

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 30, 1974

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

## QUESTIONS

## RACING INDUSTRY

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Acting Chief Secretary say whether Cabinet has studied the report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Racing Industry and, if it has, whether Cabinet is satisfied that the report accurately presents the financial position of the various sections of the racing industry? If Cabinet is satisfied with the recommendations, will legislation be introduced to implement those recommendations?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Cabinet has not completed its consideration of the report. When it has done so, I shall bring down a reply to the honourable member's question.

## FOREST PRODUCTION

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement with a view to asking a question of the Minister of Forests.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Regarding the production of our forests, I remember that some contracts will come up for review in about 1989, and I am interested to know whether or not we have sufficient timber to fulfil our contracts to that period or whether production is fully committed for a longer period; in other words, whether contracts are let for the period from 1989 to 2000. I should like a general resume of whether our forest products are fully committed. If they are, does the Government intend to carry out any further planting, or to increase plantings over and above present limits, by bringing in new areas of production?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot give the honourable member a specific reply to his question regarding production, but I can assure him that any commitments made regarding our forests and sanctioned by the Government will be honoured. We would like to see a forestry organization and more plantations in the State, and it is most desirable that we should have that. However, as the honourable member is aware, this depends on many factors, especially land usage. I shall get some information in reply to the questions and bring it down as soon as possible.

## SUPERPHOSPHATE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before addressing a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to superphosphate supplies. Recent contacts I have had with people in neighbouring States lead me to believe that although the price has risen substantially (and we are all concerned about that) there has been no shortage of superphosphate in Western Australia or Victoria; in fact, the reverse situation has applied in Western Australia. However, there has been such a shortage in South Australia that some users have been rationed to as much as one-third less than they used in 1973. I have been told from a reliable source that significant quantities of superphosphate have been sent from South Australia to other

States this year. Although this is a free country (and I hope it will always be) and superphosphate manufacturers can sell their product wherever they please, because of the shortage in some areas in South Australia will the Minister find out whether significant quantities of superphosphate have been sent to other States this year? If they have, will he use his good offices with the superphosphate manufacturing companies to try to get them to supply adequately the needs of all South Australian users before selling their product in other States?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be delighted to take up the honourable member's suggestion with the fertilizer companies along the lines suggested by the honourable member.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: As the South Australian company concerned in this matter is in a highly competitive situation adjacent to and on both sides of the borders of this State, will the Minister, in fairness to the company, also give, when answering the questions of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, figures relating to the superphosphate coming into South Australia from other States, particularly from Victoria?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will endeavour to get the information, and I will take it into consideration when I reply to the Hon. Mr. Dawkins.

## LANDS DEPARTMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Acting Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Over the weekend I was told by an officer of the Lands Department Planning Branch that he and his colleagues were to be transferred to Monarto. The opening of the new accommodation, which was built at Netley at a cost of \$2 500 000 and in which the branch is currently housed, was attended by some honourable members about 12 months ago. I was told that, because of various aerial mapping processes, it is necessary for the branch to be located close to an airport, as currently applies with the branch's close proximity to Adelaide Airport. Will the Minister say whether or not a decision has been made by the Government to transfer the branch to Monarto?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will get this information for the honourable member and inform him as soon as possible.

## ROAD GRANTS

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Many councils have become perturbed about the lack of information on road grants for the current financial year. The usual notice concerning these grants will be issued much later than usual and, because of the present tight financial situation, councils are finding their areas more difficult to administer. As this uncertainty represents a serious threat to the employment of many council employees because of councils' inability to undertake long-term planning in respect of road works, will the Minister take up this matter with his colleague and ask him to have these notices sent out much earlier?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will do as the honourable member has asked.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Local government areas are at present concerned because grants for highway purposes are not forthcoming, and concern is felt about the employment of council workers. Apparently, retrenchments are unavoidable unless money is forthcoming immediately. One specific case for which I should like to ask special consideration is the Cleve to Mangalo road, which is also a school road and which will have to be closed the next time there is any rain. The residents in that area are most concerned. The grant requested to make this road serviceable is only \$500. Will the Minister confer with his colleague, stressing the urgency of the matter?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will do that for the honourable member.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government a reply to my question of July 23 about local government boundaries?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague states that, as ratepayers and any other interested party have already had the opportunity to make representations to the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, it is not proposed to hold referendums in those areas affected by the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

#### MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Marine a reply to my question of July 23 about the Murray River?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Acting Minister of Marine states that the necessary steps are being taken to have the speed limit of eight kilometres an hour reimposed for the duration of the present flood situation in the Murray River.

#### HOSPITALS DEPARTMENT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: First, can the Minister of Health tell the Council what increase there will be in the expenditure of the Hospitals Department related directly to the recent determinations made in respect of awards for hospital staff? Secondly, can he tell the Council what increase in income there will be to the department from the recently announced increased charges to patients in Government hospitals?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I can only guess at this stage. I have the figures but cannot recall them. However, I will get them for the honourable member and bring them down. From memory, I think the estimated extra cost to patients is about \$4 000 000.

#### LIVESTOCK

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Acting Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: We have seen in the press lately, on several occasions, reports stating that the trade union movement is considering boycotting the movement of livestock from this State for slaughtering. As honourable members know, the prices for livestock on the markets have decreased alarmingly over the past few months, and there is no doubt that such a boycott would have an even

further effect on the market. Would not such a boycott contravene the Commonwealth Constitution, which guarantees freedom of trade and commerce between the States?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have not seen the press reports to which the honourable member referred. However, I have read an article (the honourable member can correct me if my impression is wrong) stating that there could be a total embargo on the export of livestock.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: It was in last week's *Stock Journal*.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have not yet studied the matter, but I will do so. From the way in which the honourable member put the matter, I believe that there would be some contravention of section 92 of the Constitution. However, I shall consider the situation and let the honourable member know.

#### CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Last week, during the debate on the Brighton to Christie Downs Railway Duplication and Extension Bill, the Minister of Health said that questions that I asked then might be asked during Question Time. I shall therefore ask the questions now. First, what are the current estimates for that project; secondly, how much Commonwealth Government money is expected for the project; thirdly, how much Commonwealth money has been received to date; and, fourthly, was local government in the region contacted for its views before the Bill was introduced to reserve the transportation corridor for railway purposes across the Onkaparinga River and southward to Jared Road?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall refer the honourable member's questions to my colleague.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about local government boundaries?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Members of both Houses will be given sufficient time to study the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas and the subsequent legislation that will be introduced by the Government to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. All honourable members will be able to make any representations during the ensuing debate on the legislation.

