factories, tertiary industry in the form of Government departments being centralised), I cannot see any great advantage in establishing Monarto. Regarding the Minister's red herring, the freeways will be needed, even in Monarto. They would be needed to move marketable goods manufactured in Monarto. There is no seaport or airport near Monarto, so railways and freeways are essential if between 60 000 and 200 000 people are put in the area. People have to be moved.

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

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): There has often been discussion in this House on voting questions, particularly gerrymanders and the first past the post system. I have often listened to the member for Eyre on this matter. Even today he went back into the dim, dark ages in connection with voting, but he forgot that in those days seats were often uncontested. I therefore intend to deal with the Labor Party's position in connection with voting strengths. I refer to the first occasion on which I was elected to this House; in 1962, the Liberal and Country League vote was 140 507, and the Labor Party vote was 219 790. The L.C.L. received 34.51 per cent of the vote, and the Labor Party received 53.97 per cent. This is the wonderful aspect: the L.C.L. won 18 seats, while the Labor Party won 19 seats, and at that stage there were two Independents. The combined votes for the two Independents would not have amounted to the 79 000 majority of votes obtained by the Labor Party. Although the Labor Party obtained 53.97 per cent of the vote it was unable to form a Government. In the light of these figures, how could the member for Eyre refer today to gerrymanders and carry on as he did? In the 1965 election the Liberal Party obtained 179 183 votes (35.9 per cent of the vote) and won 17 seats, while the Labor Party obtained 274 432 votes (55 per cent of the vote) and won 21 seats, with one Independent winning a seat. The Labor Party was able to form Government, having obtained 55 per cent of the vote.

In the 1968 election the Liberal Party obtained 246 560 votes (43.8 per cent of the vote) and won 19 seats, while the Labor Party obtained 292 445 votes (52 per cent of the vote) and won 19 seats, one Independent candidate again winning a seat.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The member for Eyre must have given wrong figures.

Mr. LANGLEY: The member for Eyre brings forward only the figures that suit him. In 1969 there was a change in the electoral boundaries, and in the 1970 election the Liberal Party obtained 258 856 votes (43.8 per cent of the vote) and won 20 seats, while the Labor Party won 305 235 votes (51.6 per cent of the vote) and won 27 seats. In the 1973 election the Liberal Party obtained 250 312 votes (39.8 per cent of the vote) and won 20 seats, whereas the Labor Party obtained 324 132 votes (51.5 per cent of the vote) and won 26 seats.

In each election to which I have referred the Labor Party received more than 50 per cent of the vote, but on two occasions that was insufficient to allow it to form the Government, yet members opposite have suggested a Labor Government can be elected without obtaining 50 per cent of the vote. What is their comment on the situation that Parties receiving more than 50 per cent of the vote cannot form Governments?

Mr. Whitten: The Liberals have formed minority Governments.

Mr. LANGLEY: True. In the 1975 election, seats were won by small margins. The Liberal Party obtained 218 820 votes (31.5 per cent of the vote) and won 20 seats; the Liberal Movement won 126 427 votes (18.2 per cent of the vote) and won two seats; and the Labor Party obtained 321 481 votes (46.3 per cent of the vote) and won 23 seats (and I include the seat won by you, Mr. Speaker, in that number). That was one occasion when the Labor Party did not receive 50 per cent of the vote.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What about L.M. preferences?

Mr. LANGLEY: True, I refer to those preferences and the close election result. The figures I have given indicate the closeness of the election. How can the member for Eyre make his statements when on four occasions the Labor Party has polled more than 50 per cent of the vote but on two occasions it was unable to form Government? How can members opposite accept the position of a Party obtaining more than 50 per cent of the vote not being able to form Government? The member for Eyre is wrong, and I am sure that at the next election the Labor Party will obtain more than 50 per cent of the vote.

Mr. Coumbe: It didn't last time.

Mr. LANGLEY: Neither did the Liberal Party. I cannot say how many of the 126 427 L.M. votes were disgruntled Liberal voters and how many were disgruntled Labor voters. However, I can assure the honourable member that when we next go to the people the Labor Party will obtain well over 50 per cent of the vote. I assure the honourable member that there is much disquiet in the Liberal Party over what has happened to it since the return of Senator Hall and some of his followers to Liberal ranks. I think they are very happy to have these people amongst them. There is a lot of back-scratching in certain areas. Further to that, I wish in future the member for Eyre would just go forward a little more and speak of present times.

Also, during his speech he referred to my friends the member for Albert Park and the member for Salisbury. The member for Eyre on many occasions gets up merely for something to say and what he says never appears on the front page of the *Advertiser* or the *News* (I do not know whether it gets in the *Overlander*). He is always pleased to have a shot at my two friends. He sits in a reasonably safe seat, as do the member for Albert Park and the member for Salisbury, but I have heard that Unley was supposed to be a safe Liberal seat. I am sure those honourable members at all times look after their districts and do their work. If any member of this House thinks that by getting up and making speeches he will win votes in his district, he is wrong; the Liberal Party is fighting a losing battle on that score. If one cannot get something from the Ministers concerned, I shall be surprised. Anything that the Labor Party has started, the Liberal Party always copies. That applies to door-knocking. Liberal members do not like going out door-knocking, because

they get some strong rebukes. I assure the member for Glenelg that, if we had gone out door-knocking three weeks before we did, he would not be here now. His vote declined. The member for Albert Park knows that as well as I do. Members opposite have been out in my district, but to no avail. We door-knock where we have a very good chance of winning a seat. We are reasonably happy with what we have now, but we can win some. The member for Glenelg has not even won preselection yet. I

do not think there is much chance of my not winning the plebiscite for Unley; I shall be very surprised if I am opposed, but one executive member of the honourable member's Party is standing against the sitting member.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 9, at 2 p.m.