

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, April 28, 1977

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Appropriation (No. 1) 1977,
Crown Lands Act Amendment,
Land Commission Act Amendment (No. 1),
Uniting Church in Australia,
Vertebrate Pests Act Amendment.

LAND COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I have to report that the managers for the two Houses conferred together but that no agreement was reached.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I have to report that the managers for the two Houses conferred together but that no agreement was reached.

PETITION: CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. McRAE presented a petition signed by 5 054 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to introduce, without delay, stringent laws with appropriate penalties which would protect children from abuse by pornographers, and take action to prohibit the sale of all pornographic films, books and other material which include children.

Petition received.

PETITION: MIGRANT SERVICES

Mr. ABBOTT presented a petition signed by 78 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to provide an adequate grant for the financial year 1977-78 to avoid the decline in the services provided by the migrant information centres.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

MOTOR REGISTRATION

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (April 12).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Negotiations are proceeding to obtain accommodation for a branch of the Motor Registration Division in premises being erected on the corner of Benbowie Street and Main North-East Road, St. Agnes.

REGIONAL BOUNDARIES REPORT

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (April 5).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have received information that the report of the Committee on Uniform Regional Boundaries for Government departments will be published soon. Maps indicating the boundaries are included in the report. A public announcement will be made shortly.

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION FILMS

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (April 27).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Each film is budgeted at \$7 500. Costs vary; for example, the films on water resources and health cost \$6 204 each, and the one on the S.G.I.C. cost \$7 209.50. *Be In It* cost \$7 224.50. These production costs take the film from the briefing stage to the presentation stage and include scripting, production costs, raw film and processing costs, and commission to the South Australian Film Corporation.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE
COMMISSION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether, especially if the State Government Insurance Commission is given the privilege of having the premiums of those of its customers who are public servants deducted from their pay, the Government will review the list of societies and companies presently having this privilege with a view to allowing any life assurance society or company which requests it to have that privilege? My question follows, of course, the successful passage of the Bill to allow the S.G.I.C. to go into life assurance. The Premier will know, as I think many members in the House know, that there has been a running sore of discontent amongst a number of the life assurance companies and societies because at the present time, and for many years past (I certainly do not seek to lay the responsibility solely on this Government), only 14 societies or companies have had the privilege of their clients who are members of the Public Service having their premiums deducted from their fortnightly pay, or whatever the period is. A number of us have tried over the years to get this list extended. I can remember even when I was in office trying to do this, but I failed because of the absolute intransigence of the Treasury officers. I was not able to make even an issue of it with them.

I will bet my bottom dollar that, now that the S.G.I.C. is going into life assurance, it will seek and probably be given that privilege. I have received a letter from the manager of a life assurance company, and I desire briefly to quote some parts of it. I discussed the matter with him before and advised him how to take up with the Government a request that his company be put on the list, although that request failed last year. The letter states:

As you have mentioned, 14 companies are currently "on the list", and the criteria for adding to the list are— and this is a quote from a letter from the Chief Secretary— it is considered that these companies provide a reasonable degree of choice and provide an adequate range of cover for Government employees. The list may be extended if a Company is able to establish that it can offer benefits not available from those already listed. It may be possible to accept more companies at some future date when computerisation of salaries is operative on a larger scale.

The gentleman concerned goes on to say:

In my view, the Government should not now allow the S.G.I.C. life office the facility denied so many offices over recent years. Alternatively, of course, the Government should elect to allow all life offices access along with the S.G.I.C. life office.

I ask that the list be reviewed, desirably to allow any company or society (and I think it is common ground that there are about 45 in South Australia) that desires to do so to go on the list, along with the S.G.I.C.; or otherwise, so that competition between the S.G.I.C. and other societies and companies can be kept as fair as possible, the S.G.I.C. not be given the privilege denied to so many other companies.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has been no proposal that S.G.I.C. should be added to the list of companies. If there were any proposal to add any further names to that list, unless we could make the list completely unlimited (and on present advice that is not possible without a great deal of expense and trouble to the Public Service—

Mr. Millhouse: I have never understood why that should be so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The advice to me is that that is the case. Unless the list were to be unlimited (and that could be done reasonably), then nobody else could be added to the list unless there were a complete reassessment of the demand in the Public Service. If there were any reassessment of the limited list, that reassessment would be on the basis of the demand by public servants for the service.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: PLANNING STUDY

The SPEAKER: I have received the following letter from the honourable Leader of the Opposition:

I desire to inform you that this day it is my intention to move that this House at its rising adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that the report *Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Study: Key Issues*, prepared by the State Planning Authority and released two days ago, demonstrates massive deficiencies in Government planning adversely affecting the future of metropolitan Adelaide, and should therefore be considered by this House before the current sittings of Parliament end today.

I call on those honourable members who support the motion to rise in their places.

Several members having risen:

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move: That the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock,

for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that the report, *Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Study: Key Issues*, prepared by the State Planning Authority and released two days ago, demonstrates massive deficiencies in Government planning adversely affecting the future of metropolitan Adelaide, and should therefore be considered by this House before the current sittings of Parliament end today. This is indeed a matter of great urgency. It has been quite amusing, and it would be extremely funny if it were not so serious and tragic, to see the Government's manipulations in the planning field over the past three or four weeks. This report, *Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Study: Key Issues*, dated February, 1977, but released only two days ago, is another shot in the rearguard action

the Government is fighting to try to hide that it has no plans at all. The report has a most significant preface appearing above the name of the Director of Planning. Some sentences are worth quoting, as follows:

Some of the issues raised may seem bewildering and perhaps insoluble.

The issues discussed are all of metropolitan-wide significance.

No attempt is made to suggest how the issues should be resolved.

This is a major study of Metropolitan Adelaide . . . leading to a review of the Metropolitan Development Plan. The plan was first issued in 1962.

This report identifies and brings into sharper focus the planning issues facing the people of metropolitan Adelaide if the city is to continue to be a desirable place to live in.

The Metropolitan Development Plan of 1962 itself contained the recommendation that a five-yearly review was a vital component to ensure its continuing validity. This principle was stated again in Vol. 1, No. 3 of *Planning News*, dated June, 1969, which talked of the re-examination of the metropolitan planning area. Among other things, the article states:

The Metropolitan Development Plan is dated 1962, but many of the surveys on which it is based were carried out in the late 1950's. The authority considers that a re-examination should be made of the whole of the metropolitan planning area and has asked the Director of Planning to arrange for the necessary surveys to be carried out. The principal surveys include the updating of present land use, the revision of population and employment estimates and the survey of land requirements for industry. Recent trends in shopping and business have to be studied and open space needs analysis and an assessment made of areas suitable for redevelopment.

Efficient planning and management very much depends on population projections and trends, and this House heard in a no-confidence motion last week, and by way of a report in the *Advertiser* before that time, of the Kent report (dated last February), which I understand is to be distributed generally next week. My officers were able to obtain a copy of it yesterday. The implications of the Kent report population figures have already been ventilated in this House. Now we have this present report on Key Issues relating to the Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Study. The alarming feature of this report, which has given rise to this motion of urgency, is that clear evidence exists that no decisions have been made on a series of questions which are fundamental to planning and which were first posed in 1962.

The report provides a further variation on the list of questions of strategic importance in planning which was set out in the 1962 development plan and which was further restated in the publication "*Adelaide 2000*" (published in 1972). There are 10 key strategic issues, posed in question form, including the need for periodic planning review, the extent of the metropolitan area, development of inner areas and new residential areas, and the question of beginning building at Monarto. The answers to this list of questions, setting out the key strategic areas in planning, should have been found years ago, and should have formed the basis of the Government's entire programme of planning during its years in office. These key areas were areas in which decisions were essential if development of this State and of metropolitan Adelaide was to have been implemented efficiently and without any waste or neglect. However, because the same questions are now posed again in this most recent report, it is apparent that answers have not been found to them, and that the Government has no plan.

On what basis has the Government been operating during its term in office? Obviously, the answer to that question

must be "No basis at all", and the decisions have all been made on an *ad hoc* basis. The preface of this report states:

Some of the issues raised may seem bewildering and perhaps insoluble. They are manifestations of our complex and dynamic society. The challenge for planning in the decades to come is to keep pace with advances in technology, increased social environmental and cultural awareness and changing attitudes and ways of living.