#### ENFIELD HIGH SCHOOL

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Enfield High School Library Complex.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 25. Page 86.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I support the motion and join with my colleagues in expressions of sadness, to which His Excellency the Governor referred, concerning the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester. I also extend publicly my sympathy to the

relatives of the late E. R. Dawes and the late E. C. A. Edwards, who were former members of the South Australian Parliament.

The first matter I wish to discuss among the items that are at present important in the public mind is that regarding the recent report that was issued from the Royal Commission set up by the present Government to examine local government boundaries. I will not deal with it at length, as it is only right and proper at this stage for members of Parliament to ascertain (and, indeed, to take some time to do so) the views of people who are vitally concerned in the matter, many of whom are at present making representations to their members of Parliament.

I admit that there has for some years been a need for some change in local government boundaries. On the other hand, I have always believed (and I still do) in the principle that changes in local government boundaries should be initiated at the local level. That is an important democratic principle which, if it is adhered to, shows respect for local government, and it will be a great pity if local government in this State is ridden roughshod over by the State Government regarding boundary changes. The initiation should therefore start at the local level among the people who are so vitally affected.

I appeal to the Government to give local government adequate opportunity to discuss in detail and at length the report that is now in its hands. Surely that is not too much to ask. Until now, the Minister has not said that this is the course he intends to take. Indeed, it appears from what he said today in reply to questions asked of him that he is not going to lay down a specific period for local government to investigate in detail this report and its effects.

Apparently the Minister expects local government to make representations to members during the period in which legislation effecting the changes is before the Parliament. That was the content of one of the replies given by the Minister of Health, acting for the Minister of Local Government, in the Council today.

However, I believe that people in council areas should have adequate time to discuss all the ramifications of the intended changes, to have meetings among ratepayers, to have special council meetings, to liaise with their neighbouring councils on the matter, to make known their views to the Local Government Association (which I am sure will be examining the matter carefully), to make representations to the Minister himself, and to make adequate representations to their members of Parliament.

If the Minister were to set down a specific period of time (and I respectfully suggest it should be, say, six months) as a discussion period on this subject, surely that would be the most democratic process that could be instituted. I make a plea to the Government to decide on that course. It may well be that further communication is needed between the Local Government Department and the local areas, pointing out, for example, the advantages which may accrue but which may not as yet be fully appreciated locally.

All kinds of communication should take place before the next step is taken and the heavy hand of State legislation falls on this third tier of government. I hope the Government will consider that proposition and provide a specific period during which it will take no further action to implement the changes but in which it will be pleased to carry out discussions and communicate with local government in an endeavour to have local government in a much happier frame of mind at the end of that period than it is at present.

One can readily understand the serious criticism, for example, from an area such as Brighton when the residents read that it is suggested that their area be totally amalgamated with the City of Marion. That is only one example. We have read of many others. However, I do not want to go into great detail. I have simply mentioned one example to highlight the feelings of the people at the local level now that they have been presented with the report.

I am not criticizing the commission for making these findings. I simply say that during this period of change surely local government should be given an adequate and a specified period to look closely at the ramifications of the report before expecting the axe to fall or the next step to be taken by the Government. It is not too much to ask, and in my view any fair-minded or democratic Government should not object to such a proposal.

I listened with interest to the remarks of the mover and seconder of the motion, and I must comment on two very important matters raised by the Hon. Mr. Creedon, matters of importance and significance to our democratic way of life in South Australia and, indeed, in the nation. The first point he mentioned, which caused me great concern, was the strong view expressed in favour of centralism as a form of government rather than our present system. I shall refresh the minds of honourable members by quoting from his speech. He said:

It is obvious that the greatest barrier to successful Australian Government action on almost any problem is the existence of the States. We are all Australians, and it is not necessary to have imaginary lines dividing us when, without those lines, without the State Governments, we could work together as one nation to do the greatest good for all.

Later, he said:

Why do we need separate State Governments and separate State facilities when in most cases they duplicate the Commonwealth facilities?

The honourable member is not alone in his opinion on this subject. The Premier (Mr. Dunstan), writing in the publication *Nation* on July 11, 1970, said among other things:

Ideally, the direction in which we should be moving as a nation is towards a complete restructuring of governmental responsibilities with a central government exercising effective national control, and with subordinate Legislatures in self-contained regions throughout the country.

We must assume, I submit, that by "subordinate Legislatures" the Premier meant regional Legislatures. I believe he meant that these Legislatures should be set up by a central unitary Government in Canberra; that they would be Governments along a similar principle to that of local government as compared to the States; and that by calling them "subordinate Legislatures" he meant that they would be in every sense subordinate to the central unitary Government. I suppose they would be established by Act of Parliament, that Parliament being the Parliament in Canberra.

That was the view of the Premier in 1970, and I am sure he has not changed his views, because it was interesting to see that during last year he supported the Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) at the federal Australian Labor Party conference on this question of compelling State Labor Governments to refer legislative powers to Canberra. That policy now is part of the Labor Party platform. The two other Labor Premiers at that conference voted against the motion.

Where does public opinion stand on the question of centralism *versus* our present system of federation? Surely, the result of the referendum held in May of this year and

that held late last year showed that the Australian people gave a resounding voice to their demand to retain the federal system and the States. They do not favour centralism, as apparently do the Hon. Mr. Creedon and his Leader in this Parliament.

I believe that, because of the results of the referendum held recently and that held last year, complete support is shown for the contention that the federal system is what the people want and that it is the best system for Australia. The point was made abundantly clear, as I found in my reading, by the Premier of New South Wales in 1967 (Mr. R. W. Askin, as he was then), when he said:

The federal system has stood the test of time and is a safeguard against extremism which can flow from Labor's objective—centralized government.

