

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 15, 1974

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

PETITION: COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. Evans, for Mr. NANKIVELL, presented a petition signed by 171 persons stating that they were dissatisfied with the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, and praying that the House of Assembly would not bring about any change or alteration of boundaries.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GAWLER RIVER FLOODING

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Acting Minister of Works): I seek leave to make a statement.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister seeks leave of the House to make a Ministerial statement. Is leave granted?

Mr. Venning: Yes.

The SPEAKER: When I ask the House whether the honourable Minister has leave to make a statement, leave must be granted unanimously. If I hear a dissentient voice from any member, I must and will take it as an objection.

Dr. TONKIN: He said "Yes", Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: However, as the matter has been explained to me, I will accept it as unanimous.

Leave granted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As reported to the House last week, I have directed the Director and Engineer-in-Chief to formulate a flood warning system for predicting and assessing flash flooding in South Australia and for effectively communicating with the police, councils, the media and the public. However, the recent flooding on the Gawler River highlights the need to develop an overall water resource management plan for this catchment area. At present, the only structures that can provide any control are the Warren and South Para reservoirs. These are designed only as water supply storages and act as flood mitigation structures only when the reservoirs are well below capacity, as is the case most of the time. On the relatively rare occasions when these storages are full or near full (about once in six years on average), they cannot be used to give a great degree of flood control, and the whole catchment behaves more or less as a "wild river".

It is intended that the new Water Resources Branch of the Engineering and Water Supply Department shall carry out studies to develop a long-term management plan for this catchment area. The study will need to be multi-objective in terms of economic development, environmental quality, social implications and regional development, and will have to consider all aspects for the multi-purpose development of this water resource, including requirements for public water supply, flood mitigation, irrigation water supplies, water pollution control, recreation, tourism and environmental protection.

QUESTIONS

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

AMERICAN RIVER

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (September 26).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: During the past two years extensive investigations have been carried out to develop alternative schemes of supplying the additional water, which will be required if American River and the country lands along the "long" route are to be supplied. These investigations, which include alternative schemes for raising the existing Middle River dam and also the construction of a second dam at an alternative site, are now nearing completion. Comparative estimates of each alternative have been made, but before a final report can be prepared it is necessary to evaluate environmental and ecological aspects. This work is currently in progress and it is expected that the work will be completed by the end of the year.

The total cost of extending mains to American River via the "long" route based estimates, prepared in 1972 and updated to present-day costs, would be about \$1 100 000, whilst the revenue to accrue would amount to only slightly more than 1 per cent. In addition, it would be necessary to add the cost of augmenting the existing water supply at Middle River. Based on an estimate prepared in April 1974, this cost is \$700 000. It will therefore be necessary to refer the scheme back to the Public Works Committee for further inquiry and recommendation. In view of the high cost of this scheme and the low return on capital outlay, and the fact that Loan funds are already committed on approved projects, it is extremely unlikely that any work could commence on American River before the 1978-79 financial year, even if a favourable recommendation was received from the Public Works Committee.

HOLDEN HILL INTERSECTION

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (October 2).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The cost was \$15 900, and this was accepted by the Australian Government under its traffic engineering and road safety improvement programme for 1973-74.

ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 18).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The table hereunder shows the staffing relationships between the General Section (covering Administration and Environment Divisions) and the National Parks and Wildlife Division:

	Staffing †	
	General Section (Administration and Environment)	National Parks Division
As at June 30, 1973	22	105
New positions approved during 1973-74	11	16*
As at June 30, 1974	33	121
New positions proposed 1974-75	14	3

Note:

† Figures include vacancies plus new positions approved but unfilled at the time.

* Includes seven positions created on the divisional staff establishment to cater for persons employed at June 30, 1973, under the unemployment relief scheme then in operation. These seven persons were not included in the figures shown as at June 30, 1973, as at that time they did not form part of the official division staff establishment.

As regards the new positions proposed, most under the General Section are on account of the expansion of the

Environment Division and cover a variety of titles and salary classifications. As all these new positions are subject to formal approval and salary determination by the Public Service Board, I am as yet unable to supply this information.

TOURISM

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (August 29).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Between April and June last, the Tourist Bureau spent an additional sum of about \$6 000 on paid advertising featuring the tourist services of the Murray River. The bureau's advertising during July and August concentrated on the Murray River and the Flinders Range, taking account of how unfavourable weather conditions had affected both areas. Houseboat and river cruise operations are now being advertised weekly in Adelaide and frequently in other States. Advertising at this level will continue. Depending on how the projected flooding affects the river towns and tourist operators' activities during the next few months, additional advertising will be undertaken if and when it seems that benefit would result from it. In addition to media advertising, Riverland tourism has been promoted by:

1. A display featuring the Murray River and Orange Week was placed in the Tourist Bureau window in King William Street during the month of August.
2. A new art poster and the commissioning of a new photographic poster.
3. Supply of literature and news items.
4. Arrangements are well advanced for making a tourist film this financial year at an estimated cost of \$30 000.

CITY OF ADELAIDE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (September 18).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The sum of \$43 000 was provided during the previous year to fund the committee: \$23 570 was spent, of which \$21 910 represented fees paid to members of the committee. In addition to this amount of \$21 910, a further expenditure of about \$500 was incurred for fees and expenses in relation to appeals to the Planning Appeal Board against decisions of the committee. The balance of the expenditure was attributed to general office expenses. In the main, salaries and other expenses have been met by the Adelaide City Council. During this year it is expected that a request will be received from the council for reimbursement of administration costs, including salaries. The cost of these salaries has increased in common with all other salary costs.

In addition to the witness fees, the committee expects that further fees will be required to be paid to independent planning consultants for the preparation of reports leading up to the committee making its decisions. In my earlier reply, it was indicated that the consultants' fees were in relation to the implementation of the planning study for the city of Adelaide by Urban Systems Corporation Proprietary Limited, which, it was stated, was partly financed by the Adelaide City Council. This was incorrect. The study by Urban Systems Corporation was financed wholly by the Adelaide City Council and no contribution was made by the City of Adelaide Development Committee or the Government.

NATIONAL PARKS

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 18).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: During 1973-74, the Public Buildings Department spent \$74 044 on maintenance work, which was subsequently recharged to the National

Parks and Wildlife Division. In addition the division met the amount of \$31 257 for rental applicable to Tinsmith Building. As regards 1974-75, both these items will be met by the Public Buildings Department without recharge to the division, and the amount expected to be spent by it in this regard is about \$115 000, but the actual amount will depend upon the amount of maintenance work which arises during the year.

BEACH PROTECTION

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (September 12 and 17).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Coast Protection Board does not intend to spend any of the likely expenditure of \$7 000 000 for the improvement of the metropolitan coastline on the construction of groynes. A classic example of the adverse effects of these structures can be seen at the entrance to the Patawalonga boat haven, where a marked accretion of sand has occurred immediately to the south of the breakwater while the beach to the north is quite depleted. However, in the case of the groyne now under construction near The Broadway, Glenelg, it should be noted that the structure is low in profile, rather short and is of an experimental nature. The Coast Protection Board, of which Mr. R. Culver is a member, decided to erect this small structure only because the beach in the vicinity of The Broadway and Farrell Street has had a lengthy history of erosion and has at times scoured to the point where the original mangrove mud reappears.

The recent erection of rock protection at this low area of the foreshore, while lessening the risk of storm damage to property, will do little in the way of retaining sand on this beach and it was decided that a groyne may help the situation, particularly as nearby residents had made a number of complaints about the serious lack of sand in the area. I want to make quite clear that this groyne is experimental in nature and was erected to meet an unusual situation. If there is any evidence of undesirable beach behaviour because of the presence of the groyne, the Coast Protection Board will remove it immediately. A press release to this effect was prepared by the board, but it was apparently not printed. The study report for the Metropolitan Coast Protection District has been prepared by the board and is to be distributed to seaside councils in the near future. This report contains no reference to the construction of groynes, and it therefore follows that the management plan for the metropolitan coastline will contain no recommendations for the establishment of groynes in this area.

TOURIST BUREAU

In reply to Mr. BECKER (September 17).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The function of the Government Tourist Bureau is to develop and promote the tourist industry in South Australia. The expenditure of the Tourist Bureau includes substantial sums for advertising the State, subsidies and grants, and the salaries of many officers who are not engaged in direct booking activities. Therefore, there is no prospect of the Government Tourist Bureau earning income sufficient to meet its expenditure. To my knowledge, every other Government Tourist Bureau in Australia is in the same situation. In addition, it is necessary to bear in mind that the dominating force in Australian holiday travel is the private motorist. More and more of these holidaying motorists are seeking flexibility in travel and do not wish to book ahead. They come to the Tourist Bureau to get information and advice, which is given to them, but the bureau does not get any money in the till to show the results of efforts. The Tourist Bureau renders an essential service to the tourist

industry in South Australia. Economic and social benefits to the State flow from its work, but it is not, and never will be, a profit-making organisation.

CONSERVATION PROJECTS

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 18).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Last year the State contributed \$14 100 to the Australian Environment Council and an identical amount is proposed this year. The fund was established to enable studies to be undertaken into environmental problems of importance to all Governments represented on the Australian Environment Council. As yet, no studies have been undertaken within the geographical boundaries of South Australia. KESAB sought an increase in its annual grant for 1974-75, but the organisation was advised that, because of the extremely tight financial situation and other departmental activities which have a high priority, the Government was unable to approve any increase. The grant from Tasmania is \$5 000, the same as South Australia, but New South Wales does not give any financial assistance.

The Nature Conservation Society did not directly seek any increase in its annual grant but stated that any amount above the \$2 000 provided in 1973-74 would be immensely valuable. Following discussions between the Permanent Head of the Department of Environment and Conservation and the society, it was agreed that \$2 000 would be adequate. The South Australian Fly Fishers Association sought an increase in its annual grant but, following investigation, it was considered that an increase was not warranted. The following native trees, shrubs and ground cover were ordered and distributed in June, 1974:

1. Paid for in June:			\$
Woods and Forests.....	1600	for	480.00
Athelstone Wildflower Garden R.D.C. Projects Proprietary Limited.....	405	for	238.30
	823	for	164.60
	2828		\$882.90
2. Paid for in July:			\$
Woods and Forests.....	1000	for	240.00
Woods and Forests.....	742	for	192.72
	1742		\$432.72
Total.....	4570		\$1315.62

VEGETABLES

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. How many restaurants or hotels were circularised with the questionnaire from the Government's fruit and vegetable working party, chaired by Mr. G. Latham, regarding the variety of vegetables now available or likely to be required, and how many replies were received?

2. Could the following details be given of the vegetables, fruits and nuts listed below, plus any additional varieties:

- the quantity presently used,
- the source of supply,
- if not available what are the potential demands, and
- the estimated quantity required a week when in season?

Vegetables—baby carrots; celeriac; eschalots; okra; Chinese snow pod peas; sugar peas; chives; butter beans; French beans; graded mushrooms; graded Brussel sprouts; broccoli, top quality; egg tomatoes, red; egg tomatoes, yellow; Belgium endives; romaine lettuce; radicchio; spinach; luttuga; scarola; cicoria.

Fresh herbs—angelica; basil, sweet; basil, bush; bay trees; garlic chives; dill; marjoram;

oregano; sage; tarragon russion; thymus herva; barona; thymus vulgaris; Siberian chives; fennel; parsley Italian; rosemary; tarragon French; capers; coriander; lovage; chernic; applemint; variegated applemint; Corsican mint; eau de cologne mint; peppermint; pineapple mint; spearmint.

Fruits and nuts—monstera deliciosa; avocados, fuerte; custard apples; mango; guava, strawberry; guava, cherry; guava, ordinary yellow; feijohs; pawpaw; persimmons; limes, Tahitian; Chinese gooseberries; lychees nuts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. About 200 restaurants or hotels were circularised with the questionnaire from the Government Fruit and Vegetable Garden Working Party, chaired by Mr. G. Latham. There was no follow-up; 57 replies were received.

2. The questionnaire did not elicit the quantity presently used. However, the quantified results of the survey, omitting sources of supply, are expressed in the attached table. The response to "Sources of supply" does not lend itself to tabulation, particularly as answers in this section were frequently not given and where they were given were often too general to be of use. The attached table expresses the number of respondents not currently using the specified items who would do so if they were more readily available. The total quantity per week required when in season relates only to the expressed needs of respondents not currently using specified items but wishing to do so.