This statement was just as applicable in 1962, and obviously the Director of Planning (Mr. Hart) is still not satisfied that the answers to those fundamental questions have been found. Equally obviously, he has either not been consulted, or not listened to in many of the *ad hoc* decisions that have been made by the Government, or he is incompetent. All I can say is that I have the highest regard for him, and that he is not incompetent. The Premier and his Government initiated Monarto on the basis of the Jordan report with its population trends, and persisted with it in spite of population trends which showed that the need did not really exist. Obviously, it proceeded with Monarto regardless of any opinions expressed by the Director of Planning.

Mr. Hart is a most competent officer, who has the highest credentials and reputation. Obviously, the Premier has not allowed him to carry out his job as State Planner effectively. There is an area of conflict between the Government and the Director, and this is made more apparent by the fact that Mr. Hart is now being sent off to head an inquiry (and being placed in an invidious position in so doing), while the Monarto Development Commission has been brought into planning for every Government department. Why is this happening? Why was the Monarto Development Commission not integrated with the State Planning Authority, as was once suggested? This report, revealing as it does quite clearly that planning queries which were identified originally in 1962 have still not been answered, and that this Government has been proceeding on an *ad hoc* and unplanned basis, is a great credit to Mr. Hart, and indicates a great deal of courage and dedication to his job.

The Government's policy of blind, unreasoning adherence to the development of Monarto has cost the taxpayer dearly. The adverse effects it has had on urban renewal and the provision of services to the metropolitan area have already been ventilated in this House. There has been waste and neglect on a massive scale. It is generally accepted that no Government can plan properly for the development of a State without a continual review of the overall plan. This latest report confirms our worst fears. We are still trying to work on the 1962 development plan, which has not been reviewed. In fact, there is no updated plan, and this Government's much vaunted good management is nothing more than *ad hoc* hockery. It makes *ad hoc* decisions regardless of the effect on the overall picture. Even the former head of the Premier's Department (Mr. Bakewell) said:

To reach any given objective, some means are more effective than others, and one could well ask what would be more clearly needed than a unit to examine and co-ordinate long-term planning by careful and systematic analysis of alternative means of achieving objectives?

Such a unit has been set up in the Premier's Department for the long-term political planning to meet the long-term political needs of the Premier's Party machine, but there has been no such unit encouraged by the Premier to look into the long-term planning of South Australia's needs. It is absolutely essential that a Government link financial planning with an overall plan. This has not happened.

It is easy to understand why the Budget explanations for the past two or three years have been relatively sparse and quite inadequate. No wonder the Government has been anxious to have consideration of the Budget by this Parliament through this House as quickly as possible. Members will recall that two years ago the Government used the guillotine to force the consideration of the Budget through the House, and that last year it was forced through the House during the course of two isolated marathon sittings until after 4 a.m. The Government accused the Opposition of time wasting but, in fact, it was the Government that wasted time, because it did not have satisfactory answers to questions which were being asked by the Opposition.

There is no doubt in my mind that in future there must be a major review of the overall plan for the State every five years, and that a current summary of planning alternatives based on current trends should always be available with the Budget papers as a guide to the efficient financial management of the State, that is, to show the basis on which the Budget has been framed. This is what the Liberal Party will do in Government. No such basis for planning of the Budget (and indeed very little satisfactory explanation) has been provided by the Government for the items in the Budget. Gaps in planning are becoming more and more obvious.

The Government cannot avoid doing this forever, and I give clear notice now that the next Budget will be examined minutely. It will be interesting to see whether there will be any disclosed planning basis for many of the Budget proposals, because I believe that the Government will not be able to provide these. The overall planning of this State has been neglected in a scandalous and monstrous way, and the most recent Key Issues report of the Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Study confirms this.

Let us take one major example—transport. Everyone in the State is concerned that no major advances have been made in public transport during the entire time of the Labor Party's term in office. We heard the Minister say recently that there had been tremendous advances; the Government stopped freeways from being built. What is positive about that: obviously, nothing at all.

We have heard of committees of inquiry and further committees to inquire into those committees: we have heard of the NEAPTR study, but in fact we have seen nothing positive come from all this planning activity. It is not to be wondered at. How can transport planners, no matter how competent or gifted they may be, effectively plan and make decisions on metropolitan transport needs if decisions have not been made on the overall planning needs of the metropolitan area? It is not the fault of public servants; it is the fault of a Government, which has systematically ducked decision-making and forward planning.

The quality of life in South Australia will continue to fall as long as planning continues to be neglected in the metropolitan area. We have already seen gross waste of public funds and neglect of people in the *ad hoc* decisions that have been made so far. The decisions that have been made have taken account of an overall plan which was originally designed in 1962 and which has not been significantly reviewed since then. The Director of Planning said in a speech to the Royal Institute of Public Administration in 1975:

Three main tools are needed to implement a development plan. First, all development originating from public funds must be co-ordinated so that it proceeds in accordance with

the plan. Secondly, if a plan is to reach fruition, development of a particular kind will need to be promoted, otherwise it will not take place. Thirdly, private development must be regulated so that it proceeds within the broad framework of the plan.

All of these things are very true, but they require a fundamental requirement, that is, an overall plan that is up to date. These comments take on a deeper significance in the light of the report that has just been released, which I regard as a final call for help from the Director of Planning. He can see the mess which our lack of leadership in effective planning and decision-making has created. The Government has a clear duty to plan and administer this State for the benefit of its people. At present it is guilty of ad hockery on a colossal scale, and obviously the present waste and neglect will continue as long as this Government remains in office.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The honourable member continues to dispense more heat than light. We have heard once again from him a heated diatribe on the subject of waste, neglect, and ad hockery on the part of the Government and, as usual, not one single instance of what he accuses the Government of was cited in the whole of his speech. Where has the Government failed to have co-ordinated its expenditure in the provision of public services?

Mr. Tonkin: Monarto.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We co-ordinated our expenditure very well in relation to Monarto. At the moment, unfortunately we are unable to co-ordinate the non-existent Federal funds. There was no lack of co-ordination about Monarto and, if the Leader is going to dilate on this report, he had better read it. I refer him to the conclusions, at page 9 of the report, and that does not ask whether Monarto should be built. It states:

When should major building work begin at Monarto? That question, of course, can be decided only when we have a clearer view of the availability of finance. If we had more available finance for Monarto, the answer would be "Tomorrow".

Then the Leader went on to say that the Government had not made any planning decisions, and castigated us for making the very good planning decision of rejecting the Metropolitan Adelaide Transport Study report. Then he says that we have not done any planning work in relation to the development of facilities in the developing metropolitan area. I point out to the Leader that, when the Labor Government took office in 1965, we found that there had been no planning at all by the Liberal Government, not only for planning itself (because it had no planning legislation on the books), but no planning facilities, either. The facilities of hospital services in outer metropolitan areas at Modbury and Flinders were the planning work of this Government—very *ad hoc* they were! They were on the basis of the then examined demand for hospital services. It was a real demand and the demand has been met. Let us turn to the key strategic issues. The Leader talks of massive deficiencies in planning. The report states:

Should the planning period for the review of the Metropolitan Development Plan be limited to the period of time likely to be taken to develop the land presently shown for urban use, with frequent reviews and long-term advisory forecasts?

If the Leader concludes from that that the State Planning Authority is suggesting that what we do for the future is a continuance of the land use plan, I can only say that the Government has clearly, as the State Planning Authority knows, taken a decision that that should not be the basis

of planning. If that is the kind of thing to which the Leader is attached, he is living back in the 1920's.

He says that no unit has been set up to review policy. Apparently he has not heard of the Urban Planning Department. Mr. Mant's unit, under the Minister, was specifically set up for the purpose of reviewing the forward planning in South Australia, the overall strategies of planning. This very efficient unit is doing its job well. Then the question is asked:

Should attempts be made to confine the urban area of Adelaide permanently to the land now shown for urban use on the Metropolitan Development Plan?

The Leader apparently thinks that this report suggests that no decision on that matter has been taken by the Government. If that is the Leader's impression, obviously he has not bothered to follow what has been happening in planning in South Australia. As the Minister said in releasing this report, it is only to raise questions in the public mind as to issues to which their attention should be directed. That issue has already been decided by the Government. The Director of Planning has been told time and time again by me, amongst other people, that the policy of the Government is that the urban area should be confined to the metropolitan planning area. The report states:

Can the metropolitan area be made more compact by making better use of non-residential land, reducing land requirements for non-residential development and building residential areas at higher densities?