I suggest that the Hon. Mr. Creedon and the Premier are flying in the face of public opinion in this State when they hold the views that they apparently hold at present.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It's a matter of how long local government will last, too.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is right. The Hon. Mr. Creedon implied that over-government, as it is sometimes called by many unthinking people, is bad for Australians, but there is great protection in this so-called over-government. It divides legislative power throughout the length and breadth of the land, distributing that legislative power adequately and fairly, so when people rush to criticize so-called over-government it is always well to remember that unitary strong government can be very dangerous to any nation, especially one with the geographical proportions and the relatively small population we have in Australia. There is great safety in having the divided legislative power that exists with a federal Government in Canberra and separate State Legislatures throughout the land.

Looking at the question in practical terms we know that the greatest population densities are on Australia's eastern coast, centred around Melbourne and Sydney. In political terms that is where the votes are, and the material benefits to such regions would grow and grow at the expense of the smaller communities throughout Australia if complete control were in the hands of the Government in Canberra. Doubtless, the South Australian community, which the Hon. Mr. Creedon represents, would suffer, too. If we had one unitary Government in Australia compared to the present situation, and if we compared the current situation with what might have existed in the past under that different system, one writer stated:

It is unthinkable that the people of Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania would enjoy some of their present educational, health, social and development standards.

In other words, we in South Australia would lag behind New South Wales and Victoria and, if the system favoured by the honourable member and the Premier existed or was implemented, fewer benefits would be derived by the people of this State. Apparently, that is what the honourable member wants. Certainly, Government members cannot argue that a second Chamber in Canberra would remain as it has in the past, namely, as a States' House, protecting regional communities, regional Legislatures, States or whatever they foresee, because the honourable member, his Leader, and his Party generally favour the abolition of that second Chamber.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: They believe in one House for the whole of Australia.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Exactly. It is well worth considering the every-day effects on people in South Australia

and elsewhere in areas far distant from Canberra if this dream of unitary Government in Canberra ever comes true. As an example, I refer to the case of a parent living, say, in Gawler (the same town in which the Hon. Mr. Creedon lives) who is dissatisfied with a matter concerning the education of his child. Under the present system, representations can be made to officers of the State Education Department and, if the parent concerned is still not satisfied, he can contact his local member (in this case, the Hon. Mr. Creedon), who can take him to visit the Minister of Education—to the top man, so to speak. Under this system that is not a difficult process, and at least the parent derives the satisfaction of knowing that he personally has been heard and that he has discussed his problem with the Minister.

In the other form of Government, apparently favoured by the Hon. Mr. Creedon, that same parent would come to Adelaide or his regional centre and would discuss the matter with either a local politician or a senior public servant, who would be subservient to the Director-General (whatever might be his title) in Canberra, and that could be the end of the road for the parent concerned. The officer in this State could simply say, "I am sorry, I appreciate your point of view; I have made representations to Canberra, but this is the reply."

Similarly, if representations were made to a regional politician, his reply could be, "I fully understand your problem, and I appreciate it, too, but the final say is with the Minister in Canberra." Of course, the Gawler parent has little opportunity to get to Canberra to present his case or to gain the satisfaction of that form of democratic communication which exists in our present system.

I take the matter further and consider the present criticism currently being levelled about increased water rates in the Adelaide suburbs. Is it not more satisfactory for those who have a complaint to know that a deputation from them is being taken to the Minister in charge and that they cannot take their problem any further? Is it not more satisfactory to have that form of personal contact than, say, going to an officer in Adelaide who may pass the buck on to Canberra, or than talking to some local politician who is subordinate to the Director-General, or whoever it may be, in Canberra?

Looking at the matter in this personal way, we can see the benefits that can accrue to individuals through retaining the present system. Therefore, I reject the views and arguments of the Hon. Mr. Creedon and the Premier. Further, I state emphatically that the federal system of Government is the best for Australia. A strong federal system must comprise strong States, and the real human and material strength of Australia, as a nation, depends on the human and material resources within the respective States. I am certain that the individual Australian is served best by the federal system based on the broad form which was fashioned early this century and which has been retained ever since.

The second point I want to rebut in respect of Mr. Creedon's address concerns compulsory voting. Although there is no need to quote the honourable member again, he stated emphatically that he supported the principle of compulsory voting, especially as regards local government. However, I believe that compulsory voting is an infringement of liberty, whether it be used for local government purposes or for any of the other tiers of government.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You don't mind it being used to carry out the laws that are made.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: What about union affairs?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have not heard of compulsory voting being introduced into the union movement. Individuals should retain and enjoy the freedom of choice, starting with whether or not they wish to go to the poll. It is just as important a freedom as that possessed by the individual when he enters a voting booth and casts his secret ballot or vote for the candidate of his choice.

It is a great shame in the political history of this country, starting way back in 1915 when the first move was made in the Queensland Parliament and ending in 1942 when South Australia changed to compulsory voting for the House of Assembly, that this trend has developed, apparently in the name of so-called progress, leading to a system of compulsory voting. It is interesting to observe the nations that line up with Australia and compare them with some of the great democracies of the world, where voluntary voting is cherished and retained.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Liberal Party did not change it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I predict that in due course when this movement develops on a national basis—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I am referring not to the Movement but to the Liberal Party.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That Movement was born similarly to the way in which the Democratic Labor Party was born. I find that the countries linked with Australia in this system of compulsory voting are Argentina, Belgium, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Italy, Peru, Spain, the United Arab Republic, Venezuela, and I believe Holland was under a system of compulsory voting but changed in 1971.

If I may pursue the point I was making a moment ago, I believe we shall, in our time, see a public demand throughout Australia for the various Parliaments to change back to this democratic system of voluntary voting.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: When was the change in South Australia?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In 1942; South Australia was the last State to change.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There was 30 years of Liberal Government in the meantime and not a thing done about it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall now touch on two other matters briefly that were mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. The first is the Redcliff petro-chemical project and the indenture that the Government proposes to introduce in this Parliament soon for ratification. I commend the Hon. Mr. DeGaris for raising this worrying aspect of possible pollution as a result of this project. The days of development at any price, as far as I am concerned, are gone. Parliament must receive an assurance, and be satisfied with that assurance, that the present Government has gone into every aspect of pollution in regard to this matter and that it is satisfied unequivocally that pollution will not be harmful as a result of this proposed development.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Parliament must be satisfied.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I agree with the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan that Parliament must be satisfied on this matter before it proceeds to ratify that indenture. Certainly it will be too late if the horse gets out of the stable and pollution becomes a problem in the area. I whole-heartedly support the matter as it has been raised. The public at large is concerned about the possibility of pollution in this regard and I hope that before this debate concludes a member of

the Government will put the Government's attitude on this matter, detail all the investigations that the Government is undertaking, and give Government assurances so that they can be fully probed and questioned, both outside and inside Parliament, before the matter proceeds.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Are you satisfied with the reports that have been tabled so far?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No. Not enough have been tabled. The real basis of criticism is that what has been published so far is not enough. The other matter I raise deals with His Excellency's Speech where he gave a very long paragraph listing all the measures to be amended during this session. Amongst them was the Act known as the Planning and Development Act. For some time, there has been great and growing concern about the state of planning and development legislation in South Australia. At one time in the press we read an article headed "Concern at role of Appeal Board". The opening paragraph was:

There is growing concern in the South Australian Government about the role of the Planning Appeal Board as a decision-maker on land use questions.

Then, on another occasion, there was a lengthy article headed "Changes urged to planning laws". The article stated:

Changes in the planning appeal system in South Australia, and amendments to the Planning and Development Act to end anomalies, were urged yesterday.

Then Mr. Bruce Guerin, the journalist, wrote an article headed "South Australia planning law 'hinders' good planning". He stated:

After eight years, South Australia's planning laws are still plagued with fundamental problems. A number of metropolitan councils do not yet have permanent zoning regulations. Projects opposed by the State Planning Authority, by local councils and by considerable public opinion have been allowed to proceed. Different criteria are used for assessing the same project at different levels of decision, from local council through to the Planning Appeal Board. Confusion results.

Then the *Australian*, on August 14 last year, publicized the Chief Justice's remarks about the Planning and Development Act. That paper reported:

Planning Act chaotic. South Australia's Planning and Development Act was in chaos, the Chief Justice, Dr. Bray, said in the Full Court today. The present deplorable and chaotic state of the legislation should be drawn to the attention of Parliament, he said.

We have been told, as I said a moment ago, that changes are to take place this session, but the point I wish to stress is that I do not think amendments to the present Act will be good enough for the planning processes in South Australia. I should like to see either a Royal Commission or a similar public inquiry into the Planning and Development Act of this State with a view to a completely new Act being written and introduced into this Parliament. A Royal Commission should be given terms of reference to ascertain the form that the new legislation should take, and thus a public inquiry should be initiated so that everyone interested in planning can be given, in the first instance, the opportunity to submit to such an inquiry his or her views on the matter.

If we do not give that right to all people concerned about this subject, we will be making a grievous error. The right should be given to individuals, professional planners from the public sector and the private sector, residents who have formed societies and who are vitally interested in the subject, conservation groups and similar groups, Government departments, and property owners who are greatly concerned about questions of zoning and compensation.

Indeed, all the available evidence should be taken, and oversea experience should be called on, too, so that the very best planning and development legislation can be brought down. In this way the people of this State will live under what we can fairly describe as the best possible legislation. The manner in which planning has changed and the manner in which the present legislation has been working over the past eight years must support the contention that a new start altogether ought to be made in this area.

Unless such a start takes the form of an open inquiry, as I have suggested, we will not get the best legislation and, more important, it will go wrong again in a few years time in the manner in which the present legislation went wrong after a few years operation. In questions of this kind it is vital that everyone interested be given the opportunity to give evidence and present viewpoints. The establishment of Monarto is an example of planning going wrong in South Australia as a result of a basic initial inquiry not being undertaken.

I firmly believe that Monarto is not meeting with public acceptance; at present every indication is that Monarto will be a failure. If we look back to see where things went wrong we must conclude that the basic error was the failure to hold an initial public inquiry into the best method of accommodating the excess population from metropolitan Adelaide. If there had been an inquiry and if that inquiry had ascertained that the best method was the establishment of a new town such as Monarto, I am sure that some of the initial mistakes made in regard to Monarto would not have been made.

Elsewhere in the world, if the establishment of new towns has not been preceded by an inquiry, they have failed. To the best of my knowledge, no new town in Great Britain is commenced without that machinery being first put in train.

But what happened here? A few Government members and public servants sat in conclave and dreamed up the vision. It was then made public, and the people were invited to participate in one way or another. The people are still being invited to participate, but the initial error has been made. There is now widespread criticism, and it appears that public servants will be drafted to live in the town.

Apparently we will have a town with magnificent and attractive material improvements, such as public facilities, roads and houses, but with unhappy people living there. So, the Government has taken away the freedom of choice of the residents of the State as to where they want to live. The Government is planning to uproot public servants from their present homes, social patterns, and schooling arrangements, and it is planning to deposit them in Monarto. There is very serious criticism of this policy.

Also, the State Government is trying to coax the Commonwealth Government to regiment some Commonwealth public servants to join with the State public servants and form the base for the new town. It is terrible to realize that, for the first time in this State's history, this kind of regimentation is taking place. It is altogether different from the situation that applied when Elizabeth was established. At that time, when migrants arrived they found factories and work waiting for them.

Further, they found new houses waiting for them that were in many cases better than the accommodation that they had left in other countries. So, the work and the accommodation were eagerly sought by the new citizens, and I give them credit for making Elizabeth the wonderful

place it is today. How much pride and interest will public servants have in Monarto when they arrive there in the same state of mind as they are in now?

The Hon. C. R. Story: How will the rest of the State be affected?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The problem with the rest of the State is that decentralization will be completely killed by the new town, because it makes a mockery of decentralization. Actually, Monarto will be a glorified suburb. The Premier has already called it a sub-metropolitan area. With break-neck speed the Government is trying to establish fast communication lines between Adelaide and Monarto for the benefit mainly of commuters, so that they can travel at speed between the two centres.

So, there will not be any resources left to establish elsewhere a truly decentralized city, such as the one which might have been established near Port Pirie and which was initially recommended by the Committee on the Environment under Professor Jordan. My whole criticism is that the initial mistake was that there was not an initial open inquiry, under a judge of one of the lower courts, into the method of re-establishing excess population. Then, there was not an open inquiry into whether there should be a new town and whether any such town should be at Monarto.