FILM CORPORATION

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many premises does the South Australian Film Corporation rent or own, and where are they situated?

2. Where premises are rented, who owns them and what is the rental?

3. For premises occupied by the Corporation:

- what furnishing has been completed in any of the premises and at what cost;
- what additional furnishing is contemplated and at what cost;
- what have been the telephone accounts for each completed charge period; and
- are there any special features of the telephone costs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The South Australian Film Corporation does not own any premises. The corporation rents the following five premises:

- 2nd Floor, 59 King William Street, Adelaide.
- 64 Fullarton Road, Norwood.
- 1A Gray Street, Norwood.
- 230 The Parade, Norwood.
- 164 O'Connell Street, North Adelaide.

2. Owners:	Monthly Rental \$
(i) Public Buildings Department.....	586.46
(ii) Gorizis Investments Proprietary Limited.....	1 208.33
(iii) Gorizis Investments Proprietary Limited.....	108.34
(iv) The Greater Union Organisation Proprietary Limited.....	953.78
(v) Adelaide Development Company Proprietary Limited.....	885.00

3. (a) Furnishing completed:

- Supplied for administration office by Public Buildings Department.

(ii) Production and distribution office:

14 office desks
 7 typists desks with returns
 21 office chairs
 10 conference chairs
 17 theatrette chairs
 3 stationery cupboards
 16 film cabinets
 3 bookshelves
 2 workbenches

9 desk lamps
 2 fans
 2 electric urns
 2 electric jugs
 14 radiators
 1 reconditioned refrigerator
 steel shelving
 linoleum for editing
 rooms
 curtains and carpet for
 theatrette..... \$13 122

VEGETABLES

Vegetable	No. who presently use it	Source of supply	No. who would use it if available	Total quantity required when in season a week
Baby carrots.....	26	—	9	21 bunches + 203 lb. One did not indicate.
Celeriac.....	12	—	3	40 lb. 2 bunches 30 kg.
Eschalots.....	15	—	6	37 lb. One did not indicate.
Okra.....	2	—	3	10 bunches.
Chinese snow pod peas.....	4	(1 from Sydney)	7	3 tins + 15 kg.
Sugar peas.....	13	—	8	82 kg. One did not indicate.
Chives.....	15	—	6	100 kg. One did not indicate.
Butter beans.....	13	—	5	45 bunches. One did not indicate.
French beans.....	38	—	3	indicate.
Graded mushrooms.....	26	—	2	45 kilos. One did not indicate.
Graded Brussel sprouts.....	25	—	4	70 lb.
Broccoli—top quality.....	31	—	3	7 lb. One did not indicate.
Egg tomatoes—red.....	17	1 private yard and some from A.C.T.	6	5 lb. Three did not indicate.
Egg tomatoes—yellow.....	4	1 private yard and some from A.C.T.	2	25 kilos. 15 lb.
Belgium endives (witlof).....	3	—	9	30 kilos. + 12 lb. + 4 cases.
Romaine (cos) lettuce.....	21	—	6	17 lb.
Radicchio.....	18	—	4	27 lb. + 2 cases. Four did not indicate.
Spinaci.....	16	—	5	75 head + 10 lb. + 1 case.
Luttuga.....	6	—	1	5 lb. + 41 lb. + a few.
Scarola.....	7	1 private yard and some from A.C.T.	4	10 lb. + a few.
Cicoria.....	7	Some from A.C.T.	5	2 cases.

Potatoes: eight respondents requested graded varieties of potatoes. Additional varieties suggested perthuis (for mash), Bentje (for chips), conichons (for stew).

Additions: Artichokes, knoll, kale, sorrell, young grade beetroot, baby marrows, egg plants, chic peas, broad beans, Chinese cabbage, zucchini.

FRESH HERBS (not dried)

Herb	No. who presently use it	Source of supply	No. who would use it if available	Total quantity required when in season a week
Angelica.....	7	—	4	(In each case only talking of a few bunches or of a few oz.)
Basil, sweet.....	11	—	7	
Basil, bush.....	6	—	3	
Bay trees.....	15	—	3	
Garlic chives.....	22	—	2	
Dill.....	10	—	5	
Marjoram.....	13	—	7	
Oregano.....	13	—	7	
Sage.....	12	—	5	
Tarragon—Russian.....	7	—	5	
Thymus herba—Barona.....	5	—	4	
Thymus vulgaris.....	5	—	—	
Siberian chives.....	2	—	2	
Fennel.....	9	—	4	
Parsley—Italian.....	19	—	3	
Rosemary.....	13	—	4	
Tarragon—French.....	4	—	6	
Capers.....	12	—	3	
Coriander.....	3	—	4	
Lovage.....	2	—	1	
Chernic.....	3	—	1	

FRESH HERBS (not dried)—*continued*

Herb	No. who presently use it	Source of supply	No. who would use it if available	Total quantity required when in season a week
Applemint.....	2	—	1	
Variegated applemint.....	—	—	1	
Corsican mint.....	1	—	—	
Eau de cologne mint.....	—	—	1	
Peppermint.....	3	—	3	
Pineapple mint.....	—	—	2	
Spearmint.....	3	—	11	

Additions: Red paprika, cumin, cardamom, lemongrass, chilli, ginger, tansy, anise, balm, hyssop.

FRUITS AND NUTS

Fruits	No. who presently use it	Source of supply	No. who would use it if available	Total quantity required when in season a week
Monstro delicious.....	1	—	3	10 pieces. One did not indicate.
Avocados—fuerte.....	19	—	2	1 case. One did not indicate.
Custard apples.....	4	—	6	22 kg. + 10 pieces + 51b. Two did not indicate.
Mango.....	8	—	10	40 pieces + 1 case + 5 lb. Four did not indicate.
Guava—strawberry.....	3	—	6	+6 kg. 25 pieces + 81b. + 50 punnets. Two did not indicate.
Guava—cherry.....	2	—	2	Two did not indicate.
Guava—ordinary yellow.....	2	—	3	25 pieces. Two did not indicate.
Feijohs.....	2	—	2	One did not indicate, ½ lb.
Pawpaw.....	6	—	7	12 pieces + 5 lb. + 1 case. Two did not indicate.
Persimmons.....	—	—	2	½ case. One did not indicate.
Limes—Tahitian.....	—	—	5	2 cases. Three did not indicate.
Chinese gooseberries.....	11	—	6	6 kg. + 3 doz. + case. Two did not indicate.

Nuts	No. who presently use it	Source of supply	No. who would use it if available	Total quantity required when in season a week
Lychee nuts.....	7	—	4	22 kg. One did not indicate.

Additions: Rambutans, logans, jackfruit, chestnuts, macadamia nuts, raspberries, mulberries, quinces, figs, tapoverallas, pine nuts, tabini, tangerine, American almond, African cashews.

	\$		\$
(iii) Short-term accommodation: 4 sets divans, wardrobes, chairs, lamps, lounge suite, electric radiator, partial recarpet/retile ..	2 114	(iii) Short-term accommodation ..	—
(iv) Studio, sound mixing suite and non-commercial theatre: Partial recarpet and reseating	3 093	(iv) Studio, sound mixing and theatre: sundry furniture for reception clerk and studio crews.....	1 500
(v) Film library: 6 office desks 3 typists desks 1 reconditioned refrigerator 18 office and theatre chairs theatrette carpet and curtains	4 416	(v) Film library: 6 sets desks, chairs etc. for staff expansion and replacement of borrowed items; chairs for visitors and resource users.....	2 400
(b) Additional furnishing contemplated: (i) Administration: 4 sets desks, chairs, etc., for staff expansion, fire-proof cabinets, document shredder, separation screens, kerosene heaters	4 000	(c) This information is now being compiled and will follow as soon as possible.	
(ii) Production and distribution: 9 sets desks, chairs, etc., for staff expansion; desk lamps, kerosene heaters, separation screens	6 876	(d) The corporation is required to carry out a great deal of urgent interstate negotiations by telephone including film laboratory work, film library supplies, Commonwealth production financing, senior production personnel and film distributors. To control the use of STD facilities, the corporation's switchboards are trunk access barred for switch lines except one at the administration office and the studio and all lines except two at the production/distribution office and the film library. Switch operators compile weekly lists of long distance calls which are scrutinised by heads of divisions.	

HILLS ROADS

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What was the traffic count for the most recent surveys on Blacks Road, Aberfoyle Park; Kenehans Road, Happy Valley; and Ackland Hill Road, Coromandel Valley, respectively?

2. When is work expected to be carried out on Laffers Road, Belair?

3. Why do Municipal Tramways Trust buses not have the name and weight displayed on them?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Blacks Road, 1 300 vehicles in 24 hours; Kenehan Road, 340 vehicles in 24 hours; Ackland Hill Road, 350 vehicles in 24 hours.

2. This road is under the care and control of the Corporation of the City of Mitcham. The Highways Department has no current proposal for work to be carried out on this road.

3. Under section 163 (4) of the Road Traffic Act, Municipal Tramways Trust vehicles are exempt.

MONITORING SYSTEM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What has been the cost, so far, of establishing the new Government media monitoring service?

2. What is now the estimated annual cost of operating it?

3. Will the information obtained from it be made available to the public and to members of Parliament and, if so, when?

4. If it is not to be made available, why not, and to whom will that information be available?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The cost to date of establishing the Government media monitoring service is \$5 900.

2. The estimated annual cost of operating the service is about \$12 000 based on part-time services of the Media Co-ordinator and Press Secretary to the Chief Secretary (Mr. K. Crease) and typing services, etc.

3 and 4. Consideration is being given to the feasibility of making information available to members of Parliament.

TUTORIALS

Mr. EVANS (on notice): Is it a fact that tutorials conducted by colleges of advanced education have been held in hotels and, if so—

- (a) on what dates were the tutorials held;
- (b) is it intended to continue this practice;
- (c) was alcohol consumed during these tutorials;
- (d) were the participants first, second, third, or fourth year students; and
- (e) whose decision was it to hold tutorials in hotels?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: One tutorial group for a class in one college of advanced education has met in a private room in an hotel. It is this class to which the member for Fisher has agreed to give a lecture tonight.

- (a) Commencing at 7 p.m. in the evening on most Tuesdays during term times, following a lecture in the college at 6 p.m.
- (b) The matter must be decided by the college council.
- (c) Yes, by those who wished to.
- (d) The tutorial group consists of about 14 mature age part-time students taking a third-year subject.
- (e) By consensus of tutor and students.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is it intended to amend or redraft the Mental Health Act and, if so, when?

2. Will changes be made in the provisions for certification and, if so, what changes?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. A committee is examining proposals and a report will be made in due course.

2. Yes. The changes in the provisions for certification are included in the proposals presently being examined by the committee.

PETROL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What stocks of super grade petrol were held in South Australia on October 4 and 11, 1974, respectively?

2. What is the method of allocation and distribution of petrol from the Port Stanvac oil refinery to the various oil companies?

3. Why are Ampol service stations experiencing a shortage of super grade petrol?

4. When will full supplies be restored?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. This information is not readily available. To obtain it would entail an inordinate amount of work because it could only be obtained from every organisation and individual that stores petrol.

2. In accordance with normal business practice the principals of the refinery determine the method of distribution.

3. The Government has not been advised of such shortage.

4. Vide No. 3.

SCHOOL TELEPHONES

Mr. RODDA (on notice): Will the Education Department take over telephone services installed by and at the expense of school councils in Deputy Headmasters' houses where the service is necessary for the running of the school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not policy of the Education Department to provide telephones for Deputy Headmasters at departmental expense, or to reimburse school councils for such expenditure in cases where the service has been provided for the Deputy Headmaster by the school council.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. How many tradesmen are working for the Public Buildings Department?

2. What are their different categories and how many are working in each trade?

3. How many apprentices were working in the department in each of the years 1970-71, 1971-72, and 1973-74, and to date in the present financial year?

4. What is the year of their apprenticeships, and to what trades are they apprenticed?

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

1. 1 425.

2.