The Government has undertaken a series of studies about getting higher density or medium density development in Adelaide, about the comparative costs involved, and about where the areas should be, and it has consulted residents groups as to the areas in which this could be developed. Is that no planning decision at all? The report states:

Land to the north of Adelaide is relatively more expensive to develop than land to the south. Land to the north is better for industry and land to the south better for housing.

I think that is a fairly broad statement; I think many other conditions are involved. However, if the Leader suggests that no decisions have been made on that score by the Government, he is as ignorant on this aspect of planning as he demonstrated himself to be on the last occasion when he spoke in this House on the matter and gave one instance of redevelopment, the Hackney area, obviously not knowing that building is taking place there at the moment. Actually, co-ordinated decisions by the Government in relation to the necessary expenditure for projected developments in the north and in the south have been taken, and the State Planning Authority is aware of them and the Director of Planning has been involved in the decision-making. The report states:

The concept of metropolitan districts upon which the Metropolitan Development Plan is based needs to be recognised in future planning and more effective means devised of establishing their separate identity.

That is perfectly correct. The Government agrees with that statement and that is part of what our planning programme is directed to. The provision of urban nodes in the development of separately identifiable community areas is part of the strategy of development of the metropolitan area adopted by this Government. Apparently, the Leader is not aware of all the planning cases we have been through in order to keep the definition between the southern areas and metropolitan Adelaide. I do not know whether he has read the law reports at all about what we have been trying to do, or considered the moneys expended by the Government in that area. The report states:

A sharper definition needs to be achieved at the boundary between urban and rural land with particular reference to land use and land taxation policies.

We entirely agree with that. Legislation will be introduced in relation to land use and land taxation policies to ensure that we keep the rural character of the hinterland of Adelaide. We have already introduced many planning measures. Apparently the honourable member is not aware of them, but the restrictions on minimum land subdivision area were planning decisions taken specifically in relation to that matter. The report states:

The development of new residential areas and the redevelopment of inner areas should take place in an orderly manner to ensure that the necessary public utilities and community facilities are available as housing proceeds.

It was under this Government that a whole series of provisions were introduced in order to ensure better development in those areas, provisions which did not exist under Liberal Governments in South Australia. The only protest we have had so far from the Liberal Party on that score is that the resulting planning controls mean that more time and cost are involved in development by developers. But no alternative proposition has ever been put forward by them. The report continues:

Better use should be made of financial policies to further planning aims rather than conflict with them.

I am not aware of any conflict. I do not know to what that refers. The honourable member proceeded to deliver himself of some remarks about the Budget in South Australia, saying that there was not forward Budget planning in this State. There is very extensive forward Budget planning in South Australia. I am very proud of the Treasury officers of this State—they are the best in Australia. I say that without qualification. They are the envy of every other State. The forward Budget planning processes that they have introduced (I did not initiate them: they advised them to me, and I thoroughly agreed with them) have been of enormous benefit to this State in the forward planning of our Budget situation.

It is remarkable when I go to Premiers' conferences that considerable envy at the state of the South Australian Budget is expressed by colleagues of members opposite from other States, and a few dark remarks about the extent of the effects of our Budget control and the resultant moneys in our Treasury are addressed to us by the Prime Minister as well. We do have effective forward budgeting control. We have long-term as well as short-term plans in relation to construction expenditure. The forward planning in relation to public works and the provision of services in South Australia is an extensive system of planning and it is not in any way unco-ordinated with the material that we receive from the State Planning Authority as to the forward demand of planning areas. Again, the Leader delivered himself of a diatribe. He did not point to a single instance in which we had failed in this area—not one. The report continues:

Should the anticipated changes in the cost and availability of various forms of energy be recognised as a factor influencing Adelaide's future development?

If we can get good information as to forward planning of our energy, yes, it should be. The Government of South Australia established the State energy committee for the purpose of looking at our energy requirements effectively, developing them with the authorities involved in energy supply in South Australia, and ensuring that our forward decisions would be based on the best evidence. We have provided that information and, of course, it is an ingredient in our planning.

What the Leader seems to have overlooked is that the whole of this report is aimed at stimulating public discussion in these areas. It is not to say Governments have not been involved in planning in these areas or have taken no

decision in these areas at all. The State Planning Authority does not say that, and if it did say that it would be quite false. The proposal is to stimulate public discussion about the issues. That is a vital part of planning. Unless we get effective public involvement and thought directed to issues in planning in South Australia we cannot get the necessary plans made, because the planning must involve a public consensus. The Leader criticises NEAPTR because he has not heard anything about it, but the people in the areas concerned have heard about it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The member for Torrens knows all about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Torrens has not entered this debate so far, but he is undoubtedly well aware of what is happening in his district, as I am in mine and the member for Tea Tree Gully is in her area. There has never been a planning study in Australia that has more involved the people affected than that one. The last we heard from the Liberal Party on this score was that we should get on with the job and make executive planning decisions ourselves and invite public comment on them. That, of course, is the worst possible way to proceed with planning.

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

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I find it rather difficult to understand the Premier's relative complacency on this question. He has made several relatively minor points in the past 15 minutes, so perhaps I will rebut one or two of them before proceeding with my main argument. The Premier referred to several amendments made to the Planning and Development Act. The Liberal Party regards the majority of those amendments as rather a "band aid" approach when what was really needed over the past 15 years was a major operation. The Premier's reply did not indicate that major plans had been made by the Labor Party. The implication that the work Mr. Hart was doing was simply to stimulate public discussion bears close scrutiny when one examines the situation. We believe that all of the questions that were raised today by the Premier might have been construed as an assassination attempt on Mr. Hart, because, whilst accepting the report (which we received only today, although it is dated February, 1977), the Premier took apart the 10 questions raised by Mr. Hart and answered several of them by saying that the questions were well on the way to being answered effectively. This was said despite the rather fearful approach by Mr. Hart when he said some of the issues raised might seem bewildering and perhaps insoluble. That is what he said in the preface to the report that the Premier has tried to answer so glibly. In the fourth paragraph of the preface of that report Mr. Hart states the issues discussed are all of metropolitan-wide significance. Mr. Hart says that no attempt is made to suggest how the issues should be resolved.

We believe that the Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Study, which is dated February, 1977, and for which we had to ask today, was being hidden from the Opposition in the hope that it would do nothing about it before Parliament rose and that it is really an indictment of the Government's policy. Mr. Hart, by asking 10 questions and not presenting any solutions, is obviously saying that the Government has no plans. Without plans, how can we budget effectively? How can we budget without building in each year a considerable amount of waste because

of the "band aid" approach to the overall planning situation in metropolitan Adelaide? That will just not wash, nor will it wash to lay the blame entirely at Mr. Hart's door.

Mr. Hart is the State Planner and is held in high regard in other States and also by South Australian Ministers, who have said as much in State planning publications. So, there is no question at all that Mr. Hart has been highly praised by members of both sides. "What then is the issue? What are the alternative policies that the Liberal Party has to offer?" asked the Premier. The Liberal Party would have ensured that, over the past 15 years, the State Planning Office was given central control and that the answers would have been forthcoming by this time instead of the State Planning Authority having been bound or gagged in some way so that all he could do after 15 years was present a series of questions, which the Premier reiterated. The Premier even went so far as to say that Mr. Hart had ignored some of the Premier's own instructions, whereas a few minutes later the Premier said that autocratic instructions from the top were not the way to plan a State.

I am not sure which way the Premier is having us think. We should have a co-ordinated approach to planning instead of the fragmented approach we have now, with the Monarto commission going one way and Dr. Scrafton trying to plan the State transport system going another way. Also, the Land Commission has been a sort of *de facto* State Planning Authority in the way that it has been working. If I were Mr. Hart I would have been rather peeved to see so much going on in different directions and ostensibly seeming to be out of my control when I was the acknowledged authority, the expert in the State and being ignored. He has my sympathy.