The same type of error could be made in regard to the planning and development legislation. Perhaps some officials are in conclave now trying to fashion the present legislation into a better form. If only the privileged few are having a say on how the legislation ought to be changed, it will fail, because we must start in the public arena. I therefore urge the Government not to remodel the present legislation on the advice of only a few, because that will result in second-best legislation and in the same errors and criticisms in the future as have arisen in the past.

There has been much criticism of the serious effects of the Land and Business Agents Act. I believe that the Government is considering whether it can improve the present situation, and I urge it to study the matter carefully.

I refer to two serious problem areas, one of which is the example that must now occur under the law where, at a public auction, all the details are given of the mortgage, comprising the principal sum, interest thereon and repayments. The name of the party to whom the money is owed must under law be read out publicly for all and sundry to hear. It is not a question of there being any danger to a prospective purchaser in relation to the settlement of that property, as at the time of settlement he has people in charge of his conveyancing work who handle the settlement in such a way as to ensure that all mortgages are discharged.

I believe that the Government, which has passed laws to protect the privacy of the individual, made a grave error in permitting all this information to be given out for all and sundry to hear. For instance, all the people living nearby, or anyone else interested in the matter, can attend an auction and hear all the gossip. The Government has made an error in standing by and letting this sort of thing happen. I therefore hope that it will rectify the situation.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It's a pity that they didn't listen a little more closely to the views expressed in this Chamber.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is. Strong efforts were made to ensure that it did not happen, but that water has flowed under the bridge. I also ask whether the Government cannot assist regarding the whole matter of land brokers.

Some of the fears that were expressed when this legislation was before the Council have now proved to be a reality.

Already people are being retrenched in almost every real estate office in Adelaide. One of the reasons for these retrenchments is that the people have had part of their livelihood taken away by this legislation.

In some instances, they cannot continue as both licensed land broker and licensed land agent, and in other instances employees who were brokers cannot undertake any brokerage work that comes into their office from outside sources. This contradicts completely the initial principle that the Attorney-General and the Premier said they were trying to enforce: that they did not want employees to do their principals' brokerage work and that the broker ought to do outside work only.

Now, employee brokers are permitted to carry on the work of their principal but not to do outside work, which, for years and years, has been coming into their offices from established clientele. These people of whom I am speaking are highly reputable people, and they have been treated harshly by this legislation. Putting it mildly, their jobs are now on the line. No-one likes to see unemployment, irrespective of the area involved.

These are, therefore, two serious matters that have arisen. I hope that, when the Government looks closely at the representations that I believe are being made to it by the Real Estate Institute, it will seriously consider alterations that should be made in the best interests of all concerned, not only the reputable people in this industry but also the public generally.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): I support the motion. The first subject on which I wish to speak relates to paragraph 15 of His Excellency's Speech, as follows:

The last year has seen a rapid expansion in the provision of State Government funds for pre-school education and the first entry of the Australian Government into this field.

It was a pretty short entry, as it was suspended only two days later for a period of 12 months. His Excellency continued:

It is now proposed to introduce legislation to establish a Pre-School Education Committee to advise and assist the Minister of Education in the development of pre-school education.

They will not have much to do for the first 12 months, as it has already been suspended for that period. His Excellency continued:

Parliament will also be asked formally to empower the Education Department to enter the pre-school education field.

I charge the Commonwealth Government with fraud and deceit in the matter of pre-school education and day-care centres. These matters constituted one of the central themes of the Australian Government's election campaigns in 1972 and in 1974. Although that Government often claims a mandate about matters that it has raised in its policy speech, it appears to believe that it can pick and choose which items it will carry out, and when it will carry them out, even after it has been given a firm mandate in relation to them. It has seen fit to renege on its commitment to the people in relation to these two matters.

Until its decision to renege on its commitment to the people on these two matters, the Australian Government was fully backed by the State Government, and I ask whether the latter is willing to take up where the Australian Government has fallen down in its commitments or whether it will strongly criticize the Australian Government. I

believe I have the support of the whole Parliament regarding my statements on these matters. In this respect, I refer to page 48 of *Hansard*, where, by interjection, Mr. Millhouse asked the Minister of Education the following question:

Have you any comment on the Commonwealth Government's decision last evening to reduce expenditure on pre-school education?

Replying, the Minister of Education stated categorically that it was an appalling decision. Although that statement was not made in the Address in Reply debate, it was nevertheless made by the Minister of Education: he said that he was appalled by this decision. I therefore believe I have every right to say that the whole Parliament would support me on this matter.

I have no doubt that the Labor Party conducted one of its famous surveys to discover the right subjects to publicize at election time. It clearly chose pre-school education and child care as two good emotional subjects on which to deceive the voters. Therefore, these deceitful men fed not only the press but also the public with high-sounding sentences of support only to renege as soon as possible thereafter. The people who suffer most from neglect in this area are the less financially well endowed members of the community. Despite this, this Government, which pretends to look after and represent this sector of the community, picks this most important area as one of the first in which to cut back spending. I ask the State Government to take up this matter and to persuade the Australian Government to honour its promise, on which it won wide support in the community. I now refer honourable members to the Annual Report of the Board of Management of the Kindergarten Union of South Australia Incorporated, part of which is as follows:

The much publicized and long awaited Fry report did not reach the Senate table until December 11, and, as a consequence, the Commonwealth Government was unable to act upon it. The one decision which they should have made to enable pre-school education to continue to develop in 1974 was to allocate the promised \$10 000 000 to the States, and make some direct move towards the final promise of pre-school education for all in six years. The stand off and wait attitude was also adopted all the way down the line to the parents who now firmly believe that Governments, State and Commonwealth, have accepted the major responsibility and have consequently absolved the parents from having to find very large amounts of money from the community. There has been no expressed wish by parents to withdraw completely and, indeed, there is probably renewed parent interest in pre-school education, but not for fund raising.

That is the important point. With the widespread publicity that has been given to the Commonwealth Government's taking over in this field, there has been a falling in the desire of parents to raise money on their own for this purpose. There has also been a wide acceptance of the Commonwealth Government's taking over the responsibility in this field. Now, 12 months will pass without the Commonwealth honouring its promises in this respect. This facade of promises being made to the community has continued since 1972. I refer now to the following statement by the Prime Minister, which he made in his 1972 policy speech:

The area of greatest inequality in education is pre-school, and it is precisely here that inequality is riveted on a child for a life-time. The greatest single aid in removing or modifying the inequalities of background, environment, family income or family nationality or race will be the provision of pre-school education. In Canberra, where the Commonwealth cannot escape responsibility, every child enjoys a year at properly equipped and properly staffed centres. In the States, fewer than 20 per cent of children do.