	No. of tradesmen
Awards—State:	
Bricklayers and tuckpointers.....	17
Government foremen (construction and maintenance).....	23
Government foremen (tradesmen/workshop)	52
Painters and decorators.....	269
Plasterers and terrazzo workers.....	27
Plumbers and gasfitters.....	121
Awards—Federal:	
Carpenters and joiners.....	283
Metal trades.....	444

	No. of tradesmen
Agreements—Federal:	
Timber workers.....	36
Carpenters and joiners.....	140
French Polishers.....	5
Lino layers.....	4
Upholsterers.....	2
Panel beaters.....	2

3. and 4. Considerable research is necessary to provide information required. Would the honourable member please ask these questions again?

ALCOHOL EDUCATION

Mr. EVANS (on notice): Is it intended that special education programmes be introduced at Ceduna, or any other area of South Australia, to help solve the problems associated with the consumption of alcoholic beverages?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No special educational programmes have been introduced in Ceduna or other similar areas on alcoholism. At present education programmes on a modest scale are conducted by the Public Health Department, Community Welfare Department and others, but do not impinge directly upon the school. Teams from the Public Health Department are available to speak to schools on these matters on the invitation of the principals. Alcoholism is part of the health course being conducted at present in 31 pilot schools, but not, as yet, in Ceduna.

FESTIVAL BOOKLET

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many copies of the booklet *Adelaide, The Festival City* have been printed and what was the total cost of preparation and production?

2. Who and how many persons were involved in the preparation of this booklet, and how long did it take?

3. Why was a photograph of the Premier used in the booklet instead of a male model?

4. Has the accuracy of statements in the booklet been checked?

5. Where has the booklet been distributed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. A total of 100 000 booklets is being printed by the Government Printer at a cost of \$27 000, including platemaking. It is difficult to give the cost of preparation as work by the officers concerned was spread over several months, phased in with a programme of other work.

2. Publicity Branch, Premier's Department, produced the booklet and the officers mainly involved were one journalist, one illustrator (designer) and a photographer, for photographs not already on file. It was produced over several months primarily because it was necessary to await ideal weather and seasonal conditions for photography. Other photographers whose work is included are Jan Dalman, Bill Neve, Brian Rohde, Ian Bawden and Kent Rossiter, who were given credits in the book. Type was set by Modgraphic, Litho Platemakers made the plates and it was printed by the Government Printer.

3. The photograph of the Premier was used to lend status to the booklet; signature and title were deliberately omitted in the interests of informality and, as opposed to a male model, the Premier's services were gratis. The message on the page in question was from the Premier.

4. The writing in the booklet is informal. However, it is not the intention of the Government to mislead people with inaccurate statements. The booklet aims at giving a pleasant, casual and fair account of the State's attractions.

5. It was produced by the Publicity Branch of the Premier's Department for the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, and at present only 40 000 of the total order have been completed. A preliminary delivery has resulted in copies being sent to New Zealand to accompany a major combined South Australian and Australian Tourist Commission sales promotion. The main distribution has been to interstate offices of the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau, the South Australian Agent-General, and to travel agents throughout Australia. Other copies have been sent to Australian Government Embassies and Consulates overseas and the Department of the Media. Further oversea distribution will follow completion of printing. Indications are that the booklet has been very well received.

PREMIER'S OFFICE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the total cost, including consultants' fees, etc., of refurbishing the Premier's office at Parliament House?

2. What type of furniture was acquired?

3. Why was such decor decided upon?

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

1. \$10 993.81.

2. Period furniture.

3. The decor was determined to conform with period of the building.

SHACKS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Does the Minister's statement on shack sites announced on October 2 apply to Crown land only?

2. Can private subdividers still lease freehold property for new shack sites?

3. Will it be permitted for shacks along the Murray River that are damaged or destroyed by floods to be repaired or replaced?

4. Are new shacks still permitted to be erected on council owned and leased property?

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

1. The policy on shack sites announced by the Minister of Lands on October 2, 1974, intended to apply to Crown land and land licensed, dedicated or reserved to councils for shack site purposes in waterfront areas.

2. The Lands Department has no control over subdivision or leasing freehold land. Subdivision for shack site purposes would be subject to normal legislative provisions applying to the subdivision of freehold land.

3. This question is still under consideration and a decision is expected to be reached in the near future.

4. It is intended that the announced policy apply to land held by councils from the Crown.

HOUSING TRUST FLATS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Have contracts been let for the erection of Housing Trust flats at Novar Gardens and what was the amount of each contract?

2. How many flats will be erected and what is expected to be the total cost?

3. What weekly rentals will be charged a unit?

4. Has an environmental impact study been taken of the area and, if so, what were the findings?

5. If such a study was not made, why not?

6. When is the project expected to be commenced and completed?

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

1. The trust has accepted a tender and let a contract for the construction of 50 flat-type dwellings. The trust intends to call tenders for a further 51 flat-type dwellings in the same area within the next few weeks.

2. A total of 101 flats is intended for the area. The trust has let a contract for 50 at this stage, so it is not possible to give an estimate of the total cost. The contract for the 50 flat-type dwellings has not been started.

3. Weekly rentals for the flats have not been calculated and cannot be calculated until such time as the final cost can be determined, but in any case, all rents will relate to the income of occupants.

4. An environmental impact study has not been undertaken in this area.

5. It is generally expected that in some areas the Environment and Conservation Department may require an impact study, but the preplanning of this particular area did not include a requirement for such a study at that time.

6. The contractor for the first 50 dwellings in the area will be given possession of the site on October 21, 1974, and it is expected that all dwellings in this first stage will be completed early in 1976, with completion of the whole site, including site works and landscaping, in March 1976.

NORTH HAVEN

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Where has the sand dredged from the sea at North Haven been deposited and why?

2. How much sand has been removed and how much is expected to be moved?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. Within the boundaries of North Haven in accordance with the Indenture Act.

2. No sand has been removed to outside the boundaries set down in the North Haven Indenture Act. The work being done to the sand is to rearrange it to suit the development. However, the Indenture Act does provide that any surplus sand will become the property of the Government and is to be used, if any is available, for beach replenishment on the metropolitan coast.

GENERAL MOTORS-HOLDEN'S

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has there been any official indication that General Motors-Holden's is considering transferring any part of its activities from South Australia, and, if so, what part of its activities is it intended to transfer?

2. If any activities are to be transferred, where will they be resited?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has not received recently any indication from General Motors-Holden's that it is considering transferring any part of its activities from South Australia. The transfer of the Torana assembly line to Dandenong, Victoria, was under consideration by the company some time ago but the company's present intentions regarding this transfer are not known.

TENDERS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. By what percentage has the level of tenders accepted for major construction projects worth \$500 000 or more fallen in South Australia during the last month, compared to the same month last year?

2. By what percentage has the level of such accepted tenders fallen in respect of Government projects and non-government projects, respectively?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Public Buildings Department was the only department that let contracts in excess of \$500 000 in September, 1973 and 1974. One contract was let in each September month.

2. There are no published statistics that would indicate the level of tenders accepted for major private building projects. However, the indications from a recent survey of architects' offices conducted by the Master Builders Association are that the current level of non-acceptance is higher than previously.

PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many prosecutions have been made for the non-payment of pay-roll tax since its collection has been handled by the State?

2. What is the amount and penalties involved?

3. What action is being taken to ensure maximum collection?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Nine prosecutions for failure to supply information and two Local Court actions for failure to pay tax have been finalised. Twenty-four prosecutions were withdrawn following payment of tax, or commencement of bankruptcy or liquidation proceedings, or other action. Five Local Court actions were discontinued. One prosecution and four Local Court actions are proceeding at present.

2. Penalties for failure to supply information have amounted to \$6328.08. Tax involved in Local Court actions finalised amounted to \$2 564.33.

3. (a) Inquiries are made to detect unregistered employers.

(b) Industrial inspectors employed in the Labour and Industry Department are authorised to perform duties under the Pay-roll Tax Act, 1971-1974.

(c) Administrative action is taken regularly to follow up returns outstanding.

(d) Inspections of books and records of employers are made wherever necessary to enable assessments of tax to be issued.

(e) In appropriate cases employers are prosecuted for failure to supply information or failure to pay tax. However, every effort is made by personal contact to recover tax without recourse to prosecution.

SCHOOL LEAVERS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is it expected some students will return to school next year because of the increasing rate of unemployment in the community?

2. What studies have been undertaken to determine what proportion of students now intending to leave school this year may consider returning to school for this reason, and what have been the results of such studies?

3. What number of intending school leavers this year is it expected will return to school next year?

4. What actions are now being taken to provide assistance to those school leavers who may have difficulty in obtaining employment?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. No detailed studies have been undertaken.

3. It is not possible to say precisely. Our estimates would make only an approximate allowance for this factor.

4. In the past, school leavers having difficulty in finding employment have returned to school, sometimes to study for the whole year, but most often to leave school when suitable employment has been found. Assistance in finding jobs occurs mainly through the Commonwealth Employment Service.

POLICE DOGS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is the operation of the Police Dog Squad proving to be as successful as was contemplated when it was first set up?

2. Is it intended to increase the number of dogs and handlers and, if so, by what number and when?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The operation of the Police Dog Squad is as successful at this stage of its development as was expected when it was first set up.

2. It is intended to increase the number of dogs and handlers. This will be a slow process over a period of years contingent upon the raising or purchase of suitable dogs and the training of handlers. It is necessary to assess the capacity of a dog squad in Australian conditions to a far greater extent than has been possible at present before specifying the number which need to be employed in the South Australian Police. A guide to the eventual establishment of a dog squad can be gauged by the fact that in the United Kingdom this section consists of 2 per cent of the total active strength of the force to which they belong. It is not expected that such a percentage will be reached, if at all, for many years in South Australia.

TRANSPORT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to transfer the South Australian Railways to the Commonwealth Government and, if so, when will this transfer take place?

2. What other departments under the control of the Minister are being considered for take-over by the Commonwealth?

3. To what extent is forward planning for the transport needs of this State being inhibited by the need to consider the availability of specific funds from the Commonwealth Government and the need therefore to obtain Commonwealth approval for each project?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. The matter is still being considered.

2. None.

3. None.

LAND COMMISSION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many land purchases or acquisitions made by the South Australian Land Commission have exceeded \$200 000 in value?

2. For each such purchase or acquisition—

(a) what was the location and stage of development of the land;

(b) what was the purchase or acquisition price; and

(c) who was the vendor or landowner?

3. Has the South Australian Land Commission purchased or acquired land from Realty Development Corporation and, if so, what were the details of such transactions?

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

1. 12.

2. (a), (b) and (c).

Location	Stage of development	Price \$'000	Vendor
1. Golden Grove ..	Broad acres .	3 500	Cambridge Credit Corporation Limited.
2. Noarlunga ...	Broad acres .	525	Noarlunga Ostrich Farm.
3. Salisbury ...	Broad acres .	287	South Australian Housing Trust.
4. Christie Downs .	Broad acres .	212	South Australian Housing Trust.
5. Seaford.....	Broad acres .	200	South Australian Housing Trust.
6. Smithfield ...	Broad acres .	725	South Australian Housing Trust.
7. Happy Valley ..	Broad acres .	280	Happy Valley Estates.
8. Noarlunga ...	Broad acres .	287	H. V. Antonio.
9. Happy Valley ..	Proposal plan for subdivision lodged	310	International Holiday Co-op. Ltd.
10. Noarlunga ...	Proposal plan for subdivision lodged	900	International Holiday Co-op. Ltd.
11. Happy Valley ..	Proposal plan for subdivision lodged	475	World Travel Co-op.
12. Happy Valley ..	Proposal plan for subdivision lodged	338	World Travel Co-op.

3. An agreement has been negotiated with Realty Development Corporation and a contract is presently being prepared by the Crown Solicitor. Until such time as a contract is signed, this matter must remain confidential in the interests of the parties concerned.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many persons are now working for the South Australian Land Commission?

2. What is the total annual cost of the salaries of these employees?

3. What are the work classifications of each person working for the commission and about what are the annual salaries of each classification?

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

1. 16.

2. \$170 640.

	\$
3. 1 Chairman.....	26 038.....
1 Director (Operations).....	18 000
1 Manager (land acquisitions and land management).....	13 699
1 Manager (land development).....	13 115
1 Manager (land marketing and land disposal).....	14 048.....
1 Manager (services).....	13 699
1 Valuer, Grade III.....	12 236
1 Clerk.....	8 535
3 Clerks.....	23 934
1 Steno-Secretary, Grade II.....	6 460

	\$
1 Junior Clerk.....	4 477
1 Office assistant.....	5 494
1 Office assistant.....	5 457
1 Clerical assistant.....	5 448

HALLETT COVE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to take any further action to preserve Hallett Cove and its surrounds and, if so, what action?