What has gone wrong with the planning process? Two questions should be asked. Obviously, something has gone wrong. It was 1962 when the Metropolitan Development Plan was first put under way, and that was based on 1950's information. It was 1967 before that plan came to fruition and was presented. It was 1972 when the report *Adelaide 2000 Towards a Strategy* was presented, or 10 years after the original commissioning of the report, and we have this document dated 1977—a period of 15 years during which we have achieved a series of questions that has been asked time and time again, and we still have not got the State Planner with sufficient confidence to answer the questions, because answering questions requires Government decisions. He cannot do it unilaterally, and that is really where the problem lies. If the Government is not prepared to be decisive, when will it be decisive? When will we get the answers—in the 1980's, the 1990's or when? It is important. On page 93 of the report (and that is one of the more informative pages) we have the useful information which states:

Public utility planning periods. The Engineering and Water Supply needs a 30 to 35-year planning period, with a comment that the department indicates that high priority should be allocated. Telecom Australia needs a 20 to 50-year planning period, depending on what planning facilities it is putting in. Australia Post needs 10 to 20 years. The South Australian Gas Company needs 30 years. We have already lost 15 valuable years of planning time. How long does it have to go on before we get not out of gear (it has taken the Government two years to get out of gear over the Monarto issue) but into forward gear once again and start looking at the Adelaide metropolitan area, which has been neglected? We have neglected about 800 000 people while providing for a potential 180 000 to 250 000 people in Monarto. That neglect has meant that the people of Adelaide will have to suffer over the next

10 to 20 years as a result. The decision should have been made in 1972 to guide the efficient financial management of the State (and more about that later, if I have the time). Given the demonstrably long period of the Dunstan Government's taking time to develop plans for Monarto, Noarlunga, Port Adelaide, and NEAPTR, how much longer will it be before it gets into gear and comes up not with questions but with answers?

Regarding some of the issues raised by the Premier in rebuttal of the Leader's address, we have one of those questions rebutted by a visiting professor (Professor Matthew Laughton) quoted in the *Financial Review* of April 28, as follows:

The Jordan report made some assessment that Adelaide should be limited to a 1 000 000 population.

The report also predicted that two cities, not one, would be needed to provide South Australia's future accommodation—two cities accommodating about 500 000 people. How far out it was in relation to the Borrie report! The Premier ignored the Borrie report and statistics provided by his own department (the Kent report had statistics available a year ago). This report, too, came up. The report is dated December, 1976, but here again we had to go cap in hand to a Government department to wheedle and cajole the information out of the Premier's Department or Mr. Kent's department in order that we might do something with it today, but it is far too full of statistics and projections for us to do anything at all. They are two reports, and we have not been able to use them during the current session of Parliament. Regarding the 1 000 000 that Jordan said should be the limit for Adelaide's growth, we have Professor Laughton, who is Commissioner for Planning in Toronto and Professor of Town Planning at the University of Toronto, saying that theories about the optimum size of a city were a wonderful academic exercise. He stated:

The size of the city was determined by its attractions for people and trade, not by theoretical exercises. To seek to control the size of a city was to say to people, "You can't live where you want to."

He then explained how he would have tackled the problem. The Jordan report is the report that the Government has taken very much to heart in deciding quite arbitrarily that 1 000 000 is the optimum size for Adelaide's population. How can one group, the Jordan committee for example, decide that 1 000 000 is too much or too little? It is a very difficult situation and it is almost laughable when we consider that South Australia's entire population is 7 per cent or 8 per cent of the population individually of, say, London or Tokyo. While we do not want that size of problem, and we have said that in the past 18 months or so, it is still a minimal problem. A million people should be very capably handled, when we consider cities around the world that are not having problems because they are planning well ahead and are not waiting for 15 years before raising a set of questions.

We believe that firm commitments were made to Parliament in 1967, when the Metropolitan Development Plan was accepted. That plan stated that it would be revised on a five-year basis, and that was stated by the Director of Planning. Was there agreement in Parliament? Of course there was. The Premier, speaking to the issue on February 3, 1966, was reported in *Hansard* at page 3788 as follows:

An amendment to the Town Planning Act followed in 1963. The amendment Act of 1963 enables the committee to recommend to the Minister amendments to the report, thus ensuring that long-range planning of the metropolitan area is kept under constant review.

All we have is a series of questions in 1977: so much for that. We have the Premier's own statement. We know what the Director's answer on this issue was, because he told us in 1969, in planning inquiries No. 3 of June, 1969, which I shall not read because it reinforces the intention to revise and replan, but that has not been done. He did not say that he would revise and ask questions again. This 1969 report was supported by the Liberal Government of that time, and it was clear that the then Liberal Government had every intention of re-examining the metropolitan planning area on a regular basis, and would accept the work of the Town Planner at that time, accepting at least that Parliamentary reviews every five years were a good thing. This is wise, because Parliamentary reviews are tied in to the five-year census period, when we can effectively revise, if we link it to that five-year census period. However, this has not been done, although it would have been a perfectly logical base.

The Jordan report was accepted as a yardstick, but that has been proved incorrect by the Borrie report and by statistics from the Premier's Department, although the Premier ignored them a year ago in rebutting similar debates on this issue when we referred to the Monarto issue. They have now been accepted as valid for this State, and they are more valid when one considers the South Australian abortion rate, which is higher than the rate in any other State of Australia, and also the diminution of fertility and immigration rates throughout Australia. We should have seen those signs several years ago, as did the Borrie committee, which reported on the matter. The Premier's Department, in statistical evidence in its own report that was released in December, had that confirmatory information which was strongly implanted in it, but it was ignored by the Government.

The Jordan committee stated that in this climate of opinion Monarto was going ahead. In what climate of opinion? The Jordan committee climate of opinion? Was the Director of Planning asked about it? I doubt it. I would have been peeved if I had been the Director of Planning that I had been involved in so little and that there were so many tangential projects going on when I was supposed to be the theoretical if not the practical head of the whole show in this State. One buys a dog but one does the barking or one can set up other kennels, but it does not make sense to me.

Perhaps we will find the answers in the 1980's or 1990's, but we do not have an up-to-date Metropolitan Development Plan at present and this is obvious from this silver-coated jubilee type of report, because it is not quite 25 years since the plan got under way. We do not have a plan for orderly development of the metropolitan area to guard against the deterioration of the quality of life in inner areas. World experts over the past 40 years have pointed out that inner urban decay is part and parcel of a developing city. I have said this several times in this House on Monarto issues, and the books are in the Parliamentary Library, even though these two copies are not. Inner urban decay is part and parcel of the development of any city. If it is ignored, and if we do not look at the inner urban areas, and stop the decay which is, after all—

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

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): This has been a most illuminating debate, not about the contribution that the Liberal Party might make to planning in this State but rather about the rules by which

members opposite think political debates should be governed: heads we win, tails you lose. I have no doubt that, if there were no attempt on the part of this Government and its Planning Authority to obtain consensus with the public about planning, if there were no attempts to try to find out what people want in the planning area, we would be under severe criticism indeed from honourable gentlemen opposite. We would be accused of being secretive, autocratic, and all the rest of that sort of thing.

However, when attempts are made to obtain consensus and to find out what people want, then we are accused of being bankrupt of ideas, of running to the public so that they can tell us what they want rather than getting on with the job ourselves. The Opposition cannot have it both ways, particularly when it is abundantly clear that members opposite have very little idea of what they want regarding the planning area. The Opposition benches are not filled with fools. I am not suggesting for one moment that there is any lack of intelligence on the Opposition benches. I am suggesting, however, that the Opposition is hamstrung by its general ideological approach to the way in which Governments should operate, and that has been traditionally that Governments should do as little as possible in these areas; if they should do anything in the planning area, it should be purely in terms of regulatory provisions. I tried very conscientiously to put down on paper the constructive proposals put forward by members opposite.

Mr. Max Brown: And you've got a blank sheet of paper.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: My honourable friend is being a little unfair. I have three. Let us look at this trinity. One, from the Leader of the Opposition, was pure padding, and had something to do with the way in which Treasury documents were presented to this House. It was a means whereby 15 minutes could be fairly comfortably filled in, and I shall say no more about that. The second point was from the member for Mount Gambier, who set out to address himself to the Premier's criticism of what the Liberal Party really had in mind, and gave up fairly quickly. However, I believe I have got him down fairly accurately, because he said that the Liberal Party in Government would give the State Planning Authority or the State Planner (or both) central control so that proper planning could take place.