In other words, we will see this area of neglect, as outlined by the Prime Minister in 1972, continued. At that time the Government got wide support in the press and elsewhere for its stated views, its stated interest in this matter, and its stated intention to take action. It received wide and strong support from the State Government. On March 6, 1973, the Minister of Education (Hon. Hugh Hudson) said:

The Education Department is expected to set up a pre-school division to administer the Federal Government's plan, announced at the weekend.

The Commonwealth Government had announced that it would make pre-school education available to all children within six years. The period mentioned was quite specific. The Commonwealth Minister for Education (Mr. Beazley) said:

The biggest bottleneck in attempting to provide at least a year of pre-school education for every child was the training of teachers.

It seems now that the biggest bottleneck will be in persuading the Commonwealth Government to carry out the promises made before the two previous elections. On September 1, 1973, Mr. Hudson said that the Australian Government was committed to making possible universal pre-school education within six years and that the South Australian Government was also firmly committed to co-operate in that venture. He said that it was assumed that about 16 per cent of eligible children from 3 years to 5 years of age were receiving pre-school education at that time. Along with the expansion of pre-school education has been a continuing expansion in the number of teachers being trained, and it is expected that within a short time 450 students will be trained in each year. The South Australian Minister has supported that, but I wonder whether we will see a cut-back of that plan. If not, and if we continue to see cuts in the Commonwealth Government's expansion into this field, we will see many kindergarten teachers without much to do, because the facilities will not be available for them.

Are we to have some firm guarantee which the Commonwealth Government will not retract after this 12-month delay to an expansion programme along the lines outlined before the previous two elections? Will the Commonwealth Government renege again next year so that pre-school education and child day care centres will next year again be the victims of inflation created by the Commonwealth Government? We should have some guarantee from the Commonwealth Government that it will not repeat this action next year.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: It will all be good grist for the mill for the next election.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: We will have the same old "sell" on the media by clever public relations staff who will once again persuade the people that this matter has been not neglected but just slightly delayed, and that the programme will commence again as soon as the Government gets back. If previous form is any indication, we will see another delay of two or three months after the firm commitment has been given. In this case, the Commonwealth Government's action occurred two or three days after the commitment was given by the Government in the Governor's Speech. I refer now to the dental division of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. This is a subject about which I have spoken in the past and one which is of continuing interest to me and to the 9 000 people on the waiting list of that establishment.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: There was something in the paper about it the other day.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: There was quite a long article and, although I am not allowed to read it, I shall refer to it. There was considerable discussion in the media recently about the fact that South Australia had a dental crisis. I am pleased to see that the Minister is now in the Chamber, because I am sure he is as interested in this as I am; probably more so, because he has the problem of dealing with the present situation as well as catching up the backlog accumulated through past neglect. I do not hold the Minister entirely responsible for the problem that now exists, but it does exist and something must be done about it.

An article by Barry Hailstone made it clear that a dental crisis existed in South Australia and that thousands of people, many of them pensioners, were denied adequate dental treatment because of the waiting list of 9 000 people. It was interesting to see a letter in a newspaper shortly afterwards, written by Mr. Paul Sarmany of Andamooka, referring to the fact that he had travelled to Adelaide solely to attend the dental department at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. He said:

I am badly in need of new dentures. I have no top dentures and the bottom dentures are more than 20 years old.

They would be getting a little loose at the bottom by that stage! He said he was 58 years of age and found it difficult to eat properly. The letter continues:

At the dental department I was told after a brief examination that nothing could be done for me immediately and to come back to the hospital in five years.

The only good point about the letter is that at long last the Minister, or someone else, has carried out the stated intention of the dental hospital, made clear at a recent meeting the Minister and I both attended, that it would be honest with the people and tell them there was a long waiting list and that they were unlikely to get treatment. I ask the Minister to say whether the 9 000 people already on the waiting list have been warned that they will be waiting five years or longer or that they are unlikely to get treatment. It is most important that people should not be left in a wilderness of no dental care; they should be making provision for themselves if no provision is to be made for them.

While I do not say I support the move to make dental treatment available to Aborigines, I was concerned at the implication in the report and in a letter which I read and which was sent to a dentist that Aborigines were to receive free dental treatment under a scheme to be promulgated by the Commonwealth Government. Reading another report from the Commonwealth Government, it seemed to me that perhaps it was a limited project, but the letter gave no indication of any limitations, stating quite clearly that all people of Aboriginal descent would receive free dental treatment under a system similar to the repatriation dental treatment scheme. Can the Minister say whether all people of Aboriginal descent are to receive free dental treatment? If they are, how does the department establish whether a person is of Aboriginal descent, and what requirement is placed on a person to prove Aboriginal descent? Must he be one-eighth Aboriginal blood, a full-blood, a half-blood, or what? There must be some criterion. Must he show that he does not have the means to provide himself with dental treatment? Is there any means test similar to the one operating, I understand, at the dental section of the Royal Adelaide Hospital? If that is so, does the Minister not consider it fair to extend this programme to all the pensioners who have been waiting for periods of up to five years, and some since 1956?



The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: This Government has not done it. I am not in a position to say what the Commonwealth Government has done.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Will the Minister contact his Commonwealth counterpart, because he will be operating this?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You have got a colleague in the Senate. Give him the job, and while you are about it find 1 000 dentists and then we will be able to do what you want.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I repeat my question to the Minister: as he is saying that he is not responsible for this, will he inquire of the Commonwealth Minister to find whether this scheme will be extended to those people who have been waiting since 1956, and possibly longer, many of them pensioners, so that it is fair to all? It would be unfair to give treatment to Aborigines if they were able to provide it for themselves. Surely we have not reached the situation in Australia where the colour of people decides whether or not they should receive treatment. That would be totally unfair. While in many other out-back areas it is essential that we provide treatment for these people, that does not necessarily mean that all the people in this bracket should have available to them something that is not available to the less fortunate members of what I reluctantly describe as the white society.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support the motion, and join with all other members and His Excellency the Governor in expressing my regret at the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester, of Mr. E. R. Dawes and Mr. E. C. A. Edwards. All these men served the community, His Royal Highness as Governor-General of Australia and Commander-in-Chief of Australia's armed forces in time of war, and Mr. Dawes and Mr. Edwards as members of this Parliament. For all people who give such service it is right and proper that we remember them at their time of death and pay our respects to their memory, to their widows and to their families.