2. If action is to be taken, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I refer the honourable member to my reply to the Question on Notice on July 30, 1974: (*Hansard*, page 128).

WIRABARA LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Were tenders called for chaining, or dozing and heaping and burning of the land being part section 1, hundred of Darling and part plantation F, hundred of Howe, an area of about 29 hectares in the Wirrabara forest reserve?

2. If tenders were called—

- (a) why were they called;
- (b) when were they called and by whom;
- (c) were such tenders to close at 12 noon on Monday, September 23, 1974, and, if not, on what date were they to close; and
- (d) were any tenders received?

3. Is it still intended that such land be cleared and, if so, why?

4. If it is not to be cleared, for what purpose is it now intended that the land be used?

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

- 1. Yes.
- 2. (a) For preparation of grazing land for pine planting;
- (b) September 7, 1974—Woods and Forests Department;
- (c) Yes;
- (d) Yes.
- 3. Yes, vide 2 (a) above.
- 4. Vide 3 above.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Were tenders called for chaining, or dozing and heaping and burning of the land being part section 614 4D, hundred of Appila, an area of about 120 hectares in the Wirrabara forest reserve?

2. If tenders were called—

- (a) why were they called;
- (b) when were they called and by whom;
- (c) were such tenders to close at 12 noon on Monday, September 23, 1974, and, if not, on what date were they to close; and
- (d) were any tenders received?

3. Is it still intended that such land be cleared and, if so why?

4. If it is not to be cleared, for what purpose is it now intended that the land be used?

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

- 1. Yes.
- 2. (a) For preparation of grazing land for pine planting;
- (b) September 7, 1974—Woods and Forests Department;
- (c) Yes;
- (d) Yes.
- 3. Yes, vide 2 (a) above.
- 4. Vide 3 above.

SECOND VALLEY LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Were tenders called for chaining, or dozing and heaping and the burning of the land being part sections 48 and 50, hundred of Waitpinga, an area of about 136 hectares in the Second Valley forest reserve?

2. If tenders were called—

- (a) why were they called;
- (b) when were they called and by whom;
- (c) were such tenders to close at 12 noon on Monday, September 23, 1974, and, if not, on what date were they to close; and
- (d) were any tenders received?

3. Is such land adjacent to the Deep Creek National Park?

4. Is it still intended that such land be cleared and, if so, why?

5. If it is not to be cleared, for what purpose is it now intended that the land be used?

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

- 1. Yes.
- 2. (a) For preparation of former farm land for pine planting;
- (b) September, 1974—Woods and Forests Department;
- (c) Yes;
- (d) No.
- 3. No.
- 4. No.
- 5. Land is to be resumed from forest reserve and transferred to the Environment and Conservation Department.

CUDLEE CREEK LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Were tenders called for chaining, or dozing and heaping, burning and ripping of planting lines of the land being part section 256, hundred of Talunga and part sections 204 and 205, hundred of Onkaparinga, an area of about 80 hectares in the Cudlee Creek forest reserve?

2. If tenders were called—

- (a) why were they called;
- (b) when were they called and by whom;
- (c) were such tenders to close at 12 noon on Monday, September 23, 1974, and, if not, on what date were they to close;
- (d) were any tenders received?

3. Is it still intended that such land be cleared and, if so, why?

4. If it is not to be cleared, for what purpose is it now intended that the land be used?

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

- 1. Yes.
- 2. (a) Preparation of former farm land for pine planting.
- (b) September 7, 1974—Woods and Forests Department.
- (c) Yes.
- (d) Yes.
- 3. Yes, vide 2 (a) above.
- 4. Vide 3 above.

CIVIL DEFENCE

Mr. CUMBE (on notice):

1. On Friday, October 4, 1974, was the civil defence organisation placed on alert as a result of the flooding in the Gawler area and, if so, were its services used as part of a co-ordinated emergency service?

2. If they were not so used, why not?

3. Will it be the policy of the Government to make use of civil defence personnel in future emergencies of a similar nature?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The Deputy Director of Civil Defence was called into conference with senior police officers to discuss the extent of the alert in regard to the flooding in the Gawler area. As a result, 125 volunteer members of the civil defence organisation were placed on standby up to 7.55 p.m. on October 4, 1974. They were then released because the water level was then falling.

2. Not applicable in view of the answer to Part 1.

3. Yes.

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. Is workmen's compensation applicable to civil defence members injured in the course of their duties?

2. If it is not applicable, is it planned to provide this type of cover for these persons?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Government has in operation a policy of insurance which provides cover for civil defence members under the age of 70 years who may suffer injury whilst in the course of civil defence duties. Such cover provides benefits equal to those provided by the Workmen's Compensation Act except that weekly payments are restricted to a period of 26 weeks in any one year in respect of any insured person.

PUERNONG PROPERTY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What action is the Government willing to take to protect the store and attached dwelling at Purnong Landing against its imminent flooding by the Murray River?

2. If no action is to be taken, why not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Because the store could not continue to give a service to the community during the flood, as access will be cut off and the majority of shacks will be unoccupied, no assistance could be given to the store at Purnong Landing. It is approved policy to provide assistance for the protection of community services where that is practicable.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Have tenders been called for the first stage of the redevelopment plan for Glenside Hospital recently announced again by the Minister of Health and, if not, when will they be called?

2. When is it expected work will eventually commence on the project and when is it likely to be completed?

3. Does commencement of work on the project, and its eventual completion, depend upon special Commonwealth funds being made available, and has the Commonwealth Government given approval for the project to proceed?

4. If approval has been given, what guarantee has been given that these funds will be made available by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Tenders have been called for the 64-bed subacute ward at Glenside Hospital which is the first stage of the redevelopment recently announced by the Minister of Health. The tender recommended was accepted by Cabinet on Monday, October 7, 1974, and a letter of acceptance was forwarded to the successful tenderer on October 11, 1974.

2. It is expected that work will have commenced on site by early November, 1974, and it is expected that the project will be completed by early 1976.

3. The commencement of work on the project is not dependent on special Australian Government funds being made available.

4. Vide 3.

REDCLIFF INDENTURE BILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What is now the time table for the Redcliff Indenture Bill?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is intended that the Redcliff Indenture Bill will be introduced in the South Australian Parliament on November 12, and referred to the committee immediately afterwards. It would be hoped that passage of the Bill would be effected by the first week of December.

HOSPITAL WORKS COUNCIL

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has a joint hospital works council been set up in South Australia and, if not, when is it expected to be set up?

2. If it is to be set up, who are the members of that council representing the Commonwealth and State Governments, respectively?

3. If the council has been set up—

(a) has it held any meetings and, if so, what projects have been considered; and

(b) will it report regularly to this Parliament on its deliberations and recommendations, and, if so, when will the first report be made?

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

1. Yes. An interim joint hospital works council has been set up.

2. The present membership of the interim council is as follows:

From the Australian Government: Dr. S. Sax, Chairman, Hospitals and Health Services Commission; Mr. J. Blandford, Deputy Chairman, Hospitals and Health Services Commission; and Dr. B. Hennessy, member Hospitals and Health Services Commission. From the South Australian Government: Dr. B. J. Shea, Director-General of Medical Services; Dr. W. A. Dibden, Director of Mental Health Services; and Mr. C. G. Rankin, Hospital Planning Consultant, Hospitals Department.

3. (a) The first meeting of the interim council was held in Adelaide on October 8 and 9, 1974. Projects under construction and proposed were discussed generally, and the State has been requested to submit for consideration by October 31 next, proposals for additional projects to be commenced during the present financial year.

(b) No.

RESERVOIRS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What was the date of completion of each reservoir in South Australia?

2. What is the date of the last inspection of the structural safety of each reservoir?

3. Was the report on any inspection critical of the safety of any reservoir and, if so, which ones and to what degree?

4. Is it intended to undertake any major repair or remedial action to any reservoir?

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

	1.Thorndon Park.....	1860
Hope Valley.....		1871
Beetaloo.....		1890
Happy Valley.....		1896
Nectar Brook.....		1899

Bundaleer.....	1902
Barossa.....	1902
Yeldulknie.....	1913
Ullabidinie.....	1914
Warren.....	1916
Hindmarsh Valley.....	1917
Millbrook.....	1918
Baroota.....	1921
Tod River.....	1922
Mount Bold.....	1938
Mount Bold (raised).....	1962
South Para.....	1958
South Para (raised).....	1960
Myponga.....	1962
Sturt Flood Control Dam.....	1965
Middle River.....	1968
Kangaroo Creek.....	1969

2. and 3. A continuous programme of inspection of all dams is carried out by operating staff, and any maintenance work is put in hand as and where necessary. Special instrumentation and observation points were installed on all concrete dams constructed in the post-war period, and readings have been taken on a regular basis since their commissioning.

Provisional results to date are as follows:

Myponga dam: Stress deflection and leakage measurements are taken twice annually at high water and low water conditions, and results show that the structural behaviour of that load is within the design criteria.

Sturt dam: Deflection measurements are taken once a year when the dam is retaining the water, and all readings have been as calculated for the observed loading conditions.

Middle River dam: Deflection readings of the dam and electrical readings on the prestressed cables to check on possible corrosion were originally taken three times a year, but, because of consistent results, these have been decreased to annual readings.

Kangaroo Creek dam: Stress deflection and leakage measurements are taken twice a year during high and low water conditions. The results indicate that the dam is behaving within the design criteria.

In 1971 a programme was instituted to review the safety of the older dams especially those constructed before 1939. The investigation includes geological inspections of abutments and foundations, the physical examination of cores taken from the body of the dams, reassessment of the capacity of spillways using current hydrological data, and the examination of the stability of the dam structures using modern methods of analysis. As this is a long-term investigation, the time required to fully examine all aspects of one dam may extend over a period of several years. Initial work therefore has been directed to particular areas where operating experience suggests there may have been some deficiencies in the original designs. The following is a summary of work carried out to date in the programme:

Hindmarsh Valley dam: A preliminary hydrological examination has indicated that the spillway capacity may be inadequate to cope with a flood which would be adopted as a criteria for present-day spillway design. This matter is being further investigated.

Beetaloo dam: Initial investigations were completed in 1973, and, as these did not reveal any deficiencies requiring immediate remedial work, the investigational resources have been diverted to other dams.

Happy Valley dam: The stability of the earthen embankment is now being examined using modern soil mechanics

analysis techniques. Work to date has not indicated any cause for concern.

Hope Valley dam: A similar analysis to that at Happy Valley is now in hand, and initial results indicate that the embankment is in good condition.

Barossa dam: The stability of the concrete arch is under investigation as proposals are being considered for increasing the capacity of the outlet works. Work to date indicates that the condition of the dam is good.

Millbrook dam: Although inspections carried out in 1971 indicated that the dam was in good condition, further work is warranted but has been assigned low priority in the overall programme.

Mount Bold dam: As a result of investigations in 1971, the upper portion of the original dam was post-tensioned in 1973 to increase its factor of safety against uplift. No further major remedial works are envisaged.

South Para dam: An inspection in 1971 did not reveal any critical design deficiencies, and no major remedial action is contemplated.

Baroota dam: Two major lines of investigation are proceeding on this dam. There has been considerable trouble with the spillway in time of major floods, and designs have been provided for its replacement. The stability of the earthen embankment is now being reviewed in light of new operating conditions which will be required when the Red-cliffs complex is in production.

Warren dam: A hydrological study completed in August, 1974, indicated that the spillway is inadequate to cope with a flood with a statistical return period of 50 years or greater. If the dam is over-topped, the theoretical factor of safety against overturning is unacceptable in terms of present-day standards for the calculation of stability of concrete dams.

Bundaleer dam: An inspection and review of the design were carried out in February, 1973, and no critical factors were evident.

Nectar Brook: Some leakage in the outlet tunnel was noted in a 1973 inspection and, although not critical to the safety of the reservoir, it is intended to carry out the cement grouting.

Yeldulknie, Ullabidinie, Tod River and Thorndon Park: All these dams are in satisfactory condition and no remedial work is contemplated in the near future.