What on earth does that mean? Immediately there flashed into my mind the sort of reaction that would occur on the Opposition benches if the Minister of Local Government were to bring in amendments to the Local Government Act, or if the Minister for Planning brought in amendments to the Planning and Development Act, which had the effect of taking away from local government the responsibility in relation to planning which it now has.

Mr. Coumbe: I do not think he was suggesting that.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not know what he was suggesting, and I do not want to be uncharitable, but I wonder whether he understood what he was suggesting. There is no doubt that involving local government in the planning process lengthens that process; it makes the co-ordination of the planning process so much more difficult. No-one seriously suggests that local government should be removed from the field of planning. What does "central control" mean for the State Planning Authority? What does it mean in its relationship to the South Australian Housing Trust, the Lands Commission, or some of the other planning tools?

First, we have a suggestion which is mere padding and has nothing to do with the debate; and secondly, we have a suggestion which has not been spelt out and which, on the face of it, means nothing whatever. Thirdly—and this

seems to be the only substantial suggestion that has come forward from honourable gentlemen opposite—is the suggestion from the Leader of the Opposition that the planning document should be upgraded every five years. That sounds very nice, but on what basis? Are we simply talking in terms of control of land use? If so, in effect, that is what happens in the present planning process and this Government has been well aware for a long time that, on its own, it is completely inadequate.

The honourable gentlemen opposite do not have to take that from me, from the Government, or from the Premier: they need only listen to what Mr. Hugh Stretton said in *Ideas for Australian Cities*. I quote from pages 162 and 163 of the revised edition, when he spoke about what happened during the period when such planning as we had was committed to Liberal Governments in this State. After talking about the incredible delays that occurred before the 1962 report was brought down, Mr. Stretton goes on to say:

When it received this plan, the Government was quicker than usual in deciding to do nothing rash. It published the report and plan next day, and next year amended the Act to allow a further year for objectors to object. It considered the plan's traffic proposals for three years, then ordered another survey of metropolitan transport needs, which took three further years to carry out. Significantly, this study was confided to a committee of which the Highways Commissioner, not the Town Planner, was chairman.

Yet the member for Mount Gambier laments about what he alleges this Government has done in relation to State planning. Mr. Stretton continues:

But even when a later Government did its best to enact the metropolitan plan, that plan still served chiefly to show how hopeless it was (and is) to try to shape a city's growth by regulation alone.

That is the point. It is all right to talk about updating plans on a five-yearly basis, but what are we talking about? What form of planning are we talking about? Are we talking about purely regulatory planning or about Governments entering the field and putting some positive content into what is going on? Do we leave the development to the developers and occasionally rap their knuckles when they seem to be going way off tangent, or does the Government become involved in this matter?

Let me remind the House of some of the means whereby this Government has acted positively and has been concerned not solely to regulate in this field. First, I remind members that no attempt was made by the various Governments under the control of members opposite to do anything about acquisition of open space in the metropolitan area. This Government put the surcharge on metropolitan land tax to allow acquisition of the major district open spaces which had been set down in the 1962 town plan to proceed, and an enormous sum of money has been spent. We are now at the stage where some of these areas which have been acquired are beginning to be developed for open space and recreation purposes.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They say that is ad hockery, although it was in the plan.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Of course it was in the plan. It was an outgrowth of the plan itself. Why was the Hon. Mr. Hill, when he was in charge of planning, not prepared to proceed in that direction? This Government was prepared to take the decision, a decision which is never popular, to put some additional charge on the community, one which has been readily accepted by the community because people can see some benefits for the money which goes into the Government's coffers. The money is ploughed back directly through the fund into the acquisition of open space and the development of these areas.

Open space is a very powerful tool in relation to overall planning, and the Premier spoke of some of the litigation in which the Government had been involved in relation to planning matters. We well know that regulation alone often is not sufficient to prevent development where it is not wanted. The only way out is for land to come into actual Government ownership. I would suggest that this has been one of the ways in which the Government has been prepared not merely to regulate but to enter positively into the planning and development field. The Land Commission is a powerful planning tool indeed, and yet the activities of members opposite in this place and in the other place have always been directed towards limiting wherever possible the activities of the Land Commission.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They did it last night.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: They certainly did. It is extraordinary that the two members who have spoken from the other side can come here, knowing full well what happened less than 24 hours ago, and criticise this Government for lack of foresight in planning. The Land Commission and its activities have already been a powerful planning tool for this Government in the development of metropolitan Adelaide, and we have not seen anywhere near the full potential of the Land Commission in the planning area itself. Members should consider money which will be available eventually for the development of public facilities in many of these areas as the result of the activities of the Land Commission. They should consider the effect on the whole planning process of being able to put lower income earners into certain areas that would otherwise not have been possible, as a result of the cheaper land which is available through the Land Commission.

Planning is not simply a matter of pretty maps, or of where railways and roads go; it is matter of where people go, and of where the various income levels of our society live in relation to one another. Members should work out, in relation to metropolitan Melbourne, the odds of a child living in the western suburbs being able to attend university compared with those of a child from the eastern suburbs of Melbourne. Tell me whether that is good planning when that sort of almost apartheid can exist in a democratic country.

Some criticism was made of transport development. That seems hollow to me, as not so long ago a railway line was built through my district as a result of the initiative of this Government. I am well aware of the steps that have been taken by the Minister of Transport to keep his options open so that we will be able to extend that railway line farther to the south as metropolitan development occurs in the Willunga council area and the more southerly parts of the Noarlunga area.

Are members opposite aware that the Scrafton report was made available to the public not long ago? That report made clear what would be the major urban transport initiatives of this Government up to the year 2000. I am also well aware of the studies of the South Australian Housing Trust in what is actually the Noarlunga urban area. I will not refer to NEAPTR because that concerns the other side of the city from my area, and I think I can better direct my remarks to the areas with which I am more closely associated. The South Australian Housing Trust has done more in the past few years than simply plan to subdivide new areas at Christie Downs and farther south. It has been involved in a close plan of the way in which shopping facilities, public facilities of various kinds, transport facilities and housing should relate to each other, and I am not simply talking about

the Noarlunga regional centre: I am talking about the whole of the disposition of that population in relationship to the Noarlunga regional centre.

It is not just a plan: it is something that is actually happening. Subdivision is occurring in relation to that plan. I know there was delay, and I know that the city of Noarlunga was not prepared initially to approve the plan that went in, but that is all part of the planning process. If members disapprove of that and believe that local government should not be involved in these matters, let them say so. We have always believed there ought to be an opportunity for local government to take place. A series of significant positive initiatives in this field has been taken by this Government. I wonder whether members opposite are really just too naive in this area, whether they really believe there are any final solutions to this matter.

I would remind members that any planning programme has to be flexible indeed. If they would like to go to Canberra and talk to the National Capital Development Commission, they would be told that. They would be told there was no final solution, and that demographic, political and fiscal patterns change.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung, the motion was withdrawn.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WILKINS SERVIS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yesterday, during Question Time, the Premier falsely accused me of a gross and irresponsible attack on Wilkins Servis. The Premier was commenting on a report in the *News* on April 26, 1977. The Premier's attack was grossly (and I believe deliberately) inaccurate on three fundamental points. The Premier said:

The Wilkins Servis organisation was subjected to utterly irresponsible suggestions that it had been given assistance from the Industries Assistance Corporation and had been placed in receivership.

First, the report does not state or imply that Wilkins Servis received assistance from the Industries Assistance Corporation. The Premier should rely less on his own fantasies. Secondly, at no time did I indicate that Wilkins Servis was in receivership. The report does have an editorial comment, clearly indicated by brackets, that the company was in receivership. That incorrect statement was obviously not attributed to me, and so the Premier was playing cheap and dirty politics in attempting to so attribute it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should know by now that he must make a personal explanation; he may not comment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. Thirdly, the Premier quoted me yesterday as saying, "Well, there should not be any form of involvement by the Government of South Australia in the development of companies in South Australia; rather, we should reduce land tax and workmen's compensation and pay-roll tax, and that is the only assistance that should be given."

Although the Premier gave it as an exact quotation, I have never made that or a similar statement and the *News* has never printed any such statement. I have not and do not object to Government assistance being given to industry, either in the form of loans, guarantees, or Government-leased factories. However, I believe it better to look at the

long-term viability of companies, rather than desperately apply short-term rescue measures. A union official was very critical of Government assistance to the company through the Housing Trust. I wonder why the Premier did not attack him?