Australia's financial stability can be likened to a man walking a tightrope. The balance needed to walk on a tightrope is assisted by a balancing pole to counteract the forces trying to upset his equilibrium. Similarly, in the economy, over-production or a flood of imports can cause a loss of balance to the financial stability of the economy, which can be counteracted by Government action and control through the Reserve Bank or through the implementation of other Government policy.

Although the Australian Labor Party enjoys labelling private enterprise as the big boggy of the working man and the cause of all the nation's ills, it must be admitted that the Australian Government as well as State Governments have good legislative control over the private sector. I refer to taxes on profits, pay-roll tax, statutory investments in Government securities, the Companies Act, and the Prices Justification Tribunal, which are but a few of the controls that go a long way in keeping reputable private enterprise companies under strict control.

Further, hardly a day passes without one of the entrepreneurs of the Australian Government expressing his opinion about further controls needed to curb private enterprise and to control it, because private enterprise is seen as the arch enemy to the progress of Australia. Should there be over-production or an excess of imports, as has been proved over the years, the Government can quickly step in to control and regulate the situation to ensure that the economic balance is kept in reasonable check.

There are other problems. Neither private industry nor Government can operate efficiently without a conscientious outlook by the work force. During the past decade or so Australia has enjoyed a high level of prosperity which has been the envy of the free world and which has resulted from tolerance and understanding among the Government, the employer and the work force. However, the flexing of union muscle in recent years (recently not so much for the betterment of the worker or his conditions) as a means of curbing production, of creating shortage, of creating financial embarrassment for the employing sector has been evident, and as a consequence the nation's economy is falling off balance. This has applied to such an extent that the fear of inflation and the shadow of depression are becoming realities.

There is not sufficient power for Government or for the employing sector to say to the union bosses, "Stop, you are rocking the boat to such an extent that your actions will create a hardship on your mates, on the nation, and on the future of Australia's stability." I have pointed out already that Governments have wide powers to control, guide, and direct the private sector, whether it be industrial or primary production. Like an insidious cancer, union bosses are riding roughshod over the intentions of employers and the Government. The number of work days lost between January and March, 1974, was more than 2.400 000.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Is that throughout Australia?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes, in Australia. I compare that figure with the little more than 500 000 lost work days in the corresponding quarter in 1973. Those figures are alarming. As a result of strikes and lost work days the nation is reeling under soaring prices and shortages of supply, and a growing fear of unemployment is the direct result of these actions. The people of Australia recently voted the Australian Labor Party into Government in South Australia and in Canberra. Voters believed they would get a better deal and a better way of life, but now the unions, which should represent the ultimate strength and backbone of the Australian Labor Party, are abusing their privileges to such an extent that the pride the Labor Party had in gaining office has become tarnished, and it will be blackened and will eventually be broken by the unions' abuse of power, unless action is taken, and taken soon.

Why should union bosses have so much power? Why should their philosophy, which has created the present crisis, be allowed to continue unchecked? No longer should the worker cry for justice and use his right to strike as a privilege, unless he is willing to justify that right. An opportunity must be provided for his fellow man to apply to a civil or industrial court seeking restraint when union actions cause hardship to his family or to his job. The employing and Government sectors should have similar rights, and it is my resolve and endeavour to have placed on the Statute Book authority for people whose livelihoods are being threatened by strikes to apply to a court so that those who are individually responsible must substantiate their actions. If the courts find that the union leaders' actions cannot be justified, the court would have the power to prohibit the continuation of the strike.

With the amalgamation of many unions under national awards, I see no reason why a court in this State should not have the power to order the national union leaders to appear to present their case. A man who commits a crime in South Australia, whatever is the magnitude of the crime, is liable under the laws of this State, regardless of where he resides. I use that example to show that a

national union leader should be responsible in a similar way for the actions of his union in South Australia. I repeat the words I used earlier: no longer should the worker cry for justice and use his right to strike as a privilege unless he is prepared to justify that right.

In another context, His Excellency's Speech is on a slightly different plane. I quote his words because they are the words of the Government. In paragraph 19 he states:

Over the next year or so the fiscal measures announced or contemplated by the Australian Government to deal with the problem of inflation will have their impact on the community. In so far as these measures may result in a slow-down in the economy, my Government is acutely aware that the people of this State are likely to suffer rather more severely than those elsewhere. Whilst my Government is conscious of the role of the Australian Government in this situation, the well-being of the people of this State is necessarily in the forefront of its mind. Accordingly, my Government will keep the effect of the Australian Government's fiscal policies on this State under the closest scrutiny and will not hesitate to point out to that Government any hardship that may arise for the people of this State . . .

Here again we have the wording:

Whilst my Government is conscious of the role of the Australian Government in this situation, the well-being of the people of this State is necessarily in the forefront of its mind.

The well-being of the people of the State is also being forced into subjugation by the problems of strikes, lack of work, the inflationary spiral and the chaos it is creating. It is no use my saying, "Aren't the strikes awful? Isn't inflation a disgrace?" unless I can stand up and put not the solution but the means whereby I can go to a court and say, "Look, this strike is causing hardship. Let the union bosses responsible for causing the strike give their reasons for their point of view."

Turning from that vexing problem and looking through the Address in Reply speeches I have made in this Council, I find that four times since I have been in this place I have referred to strikes and suggested solutions but, strangely enough, the Government has taken no notice of me; so this is my fifth try. Together with the Hon. Mr. Hill, I applaud the remarks made by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, as Leader of the Opposition, about the problem that will probably occur at Red Cliff Point on the shores of Spencer Gulf, in an area nearly midway between Port Pirie and Port Augusta. A report by the Environment and Conservation Department highlights the urgent need for the Government to supply proof that the environment and ecology of the area will not be harmed, not only for this generation but also for future generations.