4. It is intended to carry out major remedial work at (1) Baroota dam, where the existing spillway will be replaced by a spillway of larger capacity, a model of which is now under test at the South Australian Institute of Technology, and (2) Warren dam where the spillway capacity will be increased by lowering the level of its sill. This will enable a larger flood surcharge to be accommodated in the storage without raising the water level to a height which could affect the stability of the dam. This method was preferred to the alternatives of increasing resistance of the dam to overturning by either the installation of post-tensioning cables through the dam to the rock foundation, or the placing of a rock buttress on the down stream side.

WATER RATES

Mr. McANANEY (on notice): What amounts, respectively, for water rates and for the use of excess water were collected in the city of Adelaide during 1973-74?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Water rates, \$2 194 205; sewer rates, \$2 285 307; and excess water rates, \$251 907.

WEST LAKES LAND

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Have any Government departments or Government or semi-government authorities purchased or acquired any

land from West Lakes Limited during the past 24 months?

2. If land has been acquired, what has been for each transaction—

- (a) the cost of the transaction;
- (b) was it a purchase or acquisition;
- (c) for what purpose was the land purchased or acquired; and
- (d) the area of land involved?

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

- 1. Yes.
- 2. (a) South Australian Housing Trust, \$43 000; Defence Service Homes—Commonwealth Government, \$345 550.
- (b) Purchase.
- (c) Residential.
- (d) 14.5 hectares.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say whether the State Government intends to make available funds for unemployment relief work in areas where Commonwealth Government allocations do not apply? We have had a notification from the Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration that on September 24, 1974, he made available the first regional employment development scheme projects. There was no actual proposal for South Australia, although it was listed that at Port Pirie there would be a proposal for drainage, that being reserved for further consideration at the next meeting of Ministers. In the overall commitments, South Australia had listed Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Port Lincoln as awkward or dangerous areas in relation to unemployment. It is recognised that many other areas in the State are also in extremely difficult circumstances regarding employment. On an earlier occasion the Government made funds available for unemployment relief work in the Adelaide metropolitan area. On that occasion, it was something of a political exercise to try to obtain a reaction against the then Liberal and Country Party in the Commonwealth Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Oh, Mr. Speaker!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has sought leave to make an explanation, and he is now getting beyond the bounds of an explanation.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you for that, Mr. Speaker. I was just pointing out to the Premier that on an earlier occasion funds were made available in questionable circumstances. I am extremely sympathetic to the requirements of the people of this State, whether they are in the city or country areas, and, where there is massive unemployment and a sectional involvement by the Commonwealth Government to provide relief, I am sympathetic towards action being taken to help all citizens of South Australia. On that basis, I seek from the Premier an indication of what action the Government will take in this vital field.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On previous occasions in South Australia, the State Government has undertaken unemployment relief programmes, sometimes supported by the Commonwealth Government. I may say that, when we undertook programmes financed by this State, the Leader and other members opposite condemned me.

Dr. Eastick: But politics—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was condemned for doing it. At that time, the politics seemed to be different. We on this side set out to help people who were unemployed, and we were condemned for doing that. The

Leader was one of those who condemned us. As far as I am concerned, his petty political attempt this afternoon is contemptible. This Government will continue to act to assist people who are unemployed in any circumstances. Regarding the present Government programme, we have been asked to provide an officer to co-ordinate the action of the State Government with that of the Commonwealth Government. We have done that, and we will continue to do so. If the Leader has any specific proposal for any specific area, he may put it to use. However, if he comes here and tries to play shabby politics, they will be dealt with as such.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say whether the Government will make officers available to contact potential school leavers about employment prospects for 1975 and to advise them whether they should continue at school for another year? Mr. Cameron (Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration) has painted a most gloomy picture of employment prospects, particularly in relation to school leavers, in the short term. The national employment and retraining scheme would hardly cope with these people, so I consider that there is and will be in this State a major problem in relation to school leavers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is contact between our departments and the Commonwealth Employment Service and, in relation to the R.E.D. plan, an officer of our Labour and Industry Department is on the committee that is running that plan. There will be constant consultation between our officers and the Commonwealth Government on this matter, and the honourable member may be assured that we will try to ensure that the necessary information about job opportunity is given to school leavers.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a liaison with Commonwealth officials regarding the Commonwealth's retraining scheme and, if so, can he say whether people are being retrained as painters in South Australia? I understand that there are more than 100 unemployed people on the register in Mount Barker. I also understand that several houses in Mount Barker and Woodside, being built by the Housing Trust, are incomplete and have not been worked on for months. Indeed, I believe that only eight houses have been completed this year out of a total of 30. Surely, with the degree of unemployment we are experiencing in Australia, people should be retrained as painters so that essential jobs can be completed, as is not happening in Australia today.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member will know that the retraining scheme is for people who need retraining in another sphere as a result of technological changes in industry. He would also know that training adult painters is contrary to the South Australian Apprentices Act, and that the position is practically the same throughout Australia. However, some people are being trained in the building industry as adult bricklayers and adult plumbers, but we have been unable to reach agreement regarding painters because painting is a trade and such retraining would be contrary to the Act. I do not know how many people are being trained under the scheme at present, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. COUMBE: Have the Minister of Labour and Industry or his officers had an opportunity to study the effects of the implementation of the Woodhouse report on a national scheme of compensation? In view of the adverse criticism being made of the possible impact of this report on the work force and on the majority of

people of Australia, and the extra cost that may be incurred by taxpayers, does the Minister believe that such a scheme will adversely affect the work force of this State? In addition, can he say what impact the report will have and what will be its effect on the South Australian Workmen's Compensation Act?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member would know that the Woodhouse report regarding workmen's compensation is the subject of a proposal for legislation to be introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament. Regarding the effect on South Australia, I can say that it will have an effect on our workmen's compensation scheme, because it will reduce the present rate. On the other hand, other compensatory measures will cover the family, wives, and unemployed persons in domestic fields. So, certain benefits can be attributed to some areas of the report. This is a complex proposal, as the honourable member would know if he had studied the report thoroughly. There has been great opposition to the report and I do not know whether the legislation will be passed by the Commonwealth Parliament. However, the recommendations in the report would affect weekly workmen's compensation payments in this State.

Mr. Coumbe: You're not happy about it?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Not particularly, at this stage.

BEACH PROTECTION REPORT

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the report of the consultative committee on beach protection has been brought down yet and, if it has, what are its recommendations relating to the speed of vehicular traffic along the esplanades of metropolitan beaches? Last session I raised several times with the Minister of Roads and Transport (as he then was) the seriousness of the matter, particularly in the light of the summer season when the esplanades were crowded, and the Minister referred me to the appropriate councils. I took up the matter with the Seaside Councils Committee and the three councils in my district. I understand that the Seaside Councils Committee supported the suggestion, and that the matter was then referred to the Minister of Environment and Conservation because consultative committees are under his control.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will check the situation for the honourable member.

STATE AID

Mr. VENNING: Will the Treasurer say, to the best of his knowledge, what is the position regarding the payment of Commonwealth moneys to the State? At the weekend it came to my attention that the money made available for the Port Pirie drainage scheme came directly from Canberra. I should have thought that a State authority would be aware of what is happening.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member read the legislation that altered the constitution of the Grants Commission.

BUSH FIRES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether the Government will make available additional funds to provide for adequate warnings and spotter aeroplanes, and incorporating available protections and safeguards, to ensure that there are no serious outbreaks of bush or grass fires this summer? I understand that, as a result of the good season in country areas, grass has grown greatly, so that there could be a grave danger of grass fires in rural areas, as well as urban areas. Although I realise that what I

suggest involves the expenditure of money at a time when the economy is unhealthy, I believe such expenditure would be good insurance in protecting properties against any serious outbreak this season of bush or grass fires.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Premier say what action the South Australian Government will take to protect the interests of the minority Australian equity capital in the Redcliff Petro-chemical Company, particularly as the products of that plant will be sold, during the first 10 years of operations, only to the three major shareholders in that company? This morning many Liberal Party members were given a treat of 21 hours of facts about the Redcliff petro-chemical plant, these facts being most welcome as we have not been given this information in the past. It was explained in the facts that were made available that the three partners (Mitsubishi, Imperial Chemical Industries, and Alcoa) would control two-thirds of equity capital in that company. I.C.I. has an Australian shareholding of 36 per cent and Alcoa 49 per cent, both of them a minority Australian shareholding. That means the effective degree of Australian shareholding comes through only in the other one-third of the entire equity of the company, that is, the 33 per cent to be offered to Australian companies. That is very much an effective minority shareholding, particularly when it comes to actual control in the prices and policies of that company. I make one point especially: it was indicated to us that for the first 10 years all products from that plant would be sold to the three partners. I believe this means automatically that, as those three partners have a majority say, they can effectively set their own price from the Redcliff Petro-chemical Company to the three independent partners. This puts the effective minority Australian shareholding of only 33 per cent in a much weakened position. Furthermore, will the Premier give an undertaking that the products of that plant will be made available to all possible purchasers in South Australia, and that they will not be solely directed through these three companies, possibly to their own overseas interests rather than to their interests in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has done an exercise in his question to try to show that, since part of the Australian shareholding in Redcliff is a minority shareholding in two of the major companies concerned, there is not an Australian majority shareholding. However, there is an Australian majority shareholding.

Mr. Dean Brown: How about Australian majority control?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has then done an exercise to show that, although there is a majority Australian shareholding, it is not a majority Australian control, since part of that shareholding is a minority shareholding in two of the major companies concerned. The honourable member then suggests that there is somehow some detriment to the shareholders involved in their sales to the markets provided by the three major companies in the consortium, and he further suggests by implication that somehow there are competing markets represented by other Australian shareholdings. However, I am afraid that that cannot be shown. If the honourable member suggests that there is a market by other Australian shareholders for ethylene dichloride I wish he would show it to me. If he suggests that a market is available for caustic soda by other Australian shareholders,

I should like to know where it is. If he cannot do those things, I am afraid that the whole of his question falls to the ground because there is not a detriment to the Australian shareholders in the marketing to those companies of the commodity that will be the major product of the Redcliff project.

Mr. Dean Brown: Will it affect the price?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member suggests that the Australian shareholders will be disadvantaged in relation to the prices obtained, I suggest that he do the ordinary thing that a believer in the free enterprise system would do and circularise the members of the companies concerned so that they can take action within their companies on their shareholding power.

Mr. Dean Brown: The majority of the shareholding is overseas.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Most of the shareholders in the Redcliff project are not overseas. I know various changes have been made in the Commonwealth policy of the Liberal Party in the last day or so, but if the honourable member believes in the free enterprise system and that somehow Australian shareholders in this democratic system will be disadvantaged—

Mr. Dean Brown: Would you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport asked a question and he has already interjected four times. If he interjects again, Standing Orders will be applied to him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member believes that somehow Australian shareholders will be disadvantaged, I am sure that he can circularise them. I know that members on the other side, in certain company dealings in South Australia, have from time to time circularised shareholders. I am not aware of any disadvantage to Australian shareholders but, if the honourable member believes there is, I am sure that he has an opportunity under the system he believes in to take necessary action.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say what formal opportunity, if any, will be provided for comment and representations after publication of the Redcliff environmental impact statement, now due in February, 1975? I, too, attended this morning's briefing on the Redcliff project in company with you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Government Party as well as some members of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Nankivell: That's a backhander.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was only putting the record straight.

The SPEAKER: Order! No record is involved.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Davenport mentioned that only so-called Liberal Party members were present. At the briefing, I was handed, as were all members who attended, whatever Party they may have represented (the Country Party member was also present), the progress report on the environmental study. I find that the report, on which the present commission hearings that began this afternoon are to be based, is only a progress report, and that the environmental impact statement is being prepared and is scheduled for completion and presentation to the South Australian Government in February, 1975. That will be too late for the commission hearings in the next fortnight, and it was obvious from what was said this morning to those present that this commission had been appointed unexpectedly and that its operations had not been calculated on in the time table. I see, from the reply to my Question on Notice regarding the time table

for the indenture Bill to be introduced in this House on November 12, that it is hoped that passage of the Bill will be effected by the first week in December, so members of this and another place will not have the opportunity to see the environmental impact study before then and, if there is to be any real opportunity for comment when that document is made public, as Parliament will not have the chance to do anything about it, I suggest that some formal opportunity should be given to persons to make representations, and so on.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member would be aware that the control of the environment in relation to this plan is a continuing process and that provision for regulations to carry out the conclusions arrived at from the monitoring process will come before Parliament. As Parliament will be meeting in February next year, the honourable member will have ample opportunity to raise matters here, and the Government will receive representations.