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for the last time. He must make his personal explanation within the confines of Standing Orders. If he continues to comment, I shall have to take action, and he is well aware of that because he has been warned on more than one occasion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have outlined three areas where I believe the statement made by the Premier in the House yesterday was quite inaccurate. I believe that, if anyone reads *Hansard* and the newspaper report in the *News* of April 26, he will find that the statement I have made today is absolutely correct.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

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

That the Standing and Sessional Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day, Other Business, to be taken into consideration forthwith and to enable in each instance where proceedings have reached such a stage the question to be put forthwith without further debate.

In moving this motion I ask that any Orders of the Day, Other Business, which members have on the Notice Paper and which have not reached the stage at which a vote can sensibly be taken should be made Orders of the Day for Tuesday, May 31, or read and discharged. It has been mutually arranged that the only exception is to be Order of the Day, Other Business, No. 21, the Impounding Act Amendment Bill, which involves consideration of Legislative Council amendments.

Motion carried.

IMPOUNDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1—After clause 1 insert new clause 1a as follows:

1a. *Amendment of principal Act, s. 45—Penalty for allowing any bull, stallion, colt or ram to be at large—* Section 45 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the passage "entire horse" twice occurring and inserting in lieu thereof in each case the words "stallion or colt".

No. 2. Page 1, line 11 (clause 2)—After "45a" insert "(1)".

No. 3. Page 1, line 11 (clause 2)—Leave out "entire horse" and insert "stallion or colt".

No. 4. Page 1, line 13 (clause 2)—After "any land" insert "within a prescribed area".

No. 5. Page 1 (clause 2)—After line 19 insert—

(2) The Governor may make such regulations as are necessary or expedient for the purposes of this section.

No. 6. Page 1—After clause 2 insert new clauses 3, 4 and 5 as follows:

3. *Amendment of principal Act—Fourth Schedule—* The fourth schedule to the principal Act is amended by striking out the passage "entire horse" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "stallion or colt".

4. *Amendment of principal Act—Fifth Schedule—* The fifth schedule to the principal Act is amended by striking out the passage "entire horse" wherever it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof in each case the words "stallion or colt".

5. Amendment of principal Act—Sixth Schedule—
The sixth schedule to the principal Act is amended by striking out the passage "entire horse" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "stallion or colt".

Dr. EASTICK (Light) moved:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.
Motion carried.

MEDIBANK STRIKE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Dean Brown:

That this House urge the State Government to supply free legal assistance to any person who has received notice of a fine by or expulsion from a union, or the threat thereof, for working during the Medibank strike on Monday, July 12, 1976.

(Continued from October 13. Page 1329.)

Motion negatived.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Gunn:

That, in the opinion of this House, a referendum should be held in conjunction with the next State election to decide the future of daylight saving in this State.

(Continued from October 6. Page 1330.)

Motion negatived.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE REPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Arnold:

That, in the opinion of this House, the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council should, as soon as practicable after June 30 in each year, present a report to the Minister on the work of the council during the financial year ending on that date, and that the Minister should as soon as practicable after receipt of a report cause a copy of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1036.)

Motion negatived.

DEFENCE PROGRAMME

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Mathwin:

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.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1684.)

Motion negatived.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 1511.)

Second reading negatived.

ABALONE FISHING

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Rodda:

That, in the opinion of this House:

- (a) the South Australian Government should immediately set up an Abalone Advisory Committee, to include representatives of the Abalone Divers Association and the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, with an independent Chairman;

- (b) that abalone divers be permitted to sell their permits with their boats; and
(c) that abalone divers be permitted to employ relief divers.

(Continued from November 10. Page 2067.)

Motion negatived.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RACING COMMISSION

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr. Eastick:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is urgent that legislation to create a "statutory authority for racing" to be known as the South Australian Racing Commission, be introduced without delay, and that the prime objective of such commission shall be to exercise oversight of the different racing interests to the benefit of the racing industry as a whole.

(Continued from November 3. Page 1882.)

Motion negatived.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Arnold:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should introduce a Bill to provide for a Decentralised Industry Incentives (Pay-Roll Tax Rebates) Act as a matter of urgency to assist in alleviating the financial plight of industries in rural areas and to provide incentive for further development of decentralised industries.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1045.)

Motion negatived.

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 September 15. Page 1047.)

Motion carried.

PROROGATION

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, May 31, at 2 p.m.

In moving that motion, Sir, I want on behalf of all members to thank you, the Chairman of Committees, the clerks, typists, and (newly to be mentioned for thanks on these occasions) the microphone operators, the Joint House Committee and its staff including the caretakers, the manageress and her staff, the library staff, telephonists, cleaners, and the people who are in the course of making the necessary alterations for the improvement of Parliament House. After the adjournment I trust that not only will we have an improved air-conditioning service but we will have an electrical installation that works without constant fault. There was a time when electrical installations in this House were like the Leader of the Opposition's view

of planning in this State—without any known plan and in the mind of only one individual. I hope that that situation will be proven to have altered in the House, as it will also be proven to have altered in other areas.

I thank honourable members for the attention and assiduity with which they have addressed themselves to the very large amount of business that has come before the House. I hope they are able to get some little rest, apart from the necessary attention they must give to the present and future of their electorates in which they will be involved during the Parliamentary break. Also, I hope that they will return refreshed and ready for considerably more work when the new session opens.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I echo the sentiments expressed by the Premier in some respects, but not in all. I express the Opposition's thanks to the officers at the table and the officers of the House, and extend our congratulations on the changes that have occurred in that respect. We certainly miss Mr. Hull from his accustomed position at the table. We also thank Mr. Casson and his library staff, particularly his research officers, who have worked so assiduously: they have done a remarkably fine job, and that experiment has proved remarkably successful. Miss Stengert and her staff have performed wonderfully well and have given tremendous service to the people who use and work in Parliament House. The Opposition thanks those people, too. Mr. Ellis, the messengers, Mr. Martin, the caretaker, all the maintenance staff and the cleaners have all been working under continuing difficulties.

We had hoped that when the major alterations of Parliament House had been completed we would be free of the noise of pneumatic drills and jack hammers and of the brick dust that has pervaded this structure for several years. I understand that planning as usual has come to the fore. Apparently it is necessary to correct only one set of deficiencies, and that will be done soon. The Opposition looks forward to that so that we can all settle down to relative comfort. The typists and telephonists have performed a sterling service as usual. A large volume of legislation was supposed to have been put forward during this session. Although we have reached No. 160 in the Bill file, most of those introduced in the latter part of the session seem to have been only one-page Bills. Although those Bills are necessary, the Opposition has been disappointed that it has not seen the heavy volume of legislation that was promised to us when the session was opened. The Opposition is still looking forward with great interest to debating that legislation, particularly measures dealing with preference to unionists and the tort legislation. I join with the Premier in wishing all honourable members a fruitful and energetic time during the recess, and I hope that they will come back, particularly as I am sure the Opposition will do, full of energy and fight for the last session of this Parliament.

The SPEAKER: On behalf of all honourable members and staff I thank the honourable Premier and the honourable Leader of the Opposition for their kind remarks. I can only agree with them that, as one involved closely with them, I appreciate very much how they have helped to facilitate the smooth running of this House. I also thank all honourable members for the co-operation that they have afforded me throughout the session. During the session I have approaches from many members. I cannot

always accede to their requests, but I like to think that I have always been approachable and have done my best to satisfy their requests.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I again draw the attention of the House to a matter which, to some degree, has already been aired in this House and which was aired again today by the member for Davenport in his personal explanation. The member for Davenport in Questions on Notice referred to the assistance given by the Industries Development Committee and the Industries Assistance Corporation to varying business interests in this State. Even though the honourable member disclaims to some degree the reports in the press, what we must consider is his intent in asking questions in the first place. I believe he asked questions with a malevolent intent in relation to industry assisted by the I.D.C. and the I.A.C. His intent was the same as the words he used himself this afternoon: "For cheap political purposes." My contention is supported by a report in last Saturday's press (even though the report contained many inaccuracies), as follows:

In the area of industrial development Mr. Brown scored a few points when he questioned the Premier on the closure of Ceramic Tilemakers . . . The Government was under some pressure because of the member for Davenport's questions.