The Hon. Mr. Springett, in his Address in Reply speech last session, referred to the ecology of the lakes in Canada and America, where the authorities foolishly allowed those waters to become so polluted that they could support no natural life. The lack of reports and statements by Government representatives on pollution from the petro-chemical industry indicates it is obvious that very little work has been done in that respect. I do not intend to support the indenture Act, if the responsibility for preserving the environment rests with the Redcliff petro-chemical consortium (or whatever its present title is), without the Government's first establishing absolute proof that this plan will in no way materially affect the waters of the gulf and the environment surrounding the works.

Some speakers have suggested that the way to curb this problem is to provide for heavy fines against the companies involved. As the Hon. Mr. Hill has said this afternoon, it is no good our crying after the horse has

left the stable. We must see not that a company is fined but that in no way can it create a problem of pollution in these areas.

The South Australian Environment and Conservation Department's *Plan for Environmental Study*, published in May, 1974, lists many areas of research that must be done. Surely it is the responsibility of the Government to see that these areas of research are carried out and reported on to the satisfaction not only of Parliament and those who live in the immediate vicinity of the project but also of the whole State. We should have the privilege of adjudicating and the right to vote in this Parliament with as clear a conscience as man can provide, to see that the company or complex that comes into the State will not, over a period of time, become a source of death to animals or of injury to the health of humans. These are some of the things that this report suggests should be done:

Preparation of a land form map of the area and detailed morphological map of the site to enable assessment of soil erosion and deposition, flood effects . . . Assessment of the effects of the site development including storage and treatment lagoons and possible spillages, on the surface and underground water resources and on the drainage pattern . . . There is little existing information on the wind circulation associated with inversion conditions and sea breeze circulation in the area. This information is required as part of the evaluation of the effect of emissions from the plant on the air quality and the consideration of stack heights.

We can well recall the problems at Port Augusta at the Sir Thomas Playford powerhouse at the head of the gulf because the prevailing wind is from the south, which creates perhaps not a harmful effect on the citizens of Port Augusta but certainly a nuisance effect because of the smoke from the brown coal. If we are to believe reports from overseas—from Japan, Canada, and Great Britain—petro-chemical plants do not emit merely smoke that has a nuisance value: they emit smoke or products into the air containing dangerous chemicals. It is not a witch-hunt—it is proof positive from other nations. Other things that need to be done are the following:

Detail present environmental profile and investigate the effects of site clearing, fencing, barriers, alteration of natural drainage, noise, etc., on the plant site, samphire swamps and mangroves. Detail territories and migration patterns of rare species especially of the dama and yellow-footed rock wallabies whose territories may cover the site area, east of the Flinders Range.

Regarding studies into flora, the report recommends:

The effects of clearing the site area on the swamp and mangrove areas should be assessed.

Regarding land use, the report recommends:

Assess the impact of the project on the adjoining land.

Regarding hydrology, the report states:

Because of the low rainfall, streams are dry most of the year but they are capable of considerable flooding. Care should be taken in the siting of the quarries to avoid stream and underground water pollution. The effects of any alteration to drainage by salt lagoons should be assessed, particularly in regard to the swamps and mangroves.

Regarding flora, the report further recommends:

The effect of clearing and the ultimate rehabilitation of the quarry areas, and the effect of any salt fields on the swamp and mangrove areas should be assessed.

Because the Flinders Range is an area of scenic beauty and recreation for the whole State, great care must be taken in siting tracks and roads there. I draw the Government's attention to the reference in the report to the waters of Spencer Gulf. Man has been pretty ruthless in his farming and mining activities. Does man know enough about the ecology of the sea floor? Does he know enough about the growth of vegetation there which provides food for fish?

Man's record on land is bad enough. Although there are legislative controls and although there have been educational programmes, we still have not learned. Regarding the gulf waters, the report states:

This northern section of Spencer Gulf is a very important nursery area for prawn and scale fish populations, which support major fisheries in mid and lower Spencer Gulf. A Department of Fisheries study has shown that the marine environment is at present in equilibrium, but the equilibrium must be considered a delicate one since it is largely dependent on the stability of the sea grass communities. The sea grass communities stabilize the substrata, preventing erosion by tidal currents, are the principal primary producers in the areas, and provide an ideal habitat for juvenile fish.

It is therefore essential that the impact of any effluent from the complex is assessed against these factors, and therefore the following studies should be undertaken. Consideration in all of these studies should be given to the effect of any spillages from the complex which may enter the gulf waters.

The report then lists the following studies: hydrology, sea grasses and benthic communities, sediment analysis, heavy metal concentrations, toxicity tests, commercial fishing, and mangroves, etc. Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, is reported to have said:

Technology marches on, but it leaves in its wake polluted seas and rivers, polluted air, polluted land, and polluted food. I don't think it is fanciful to suggest that the birds and animals and fish which are dying in this process are equivalent to the miner's canary—the first warning that things are not quite right.

I listened with great interest to the Hon. Mr. Hill's speech and to replies to questions this afternoon. Those replies implied that this Parliament should have the right to make alterations to solve the problems of councils that are dissatisfied with the Royal Commission's report. What a glorious lot of fun could result from that, with honourable members drawing boundaries to suit their local councils! That process could create even further problems.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We are interested in more than our own council boundaries.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Of course. If this Council tries to redraw the boundaries on which the Royal Commission has spent so much time and energy, the end result may still be unsatisfactory.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think that any area would be satisfied with the boundaries proposed in the report?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: That is difficult to say, because it is hard to arrive at a cross-section of local government opinion. Some councils have expressed satisfaction with the boundaries, but do the people realize all the implications of the changes in boundaries? Will they mean increased rates and increased efficiency, particularly in distant rural areas? Will they result in better representation? Will it be easier for a councillor to do justice to his duties if he has to travel more than, say, 160 kilometres to council meetings? I am sure that these points have not been fully appreciated by many people. In reply to what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, I point out that many councils have not yet had an opportunity to discuss fully the Royal Commission's report.

Councils will get an opportunity to discuss the report, and it will be from council meetings that the Government and honourable members will get an impression of local government opinion. The reply of the Minister of Health that people will not be allowed by referendum or other means to object indicates the falsity of the boast about open government and reveals a contempt for the people. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.9 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 31, at 2.15 p.m.