Mr. Millhouse: That's an undertaking, is it? We will have ample opportunity?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows the processes of the Parliament, and he will have ample opportunity, as he also knows well.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say when it is expected that Parliament will meet in February, 1975, and what opportunity the Government will then give to members to debate the disallowance of regulations dealing with the Redcliff environmental impact study? I am sure it would be a great convenience if members were to know when Parliament would meet again during February. Regarding the matter that the Premier has said we will have an opportunity to deal with, I point out that the normal custom is that private members' business is cut off probably about the end of October. As regulations are usually debated during private members' time, unless the Government is willing to make time especially available for debate on these regulations and any other regulations, in fact there will be no opportunity towards the end of the session for these matters to be debated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Parliament is expected to meet about the middle of February, 1975. In relation to any regulations that have been laid on the table between the time when Parliament adjourns and the time we meet again, we will provide time to debate a disallowance motion.

MEAT PRICES

Mr. RODDA: My question is to the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture. Has an investigation been made by the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs into the price being paid for meat by housewives in the metropolitan area? The producer is receiving 25c a pound (57c a kg) for best yearling beef and for steer beef 15c to 17c a pound or 33c to 37c a kg. A good supply of prime beef is readily available because of the excellent feed conditions obtaining throughout the State. Looking in butchers' shop windows this morning, I noticed that prices are as high as \$1.20 a pound for prime beef with a plentiful supply of beef at 80c a pound. There seems to be a large discrepancy between the price being paid for meat on the hoof and the retail price. I should be grateful if the Minister of Agriculture could look into the matter to ensure that housewives are not being denied a real benefit that should be available to them in the market place.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will take up this matter with my colleague and, if necessary, refer it to the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch.

RESERVOIRS

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Acting Minister of Works say what proposals the Engineering and Water Supply Department has to use the land that has been acquired around Mount Bold reservoir and for the future of the Clarendon reservoir? Much land has been acquired, some of it bushland and some of it land which was previously used for farming but which has deteriorated and is becoming an eyesore with noxious weeds growing on it. Surely, some economic use could be made of this land, instead of allowing noxious weeds to spread, possibly on to adjoining land.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will take up this matter with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, but I imagine that the land has been purchased in order to create a reservoir or reserve and that this would preclude its normal use. In the case of Clarendon reservoir, the land could be used as a reserve. As we are using land around the reservoir for this purpose, that would preclude its economic use. I will ascertain as soon as possible whether or not action is being taken or can be taken to guard against the spreading of noxious weeds.

HOUSING TRUST

Mr. EVANS: In the temporary absence of the Minister in charge of housing, will the Minister of Education say what adverse effect there will be on the Housing Trust's programme of the Commonwealth Government's refusal to grant sufficient funds as requested by the State Ministers? The Minister of Development and Mines has expressed his disappointment that the Commonwealth Government did not grant an extra \$9 400 000, as he would have liked, to continue the trust's programme, \$3 000 000 of which was to offset last year's over-spending in the housing field, \$1 000 000 of which was required to acquire existing properties, and \$5 400 000 of which was requested by the Minister to help those people who fell outside the means test laid down under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, thereby offering them money to build houses. We are conscious of the need for the trust to continue its programme in a satisfactory manner and it is important that members and the general public know what adverse effects the Commonwealth Government's refusal will have on the trust's future programme.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think that the honourable member's question is misleading, because the funds for housing were first expanded significantly at the Premiers' Conference in Canberra early this year, and we have now received a further injection of funds. So, the honourable member should have asked, "What limitations on expansion of the trust's programme does the decision taken by the Commonwealth Government imply?" I shall be pleased to check out the reply to that question rather than to the actual question asked by the honourable member, and I will do that with my colleague.

MIDDLE RIVER WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation explain what environmental or ecological effects could possibly result from increasing the Middle River water supply and extending that service to American River, on Kangaroo Island? The file of applications from American River residents for a water supply is now about 12 years old, as it was opened in 1962, and there has been considerable correspondence between the applicants and the respective Ministers during that time. Although I have searched the correspondence, I cannot find any reference to the need for an ecological or environmental study to be carried out with respect to this proposed

water supply. On September 26, I asked the Minister of Works a question on this matter and, among other things, he replied that, before a final report could be obtained on this project, it was necessary to evaluate the environmental and ecological aspects. What significance does the Minister place on such an evaluation and for how long has it seemed to be necessary, as a formality (because that is all I can read into the requirement now), for such a study to be undertaken? Can the Minister say why, at this late stage, it is necessary to carry out such studies, how long such studies will take, and the time by which it is likely that this project will be further delayed?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I know that there have been discussions between the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Environment and Conservation Department, and obviously officers of those departments decided that it was necessary to study the environmental aspects of this project. I cannot say off hand how long such a study is likely to take, but I will ascertain what stage considerations have reached and let the honourable member know. Normally, this can be done fairly rapidly, but the honourable member would appreciate that the environmental officers of the department have been extremely busy with work on the Redcliff proposal.

Mr. Chapman: It's been considered unnecessary for almost 12 years.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Possibly, but times are changing and the satisfying of demands from the community, which have been accepted by this Government, for the consideration of environmental aspects in respect of any development work is an attitude which the Government is committed to support, and we will continue to support it. I will inquire and let the honourable member know.

HEALTH SERVICES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health whether he has recently received notice from the Commonwealth Government that it intends to proceed with the nationalisation of health services in South Australia from July 1, 1975, and, if it has received such notice, will the Attorney ask his colleague what has been the Government's reply to the request for its co-operation in the take-over of the State's health services? I understand that agreements are to be made between the Commonwealth Government and the State Governments, including provision to pay half the running costs of hospitals, whether those hospitals are State-controlled or State-subsidised. I also understand that there will be a requirement that private hospitals, in order to receive funds, must provide standard ward beds (which is a fancy term for public beds). I also understand that there will be a degree of regimentation of doctors, nurses, and other persons associated with health care, in this regard.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member has finished his explanation with another question that is different from the one and only question which, under Standing Orders, he is permitted to ask. The reply to his question is "No". I will ask my colleague whether there is anything worth while commenting on in what the honourable member has said, but I rather doubt that there is.

WAIKERIE SCHOOL TRANSPORT

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Education say whether satisfactory arrangements have been reached to transport students living at Taylorville across the Murray River so that they can attend Waikerie High School or Waikerie Primary School? Last Friday the Minister was

good enough to make time available to inspect the situation that exists there and to look at the available ferry boat service. The Waikerie council and representatives of the Taylorville parents have asked the Minister that the students be allowed to cross the river by boat, because the round trip over the Cadell ferry means that some students must travel about 190 km a day.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was in my office for only a little more than three quarters of an hour today, because the normal Cabinet meeting was held this morning. However, I have already made several inquiries about this matter and have asked for information from the Education Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department so that a decision can be made tomorrow. I told the people who saw me in Waikerie on Friday that I would try to obtain a decision as soon as practicable but that it was unlikely that a decision could be made by today.

WATER COSTS

Mr. BURDON: Will the Minister of Education, as Acting Minister of Works, give me details of the present cost of supplying water to a consumer in the Adelaide metropolitan area and the cost of supplying water to a consumer in the Blue Lake district? My question is prompted by a recent statement by the Mayor of Mount Gambier that users of water in the Mount Gambier district are subsidising users in the metropolitan area. I should be obliged if the Minister could make available to me as soon as possible accurate particulars of the cost of providing water in the two centres and information about how the Mount Gambier cost compares with the cost in other country areas.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not think the Mayor's comment could be accurate in any circumstances, as the overall position is that some surplus from the provision of water in the metropolitan area is used to offset the loss made on the overall provision of water in country districts. If the people in Mount Gambier are subsidising anything (and I will check that aspect of the matter), they can be subsidising only other country districts, not the metropolitan area. I will get the precise information that the honourable member has requested.

STENHOUSE BAY HOUSES

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what will be the future use of the remaining dwellings at Stenhouse Bay township that formerly were used by employees of Waratah Gypsum Company? Some of the houses of the transportable type have already been sold for removal. Local residents fear that the lease of the kiosk, which is part of that township, may not be renewed. They also fear that the remaining houses that cannot be transported (they have concrete floors and must be demolished before they can be removed) will be demolished and the site cleared, preparatory to development of the whole area as open space within the Innes national park. I point out that the tourist potential of the area is such that the remaining houses could be leased for holiday purposes. In addition, the kiosk would be useful in servicing the tourist influx at many times during the year. As I am only ventilating rumours that are at present abroad, I ask the Minister whether he can clarify the matter in order to allay the fears and clear up the confusion that exists in the community.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I cannot reply to the honourable member directly as to the future of housing in the area, but I know that the National Parks and

Wildlife Service is looking at a management proposal as to how best develop the area. I am not sure whether a decision has been made on the future of the houses concerned, so I will check to see whether a recommendation or a decision has been made and let the honourable member know.

BIRDLIFE

Mr. ALLEN: Is the Minister of Environment and Conservation aware that when the water levels of some of the lakes in the Far North recede a danger may exist for young birds that have not started to fly? I am led to believe that the last time these lakes held large volumes of water, many young birds were hatched in close proximity to the lakes and that the lakes had a high salinity content and dried up before the young birds were able to fly, with the result that many died because the water was equivalent to brine. This may not happen this time because there is more water in the lakes; however, it is a matter that I believe should be watched because it is considered locally that the young birds could be caught and, if necessary, transferred to another lake if such an operation were commenced in time.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will refer the matter to the National Parks and Wildlife Service and ask for its advice.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Dr. EASTICK: My question is supplementary to a question I asked the Premier last week relating to the closure of the Leyland plant. Has the Premier further details of the future of automobile component manufacturers in this State in the light of the closure of the Leyland plant? When I asked the question last week I was referring to safety equipment, such as that manufactured by Rainsfords Metal Products Proprietary Limited, and shock absorber equipment, such as that manufactured by W. H. Wylie and Company Proprietary Limited. Within 24 hours, Castalloy Limited announced that it was involved in the programme because it manufactured engine blocks and other component parts. Although Leyland has stated that it will accept orders already placed, the long-term prospects of this type of component production and provision is questionable.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My officers are still working on this matter, and I expect them to give me further information this week. I have nothing to add at this stage.

JAMESTOWN SCHOOLS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Education say when he will, by way of reply to a question I asked on Tuesday, September 24 (three weeks today), present the report, which I believe has been completed, on the possibility or probability of merging the primary and secondary schools at Jamestown?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will try to obtain the reply for the honourable member as soon as practicable. However, there are certain problems that involve the expenditure for the whole project and the staging of it. As soon as I am in a position to give a reasonable time table that has some chance of being implemented, I shall do so.

PRESS REPORTERS

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My question is directed to you, Mr. Speaker. Why is only one reporter present in the press gallery now?

The SPEAKER: Order! Questions of that nature are inadmissible.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Am I not allowed to ask questions about the administration of this Chamber?

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order, and I rule that the question is inadmissible.

URBAN TRANSPORT

Dr. TONKIN: Does the Minister of Transport subscribe to the theory advanced by the Victorian Transport Minister (Hon. E. R. Meagher) when he states that the Commonwealth Government's urban train is a confidence trick and an impracticable proposition? It is reported that the Victorian Transport Minister has told the Victorian Parliament that Australia's proposed new urban train is nothing more than a confidence trick and that it does not conform to the Victorian system (I therefore presume that it does not conform to the South Australian system, either) and is about .3 m too wide to pass through a station. If this is true, what steps will the Minister take to bring this matter to the attention of the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones)?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I assure the honourable member and other members that I certainly will not take the stupid steps taken by the Victorian Minister in condemning the project out of hand when, in fact, the condemnation he was offering had nothing at all to do with the project. What happened was that the Commonwealth Government offered to fund the building of a mock-up of an urban passenger train that could be used as a standard train throughout Australia in an effort to reduce costs. I am proud of the fact that the facilities of the South Australian Railways at Islington were used for this job. Despite the fact that this department is so often criticised by Opposition members, it was highly praised when its work was displayed only recently at the Royal Adelaide Show. Mr. Meagher criticised the width of the trains, saying that they would not go through some tunnels or that they would foul certain structures. However, the mock-up has been built simply to test public reaction. I hope that, if the honourable member heard Mr. Meagher's comments on the *A.M.* programme on, I think, Friday morning, he also heard the comments of members of the public who said that this would be the greatest thing to happen in Victoria in the last 100 years. They said they would rather ride in the type of mock-up train suggested by the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones) than in the old decrepit carriages that they were being forced to ride in by Mr. Meagher and the Victorian Liberal Government.