My point is that the honourable member, in asking those questions in the first place, embarrassed and acted to the detriment of the businesses to which he referred. His motives were purely Party-political and disregarded any embarrassment caused to the companies concerned. It is inevitable at times that the I.A.C. and I.D.C., when assisting enterprises in this State, should see some failures occur. This happens in the normal course of business, and failures are not always related to the companies concerned. Often the failures are related to situations that are beyond the control of the company and the I.D.C. or the I.A.C. because of the economic climate which prevails now and which, to a great degree, can be laid at the feet of the present Commonwealth Government.

The economic climate that exists in business in South Australia has not only placed businesses supported and assisted by the I.A.C. and the I.D.C. in difficulties but also it has placed many pressures on businesses throughout this State and Australia. When the Industries Development Committee makes a recommendation to the Treasurer to develop or to assist an industry in this State it must follow certain criteria that are laid down in the Industries Development Act. For the information of honourable members, particularly the member for Davenport, I shall quote section 14 of the Act, which relates to guarantees given by the Treasurer. It is as follows:

- (2) No such guarantee shall be given unless—
 - (a) the committee has first inquired into the business or proposed business in connection with which the guarantee is to be given: and
 - (b) the committee has reported to the Treasurer that in its opinion there is a reasonable prospect that the business or proposed business in connection with which the guarantee is to be given will be profitable: and

- (c) the committee has reported to the Treasurer that in its opinion the effect of giving the guarantee will be to increase or maintain employment in the State at the recognised award rates of pay and has recommended that the guarantee be given: and
- (d) the person to whom the loan has been or is to be made has agreed to pay to the Treasurer, as consideration for the guarantee, a commission at an agreed rate, not exceeding two per centum per annum, on the amount of the loan for which the guarantee is given, and to comply with any other conditions imposed by the Treasurer on the recommendation of the committee:

Other criteria are laid down, too, but I have referred to the main criteria with which the committee must comply when making a recommendation to the Treasurer. In addition to recommending to the Treasurer that assistance be given to an industry, the committee normally recommends that the industry could be further assisted by using management consultants. This assists industries in their financial and administrative affairs. The committee also tries to ensure that all the money provided to a company is secured in every possible way. In some instances, unfortunately, this procedure goes awry because of circumstances that cannot be determined at the time although at that time it was believed that every reasonable opportunity and prospect existed for the business to be viable.

As I pointed out in my explanation to a recent question on this matter, from 1973 until now the Industries Development Committee has approved the building or extension of factory premises by the South Australian Housing Trust amounting to about \$14 000 000. In addition, it has recommended to the Treasurer the sum of \$10 000 000 for Government guarantees and financial assistance to industry, and most of these have been successful. I have a list of the applications recommended by the Industries Development Committee, covering Housing Trust applications and applications for assistance in various ways, such as guarantees or financial assistance. The list is a comprehensive list of this State's business interests assisted by the committee. I will not name any of them in the House, as I would be doing much the same thing as the member for Davenport has done by bringing the names to the attention of the House and, subsequently, having them mentioned in press reports.

Colleagues of the honourable member who are also members of the committee believe that it would not be in the interests of their Party to mention the business interests that have applied to the committee for assistance. The committee has always been well regarded, because it does not make any public statements that might embarrass companies applying to it. That embarrassment has been avoided. This procedure has been agreed to by the member for Hanson and the Hon. Mr. Geddes (both Liberal Party members of the committee), and I take this opportunity of complimenting them on their application to their duties on the committee. It ill-behoves the member for Davenport to ask in the House questions that cause embarrassment to business interests in this State. He is presumed to be the Opposition's industrial spokesman, but he is not doing business interests or his own Party a service, nor is he acting in the best interests of the public of this State. Also, he is casting aspersions on the ability of the two public servants who assist the committee, namely, the Treasury representative and the Secretary. It ill-behoves the honourable member or any other member to take advantage, by making the matter public, of a situation in which any business interest runs into difficulty. In doing so, he is causing further embarrassment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): The member for Gilles, along with the Premier, is obviously trying to make politics out of this issue. They have accused me of trying to play politics. I thought that the Premier's shabby attack on me in the House yesterday (which I have already shown to be fundamentally inaccurate in three areas) shows just who is trying to play shabby politics. Why did he not attack the trade union official for criticising the granting of Government financial assistance? I did not criticise the granting of Government assistance in a particular case: it was the trade union official, but the Premier has not mentioned that. I shall get on to a somewhat higher plane of debate than the member for Gilles has done. Last Tuesday, in answer to a Question on Notice, the Minister of Labour and Industry admitted that the Industrial Registrar of the Industrial Court had issued the following instruction to commissioners, as follows:

Internal Distribution of Decisions: As you know, the President has directed that the Minister of Labour and Industry now be served in all matters relating to awards and agreements. In order that the Minister has "up-to-the-minute" knowledge of industrial developments in the general and Public Service arbitration jurisdiction, it is requested that, at the same time as you deliver copies of decisions to members, one hour before they are handed down, that a copy of the decision be placed in an envelope, sealed, addressed to the Secretary for Labour and Industry (S.L.I.) and marked "Confidential" and placed in the D.L.I. pick-up box in the Registry. To this extent I have attached a revised "Internal Distribution List" for your information and retention.

There are two significant features about this instruction. This instruction has obviously been issued at the specific request of the Minister of Labour and Industry. The Minister is apparently attempting to interfere with the independence of the Industrial Court and Commission. Such Ministerial interference is most improper and a breach of the responsibility given to that Minister by this House. This interference is particularly significant as the Minister, on behalf of the Government, would often be a party to a dispute or a case before the commission. He is therefore attempting to place himself in a privileged position compared to any other party before the commission. But, more importantly, the Minister has previously told a lie to this Parliament on this matter. On April 5, 1977, I asked the following Question on Notice:

Is the Minister of Labour and Industry informed of decisions to be handed down in the Industrial Commission before they are actually handed down and, if so, for what reasons?

The Minister's written reply was "No". I emphasise that. I had asked whether the Minister was informed of decisions before they were handed down. The Minister's reply, given only last Tuesday, was that the decisions were placed in a sealed envelope and delivered to his box in the commission awaiting delivery to him only one hour before decisions are handed down.

This answer to my first question, which was approved by Cabinet, is a deliberate misrepresentation by the Minister to this Parliament. Such behaviour by a Minister is a disgrace, and can be corrected only by an apology by the Minister to this Parliament. As it is the last day of this session, there are still two or three other points I should like briefly to touch upon. First, where are the replies to Questions on Notice that have not yet been supplied? Since last Tuesday, when replies to Questions on Notice are normally provided, the Government has had a further two days to provide those answers, but it has not done so. I understood that replies were available last Tuesday. As honourable members know, Cabinet must approve those replies. The Minister for Planning told me last night

that there would be a Cabinet meeting this morning. There has been ample opportunity for those replies to be provided, yet the Government still has not presented those replies to Questions on Notice. Obviously, the Government is deliberately trying to prevent those replies from being given to this House. The Government knows that the information is an embarrassment to it, so it has backed off.

The final point I wished to touch upon concerns the Standing Orders of this House. However, if I debate Standing Orders I would have grave difficulty in not reflecting on the way in which I believe they could be carried out. Therefore, I will not be tempted to debate that subject; I will leave that to the member for Kavel, who would like to deal with that matter at the end of this debate.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I read in today's *Advertiser* that Mr. Ray Edwards, Editor of the *Transcontinental*, believes that the Premier and the member for Stuart are out of touch with the Aboriginal situation in Port Augusta. He assumes this because of the reply given by the Premier on Tuesday to a question I asked of him. Mr. Edwards is wrong. However, before going on to explain why this is so, I wish to point out to the House that I re-enter this debate reluctantly because, in an area where so much emotion and bigotry exists, these debates serve only to inflame feelings and situations that have slowly been coming to terms with reality.

The excuse given by the Editor for raising this matter is a supposed rumour that the State Government was going to close down the Point Pearce Aboriginal Reserve, move all the residents to Port Augusta, and house them in the new Housing Trust accommodation on the West Side. The only mention I ever heard of this rumour was by Mr. Edwards himself, who rang me early one Sunday morning. Such a suggestion is patently absurd; every reasonably intelligent person knows that the State Government cannot do this, as it does not have the power. As was pointed out by the Premier, it seems to have escaped the notice of the Editor that Aboriginal administration, as a result of the referendum, is largely a Commonwealth responsibility.

Neither the Premier nor I has claimed there is not a drinking problem in Port Augusta among some Aborigines. It would be senseless to deny something that so obviously exists. My question related to the claim in the editorial that instructions had been given to the police to turn a blind eye to many of the doings of Aborigines. In refuting this charge, the Premier went on to attack the attitude that was implicit in the wording of the editorial, and he was right in doing so.

Despite Mr. Edward's assertion that he does not criticise the police, he has made a grossly unwarranted attack on the force. He knows that no instruction can be given from above to the Police Force, and he knows that to suggest that this is the case is tantamount to saying that the police are not doing their job. How ridiculous. Mr. Edwards, in his role over many years as local court reporter, well knows that the overwhelming majority of persons appearing in court at Port Augusta are Aborigines on drunk and disorderly charges. The facts prove that the police do arrest Aboriginal offenders. Anyway, the problem of drunkenness amongst Aborigines is one requiring a social remedy rather than one of law enforcement.

I would point out that the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, of which the member for Grey, Mr. L. G. Wallis, was until recently a member, will be in Port Augusta on Tuesday, May 10, tak-

ing evidence on alcoholism amongst Aborigines. That seems a more appropriate arena for Mr. Edwards to fight his battle. The editorial states that it was a condition of equal rights that Aborigines adjust to the white man's ways. There were no conditions, nor could there be, on granting to human beings rights previously denied them.

It was further stated that the inability of many Aborigines to hold liquor was spoiling it for the few who have become assimilated. The truth is that the excessive drinking of the few spoil it for the many good and responsible Aboriginal citizens in Port Augusta. Mr. Edwards knows that the Aboriginal community itself is critical of the disturbances that occur from time to time in the area of the Exchange Hotel. The charge has been made that many women will not shop in that part of Commercial Road because they are rightly afraid for their well-being.

I accept that a drunken person, black or white, has an oppressive reaction on other people, and I know that foul language is not uncommon, but I believe that Aboriginal women in Port Augusta have more to fear from the white community than do white women from the Aboriginal community. It may be that some business houses have had their takings reduced because of the activities of a drunken minority; I do not know, but there is at least one establishment in the vicinity that seems to be doing very well. Has the Editor considered that economic circumstances rather than a social problem, may explain any drop in takings?

I quote two personal experiences I have had with owners of hotels within that area. These owners are not necessarily still there, because licences change hands. I was called to the telephone one Saturday night and requested to go to a hotel where my friends (that was the term used) were causing a disturbance. I did so. The place was in bedlam. The police had arrested several Aborigines, and considerable damage had been done to the hotel. The licensee was too agitated to talk to me, and he invited me to come back next morning. I did so. He was in his office counting his previous day's takings. When I arrived he asked me what I wanted. I replied, "You asked me to come to talk about last night." He said there was nothing he wished to discuss, and went on counting his not inconsiderable takings.

On another occasion, I was visited in my office by a licensee who requested that I get the police off his back. He alleged that he was being harassed by the police. He had two summonses for serving intoxicated persons with liquor. I pointed out that I had no influence with the police but that I would be pleased to talk to them about the general problem. I mentioned that, as licensee, he had a right to expect a certain degree of behaviour, hygiene and sobriety from his customers, and that I would try to help him achieve this. His reaction was immediate. He implored me not to do anything that would affect his business. "I have the best business in town," he said. "On Thursday night when every other hotel is empty I have 60 Aborigines in my bar." He said a few fights and broken windows and glasses was a small price to pay. All he wanted me to do was to get the police off his back. Members can imagine my response to that plea.

I mention these two calls because I believe that those who profit from getting people drunk must bear some social responsibility. In Port Augusta, in the main, they exercise none. To say that the problem which exists today is as bad as it was a decade ago ignores the many achievements within the Aboriginal community and is, frankly, rubbish.

I end on this note. I know Mr. Edwards well. I like him, but we have severe differences of opinion. There is cause for concern in Port Augusta because there is a problem. The editorial is not entirely baseless. I only

wish that in making a point, or a story, he would not so patently cater to emotional reactions of many people with views similar to his, rather than look at what is the true position. I had the benefit of listening to Mr. Edwards's contribution to this morning's ABC programme *A.M.*, and it disturbed me that, when asked by the interviewer whether he might have taken a more responsible attitude, and highlighted in his editorial the social problems and difficulties that existed amongst Aborigines in getting work, he said that in his view there was no work for Aborigines in Port Augusta. I am sad that this whole debate has eventuated, because all it does is excite emotions that already exist.

I conclude on a happier note. I noted that the Leader of the Opposition wished us all a happy and a fruitful break. In my household, my wife and I hope to have a happy break, although we have had all the fruitful breaks that we can do with.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I should like to raise one matter. I refer to the lack of action by the Government, and particularly the Minister of Community Welfare, in relation to the complaints that have been aired in this House regarding the Naomi Women's Shelter. The Minister came into this place first and said that he knew nothing about the allegations. Later, he said there were no sworn allegations. I know that statutory declarations were sent to the Minister's office some time ago detailing the complaints and allegations about the woman who manages the Naomi Women's Shelter. Still, no action has been taken.

Since the matter was first raised in the House, Opposition members have received many telephone calls in which other allegations have been made. For instance, it has been alleged that an assault occurred in another shelter at the instigation of Mrs. Willcox, when there was a dispute over a refrigerator and when, indeed, the person involved in the other shelter was injured. Another Opposition member was telephoned by a man whose wife was in the shelter. He was telephoning to see how his wife was, but was told by Mrs. Willcox, "Don't worry about your wife. She is all right. Go and have a dirty weekend. If you like, I can arrange it for you." That was the communication this gentleman had with the woman concerned. We are getting telephone calls from people who are disturbed about the way in which this place is being administered.

Far from its being the responsibility of the Federal Government, a contact has been made with the department of the Minister of Health, and the official position is that the State authorities are regarded as having primary responsibility for the administration of projects operated by the States and for the immediate supervision of projects operated by non-governmental organisations, and as having responsibility to see that public moneys are duly accounted for. In relation to the use of the van for private purposes rather than for the shelter, the Premier said:

The purchase of this van has been defended by Mrs. Willcox. Her use of it has on occasion saved the Shelter money, as it was used for accommodation. The van was bought with Federal funds, and is not a matter for the State Government.

That is completely inaccurate. The responsibility is as outlined, and the Government well knows that it is the responsibility of the State Government. The statutory declarations have gone to the Minister's office. They have accused Mrs. Willcox of being a thief, of not once but continually stealing food from the shelter and giving food to another staff member at the shelter, of misappropriating funds, and of opening an illegal bank account. A serious list of allegations has been made. The Minister has the primary responsibility to see that the taxpayers' funds are not misappropriated.

It is my belief and that of many people that these allegations should be investigated. The whole controversy surrounding this shelter (this shelter only; we are not referring to any other women's shelter) should be a matter for complete investigation. If the allegations are proved correct, it is obvious that Mrs. Willcox is quite a disreputable character and unfit to manage this institution. When I first raised the matter in this House, Mrs. Willcox was going to sue me for libel. She sought to drag my wife into the matter. I have heard my wife's name mentioned publicly. She would like to invite Lynette Goldsworthy to come to her shelter, I heard. She zeroed in on me, but other members have raised this matter, including the member for the district, the member for Torrens, and the member for Mount Gambier. We have received several telephone calls from people who are concerned and who know what is going on at this place and are worried about the management of this shelter.

Mr. Allison: Since we raised it,

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, we have been contacted by those people since we raised the matter. It is not good enough for the Government to put this into the too-hard basket because she is a difficult woman. She is obviously difficult and strongminded. A newspaper reporter interviewed her, and she came through as a battler trying to do a good job. However, if the contents of the statutory declarations are true, she is quite unsuitable to manage that shelter. She has not sought to take to court the people who made the allegations, and I think that is pertinent. These statements have been made publicly, and the people making them have not been taken to court. It is a matter the Government should pursue immediately.

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

Motion carried.

At 4.4 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 31, at 2 p.m.

Honourable members rose in their places and sang the first verse of *God Save the Queen*.