BANK CARDS

Mr. COUMBE: Following the earlier question of the member for Bragg, can the Attorney-General say whether, at the recent meeting of Attorneys-General, bank credit cards were discussed and what recommendations, if any, were made about their future use by the public?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The matter having been discussed by the Attorneys-General, a warning was issued by the standing committee to members of the public who might receive these cards that they should take care, before they used them, to acquaint themselves carefully with the conditions under which the cards were issued. If they used them, subject to the conditions imposed in certain circumstances they might not only find themselves under liability for what they purchased but, if the card were mislaid, they might also find themselves liable to some extent for unauthorised purchases made by the use of the card without the authority of the owner. In addition, the Commonwealth Attorney-General said that he

intended to introduce an amendment to the trade practices legislation to make it an offence to send these cards out to people who had not requested them. Each State Attorney-General said that, in his State, he was examining the problems arising from the distribution of the bank credit cards and that legislation might be introduced in the individual States. I have already indicated (I think in answer to the member for Bragg) the topics that are exercising my mind about the position in South Australia. I expect to make recommendations to Cabinet for legislation in this State to cover some aspects of the issue of bank credit cards. I am particularly concerned that the provisions of the Consumer Credit Act that bind other providers of consumer credit should bind the banks, at any rate in relation to the credit provided by means of credit cards.

VEHICLE WEIGHTS

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say what is the formula on which the gross vehicle weight and the gross combination weight of a vehicle are determined? In making such calculations, is the manufacturer's specification of the vehicle considered? If there is a set formula or scale, can it be tabled or made available to the public? Late last week, I received from the Nantawarra area a letter from the owner of a truck who is concerned because he believes that the stated g.v.w. and g.c.w. are much less than set out in the manufacturer's specification. In another area, I was approached by a truck owner, who told me that, when he received notification of his registration, the load capacity was stated as 6 200 kg. After sending in the necessary form (his tyre rating was at the highest level), he received his registration, but the form, on return, had the figure reduced to 4 850 kg. There seems to be some discrepancy, particularly with regard to the g.c.w. I am certain (and truck owners tell me that this is their impression) that at public meetings on the matter we were led to believe that the Act would provide for a level at least 20 per cent above the manufacturer's specification. However, the report of the relevant committee and the Act refer only to the g.c.w. and the g.v.w. being determined by the Registrar; no reference at all is made to the manufacturer's specification.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I assure the honourable member that, in the course of his duties, the Registrar would take into account any data provided by the manufacturer. However, the honourable member will probably recall that, during the course of the meetings to which he refers, reference was made (I imagine on several occasions) to the fact that a make of vehicle could have a different g.v.w. or g.c.w. in various States, having regard to the peculiarities of the legislation in the various States. In other words, the Registrar does take cognisance of the fact that, under the course of the legislation of certain States, an excess is permitted over what has been determined for the vehicle by the manufacturer. In order to clarify the matter properly, I will bring down a full report for the honourable member.

RESCUE BOATS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government has considered making available grants to sailing clubs to enable them to acquire or replace power boats used for rescue work? As the Minister is aware, many sailing clubs now provide power boats for rescue operations during sailing competitions and regattas. As the cost of providing this facility is increasing, clubs would appreciate some assistance in acquiring boats. They are used not only to supervise

sailing activities but also to assist in rescue operations along beaches when members of the general public are involved in swimming or boating accidents, and all boats are equipped either with radio or with a portable radio system. Because of the value of their work in summer to sailing clubs in protecting young people who sail in small boats and in providing rescue facilities for the general public, has the Government considered providing this assistance, or will the Minister ascertain what assistance can be given to sailing clubs in this respect?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I cannot recall having received any submission from sailing clubs on this matter. It may be that they have made some approach to me and I am now having my officers consider the matter. I will check on the situation and, if nothing is being done, I will ask them to consider this suggestion. It would seem to me to be a costly venture for us to undertake, but I will consider the matter and let the honourable member know the result.

At 3.11 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FEES)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1967-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As these provisions are in accordance with Budget proposals, I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill increases the fees for liquor licences. At present the fee is a sum equal to 6 per cent of the gross amount paid by the licensee for liquor to be disposed of under the licence in the preceding financial year. There are exceptions to this in the case of wholesale storekeepers' licences, brewers Australian ale licences, distillers storekeepers' licences, and vigneron's licences where the fee is 6 per cent of four-fifths of the amount paid to the licensee for liquor disposed of in the previous financial year (excluding sales to licensed persons). The present Bill raises this percentage fee from 6 per cent to 8 per cent. This increase is in line with the increase recently announced in the Tasmanian Budget, and with an increase recently implemented in Victoria.

The revenue raised is expected to amount to \$540 000 in the 1974-75 financial year, and \$1 460 000 in a full year. The Government regrets the necessity of having to raise extra revenue in this manner, but the present decrease in State revenue makes it unavoidable. The provisions of the Bill are as follows: clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 increases the percentage fees prescribed under section 37 of the principal Act from 6 per cent to 8 per cent.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1426.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. Several clauses are consequential on advice

received from the Commissioner responsible for consolidating the Statutes. I recognise that, in undertaking such a task, it is necessary to tidy up legislation which contains superfluous matter or which expresses irrelevant details. The insertion of further guidelines for the consideration of the tribunal when it meets is a consequence of representations that have been made to successive meetings of the tribunal by members of both Houses and of both Parties. I believe the basic issues are reasonable and have been considered in detail for some time, and that they correct anomalies. The only fault (and I use that term in a general way) is that I should like to have seen provisions in relation to committee remunerations included in this Bill, so that all remuneration to be obtained by a member of Parliament, other than superannuation, would be considered by the tribunal. However, that is not the case, and, in my opinion, it does not deny the correctness of these provisions.

A slight drafting error has to be corrected so that Ministers of the Crown and those receiving additional remuneration are able to make a certain application to the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation. A brief amendment will correct that situation and make the provisions in that regard exactly the same as they are now. One pertinent fact about this legislation is that nowhere does it direct that the tribunal will meet or that action will be taken to alter the present situation. The legislation has laid down guidelines that will be used at a time when it is thought pertinent for the tribunal to consider the matters referred to in this Bill, which I support.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I regret that I cannot regard the Bill with the same equanimity as the Leader of the Opposition has regarded it in his short speech. I oppose the second reading, and also oppose the Bills that follow on the Notice Paper. I cannot speak about them now, but this Bill is obviously part of a scheme of legislation dealing with the remuneration of members and former members of Parliament. We all know that, from time to time, it is necessary for this matter to be considered, and I acknowledge freely having given it much thought for nearly 20 years, but I have not been able to find (nor has anyone else) a way in which salaries of members of Parliament can be fixed other than either directly or indirectly by Parliament itself.

When the time comes for a salary increase (as it always is in the economic state of things an increase because of inflation), its granting must always eventually be the responsibility of members of Parliament. I acknowledge all that, but I do not believe that this is the time to consider any increases in the remuneration of members of Parliament. It can be argued on the economic factors in our community today that increases can be justified, but I suggest that members should consider one aspect. By being in this place we show that we are anxious to take a leading part in the affairs of this community and, therefore, we make ourselves examples to the rest of the community. There can be no doubt that, at this time, there has been a call for restraint on wage increases and wage demands.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that I think he said that he had given this Bill serious study. I ask him to study it further, because the Bill deals only with certain subject matters: it does not deal with any increase of salary to members of Parliament, and, therefore, does not allow an open discussion on what salaries should be paid to members of Parliament. The comments of any member in this place

must be confined to the Bill being considered, as is provided by Standing Orders.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With great respect, Sir, there seems to be at least one new subsection dealing with an increase, unless I have misread it or misread the explanation on page 1426 of *Hansard*. I refer to new section 5d (2), which concerns the remuneration of the Leader of the Opposition. As I understand that, it provides for an immediate increase in his remuneration.

The SPEAKER: Order! Once again I remind the honourable member for Mitcham that, as far as I can see, this has nothing to do with the Bill under consideration. As far as I have considered the Bill, it contains no determination of salary.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Whether I am right or wrong, let me quote the new subsection that seems to me to provide for it, as follows:

In addition to the basic salary and electorate allowance payable to him under this Act, there shall be payable to the person who is, for the time being, Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly an additional salary and an allowance in respect of expenses incurred or to be incurred by him as such at the same rate as is determined by the tribunal for a Minister of the Crown. I might be wrong, but I would have thought that immediately this Bill was passed—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is wrong.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —the Leader's salary went up. Whether I am right or wrong, it certainly provides for a definite increase in the salary of at least one member of Parliament at some time, either in the immediate or in the further future. In his explanation of the Bill, the Premier said:

New section 5d deals with the remuneration of certain officers of Parliament and incorporates the relevant provisions of the fourth schedule to the principal Act. This clause, at proposed subsection (2), also fixes the additional salary of the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly as the same as the salary payable to a Minister of the Crown.

There is no hint in that that it is to be some time in the future but, if I am wrong, I am wrong. However, I do not believe that this is the proper time for Parliament to consider these matters at all, because I suspect (and the Leader of the Opposition canvassed this in his short speech) that this is a preliminary to the calling together of the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal. The Premier stressed the need to tidy up the Act: if it were simply a matter of tidying up the Act without any attempt to alter salaries in what I am sure will be an upwards direction, it would not be as easy as I find it to oppose the Bill. There is that provision, at the least, in the Bill and, as I say, I suspect that this is a preliminary to calling together the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal. Until I heard about this Bill informally, I think, on Tuesday evening and then formally on Wednesday, I had understood that the tribunal was not to be called together this year, and I supported that decision, because I believe that we must be an example to the community even if it does entail, and I suggest it does, a sacrifice on our part.

This is the position in which we are placed because of the office we hold as members of Parliament. I regret that I cannot support this Bill, because I think it will give a bad impression to the general community. Recently I read Gallup poll findings, one of which showed what a majority of people in the community thought about the fixing of jobs for the boys in both Commonwealth and State spheres. Whilst that is not absolutely on all fours—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill under discussion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —with this, it is close enough to be relevant.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not close enough.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Sir, as I do not want to trespass on you or to trespass on the feelings of other members, I shall not say any more. I think I have said enough to show that I disapprove of this Bill, and I disapprove of any move at this time, which I think is the worst possible time we can pick (a time of raging inflation) to change the remuneration of members of Parliament in any way.

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule that discussion out of order. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill, because it is not increasing Parliamentary salaries at this time. I have criticised salary tribunals in the past, my main criticism being when on one occasion the tribunal in question was brought together 12 months earlier than was planned. Large increases have occurred to certain salaries in recent years. I am not asking for an increase; I am satisfied at the present time. I believe comments made by some members should be put into practice in their own fields; indeed, there has been a 30 per cent increase in legal fees.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): This measure does not alter Parliamentary salaries and it does not in itself alter the remuneration of the Leader of the Opposition. Such an alteration could take place only after a meeting of the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal, which would take into account the instructions given to it by Parliament on all relevant matters. At the introduction of this measure, the Government announced that Parliamentary salaries would be subject to whatever indexation principle in restraint on higher remuneration within the community was applicable to the rest of the community. When the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal meets at some future time after the passing of this measure, if at that stage (and I expect there will be) there is a direction to all salary tribunals of the State for the implementation of a principle of indexation to say "1½ times weighted average weekly earnings and only a consideration of distorted relativities, anomalies, or a flat increase at the level of 1½ times weekly wages on an indexation principle for all salaries above that level", that will apply to the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal as it will to any other salaries tribunal.

This Parliament will be subject to the same restraints as are all other sectors of the community subject to wage or salary fixation in any way. That will be a significant restraint upon the higher levels of income. In those circumstances, members of this Parliament will be in the same position as are others, and they will have given a lead by legislation before this House in restraint of costs within the community. I believe that is proper, and in no way is this Parliament going against the proposals which have been put to the Premiers' Conference and which are being pursued.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (38)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, Max Brown, and Burden, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, King, Langley, Mathwin, McAnaney, McKee, McRae, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Rodda, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Venning, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (2)—Messrs. Boundy and Millhouse (teller).

Majority of 36 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Enactment of sections 5a, 5b, 5c, 5d of principal Act."

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

In new section 5d (1) after "salary" second occurring to insert "and an expense allowance".

The amendment corrects a drafting anomaly, as other officers have both salary and an expense allowance, and it is appropriate that this apply also to the officers concerned in this provision.

Amendment carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is the clause on which I got into a controversy during the second reading debate, and there are two matters I will canvass. First, what considerations led the Government to conclude that the Leader of the Opposition should now be paid at the same rate as that of a Minister? This has not been the case in the past.

Mr. Venning: It should have been.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But it has not been, and members of Parliament have been paid for a long time. What considerations led the Government to show this generosity, per kind favour of the taxpayers, to the Leader of the Opposition? Secondly, from what date will the provisions of new sections 5a, 5b, 5c and 5d operate?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason for the Government's view on the salary of the Leader of the Opposition is, I should have thought, plain.

Mr. Millhouse: I wouldn't have asked if it were.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That does not necessarily follow. As this provision obtains in the Commonwealth Parliament and in most other State Parliaments, the reason for it must be patent. The Leader of the Opposition, although he does not have the administrative duties of a Minister, must nevertheless be responsible as spokesman for the Opposition (the Leader of the alternative Government) on all matters in the administrative areas of Ministers. He becomes the sole spokesman effectively, in contrast to the whole of the Ministry; that is inevitably the case. Although at times the Opposition may have a shadow Cabinet (and the honourable member knows what trouble one can get into over that topic), nevertheless it is not possible for designated Opposition spokesmen to get the same kind of attention or publicity as is received by the Leader of the Opposition who, in consequence, is obliged to cover the whole areas of administration of the Ministry. This involves an extremely heavy burden for the Leader of the Opposition, and for this reason he is provided with the staff that this Government has provided for him, although that staff was denied to the Opposition by the honourable member's Government. We consider that the Leader of the alternative Government should have the staff and responsibility, that he should be able to discharge the responsibility, and that he should be rewarded accordingly. Other Parliaments have found that that is the case and we consider that their lead is perfectly right. The Government makes no apology for including this provision, and we think it is a proper one.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the other matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member reads the Bill, he will find that in new section 5d the words will be "an additional salary and an expense allowance

calculated at such rate in each case as the tribunal determines". It is only after a determination of the tribunal, on the instructions given to it, that the salary will apply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought I would get that sort of explanation from the Premier. The irony of the situation is that this has just been discovered. The Leader of the Opposition, of whatever Party (because there has been some sort of change), has never in the past received remuneration equal to that of a Minister, but the Leader of the Opposition always has done the sorts of thing that the Premier has mentioned. Government members may say that an injustice was done previously. However, one wonders whether this provision is not a reward for faithful service.

Regarding a shadow Cabinet, presumably the heavy burden that the Leader of the Opposition now shoulders will be lightened by the appointment or election of a shadow Cabinet to do the sort of thing the Premier has been describing. It seemed to me that, while the Premier was answering me, that suddenly occurred to him, because he had to qualify what he had said in the first place. If the Government is willing to be as generous to the Leader of the Opposition, I think it is mistaken.

I asked the Premier when new sections 5a to 5d would become operative, but the Premier has referred merely to the last line of new section 5d (1). Obviously, that refers only to the provisions of that proposed new subsection, although I may be wrong. In the second reading debate the Speaker was so confident he was right that I hesitated to argue with him, as I always hesitate. However, I cannot see that new sections 5a to 5d will not become operative unless the Bill is to come into operation by proclamation (and it is not), as soon as they receive the Governor's assent.

That must be the case. They do not repeal an existing section and, when they are passed, new section 5d (2) will be in operation as set out here. The tribunal already has decided what a Minister shall receive. I do not begrudge the present Leader of the Opposition the extra money, but it seems that he will receive it straight away and that there must be an immediate increase in his salary. The matter should be cleared up, because we do not want to gloss over anything like this. It is important that we know what the Bill does, and I ask the Premier to reconsider his reply on this point.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member looks back at new section 5c, he will see the words "calculated in each case as the tribunal determines".

Mr. Millhouse: That's a separate section.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not only in relation to that new section: it is in relation to each one that the tribunal will determine the amount.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If that is the only explanation the Premier can give, I think I am right. The new sections are independent of each other: they are not construed by reference to another section. In new section 5d the officers of Parliament are mentioned, down to the Opposition Whip.

New section 5d (2) is separate and deals only with the salary of the Leader of the Opposition. It provides that there shall be payable to him what a Minister receives. It does not provide for payment on and after the next determination by the tribunal. If that is what the Government intends and if it is what the Leader of the Opposition wants, we had better put it in to make sure, because to me it speaks immediately. Perhaps we may ask the Leader of the Opposition what his intentions are

in this matter, whether he believes it speaks immediately and whether he intends to take it if it does. The situation is not as simple as the Premier would, in his usual way when he tries to brush me off, have us believe.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Each of these clauses speaks *in futuro*. It does not speak to what has been determined as an allowance or salary payable to a Minister of the Crown, but to such as is determined (that is, to be determined) by the tribunal, and what is to be determined is in new section 5c. The next occasion of the determination by the tribunal of the salary and allowances payable to a Minister is under new section 5c; then under new section 5d, on that occasion, there will be payable to the Leader of the Opposition that same amount.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not satisfied with that explanation. I think (I am being modest again) that that interpretation is at least open to doubt. I ask the Premier whether he will look at it and, if on consideration he will concede (he may be unwilling to do so now) that there may be some doubt about it, will he use whatever influence he has in another place to have an amendment inserted to make plain that this will speak only after the next determination of the salaries tribunal?

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is "That the clause as amended be agreed to".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier give the undertaking I have asked for?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I put the question before the honourable member rose.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, Sir, with respect; I was on my feet. I watched to see whether the Premier would get up, and he did not. I immediately rose. I ask the Premier whether he will give that undertaking. Surely it is an innocent one.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is "That the clause as amended be agreed to". The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thank you for that. I have asked the Premier whether he will give an undertaking on this matter because I believe it is open to some doubt. The only undertaking I seek from him is that he will look at this and, if there is any doubt about it, I ask whether he will use whatever influence he may have in another place to have an amendment inserted to clear up that doubt. That is all I ask.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have any doubt. Having taken advice on the matter, I have given the honourable member my answer and I do not intend to look at the matter again. If the honourable member wants to use his influence in another place, he can.

Clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (7 and 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1426.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. As has been pointed out clearly in the detail given to the House in the second reading explanation, the Bill makes several changes to the principal Act, some of which bring this matter into line with decisions taken in respect of the Public Service Superannuation Act. It reduces the period of time in which a person will qualify through involuntary retirement. It becomes a matter of balance and decision for each member of Parliament. It may be said that the reduction from eight years to six years benefits members of Parliament. I make my position clear: I believe six years is the absolute minimum that can be considered—it should never be less than six years. It is noted that the reduction to six years from eight years is not as beneficial as some people think, because a member will benefit only by the same percentage as would have applied to the eight-year period. These amendments are disadvantageous to only one member of this House, and that only because of the peculiar circumstances of an election before time in 1970. That member's position has been closely examined.

I am aware that consideration was given to whether a member in that peculiar position would gain any extra benefit, but it appears he will not. In the long run he will have no difficulty, because he is assured of re-election at the next election.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I do not support the Bill. Whatever may have been the position in respect of the last Bill, there is no doubt whatever that this Bill does, of itself, give prospective benefits to members of Parliament, and that, in my view, at present is sufficient to argue against its being passed. So far as I can see, there is absolutely no reason why a Bill of this nature should be passed this session. Parliament is not due to expire until the session after next. I admit there is always a chance of what happened in 1970 happening in an election before the due time, but it seems to me (and members will probably be pleased to agree with me or may be pleased to deny me this) as a prophet of matters political in this State that there is not now the slightest chance of an election before the due date.

Why then are we fiddling about again with the Parliamentary Superannuation Act at a time when the whole community has been exhorted by its leaders, of whom we are some, to exercise restraint? There is no reason whatever why this should be done this session. Next session, in 1975 (pray Heaven that the economic climate may be better), it may be opportune to deal with the matter then, but it is not opportune now. Here we are giving ourselves advantages that we are asking other people to forgo, whereas next session we would have an opportunity to reconsider the matter before these advantages could possibly become operative, anyway.

I simply cannot see the rhyme or reason for dealing with this matter now. Members of the community outside do not analyse everything, so all they would see is that in this trilogy of Bills we are improving our lot. That is what we are doing, and that is all that people outside will see. The impression they get of us all too often, that it is a matter of, "Do as I say, not as I do", will be hardened. How long is it, anyway, since we last looked at the Parliamentary Superannuation Act? I believe it was at the end of the last session—only a few months ago. It is not even contained in the 1973 volume of the Statutes, and that confirms my recollection that it was only in March, just before Easter, that we last undertook the wholesale revision and, of course, improvement of Parliamentary superannuation, yet here we are doing it again.

Again, I do not wish (nor do I intend) to single out individuals, but when one looks at the Bill one can see the individual members of Parliament whom this may or may not benefit. Of course, I am not exempt from that myself because, under the provisions of clause 4, which amends section 17, if I live and survive politically long enough, I would benefit. That does not alter my absolute conviction that this is a most unwise matter to deal with at present. Therefore, I must oppose the Bill and, in doing so, ask the Government not to proceed with it now but to reconsider it when the economic climate is a little better than it is at present.

As I have said, if there is any group in the community that should give a lead or set an example to the community, it is members of Parliament. It is because we do not set an example on matters of this nature that, when the crunch comes, the institution of Parliament and our joint reputation as members are depreciated. That being so, and without at this stage going into any of the detail of the matter, I repeat that I believe this measure is undesirable and unnecessary, and I oppose it.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (38)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, King, Langley, Mathwin, McAnaney, McKee, McRae, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Rodda, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Venning, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (2)—Messrs. Boundy and Millhouse (teller).

Majority of 36 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Entitlement of a pension on retirement."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been looking at section 16 of the Act, which this clause amends, and I cannot fit it in. Maybe I am not looking in the right place. It seems to me that, unless the volume at which I am looking has not been amended, present section 16 was re-enacted by section 8 of the 1963 Act. I cannot find paragraph (a). Had I been able to do so, I could have answered the question myself. As I cannot, I will ask the Premier. New paragraph (a) provides for a member who retires involuntarily, having had not less than six years service. That phraseology has undoubtedly been used to cope with at least two eventualities: first, the obvious one of defeat of a member at an election; and, secondly, the deprivation, presumably of pre-selection, as it is called in some Parties. Whether there are other involuntary things I am not sure. I suppose a severe or incapacitating illness could come under this provision. This matter becomes relevant now that the qualifying period is being reduced to six years. Will the Premier say who will determine what is an involuntary retirement? Is there a provision for the determination to be made by, say, a Supreme Court judge? If there is, can one tout from one judge to another to get a judge who will give the most favourable answer?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The honourable member has been looking at the wrong Statute. Earlier this year, the Parliamentary Superannuation Act, 1974, was passed. Indeed, it was assented to in April. Section 16 of that Act does contain a paragraph (a), which is now being amended. The honourable member's question regarding who determines the matter is covered in section 6 of that Act: a judge determines it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am indebted to the Premier for that answer, which I accept. However, it lends point to what I said earlier: although this Act was amended in only April this year (when it was improved handsomely), we are now amending it again. I could not find the Act because, having been passed so recently, it has not yet been produced in a printed volume.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You can't remember it even though you were sitting here at the time.

Mr. McAnaney: He's not here often enough.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I see. I admit that, if I had gone over—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You know why it was in April, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Because it was the end of the session, I suppose.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You know why it was assented to then.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know what you are implying: that it was done for Senator Steele Hall's benefit, I suppose. That is the only thing I can think of. Whether or not it was—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I should have thought you would remember it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —my point is that it is only six months since we last handsomely improved this legislation, and here we are doing it again, at a time of raging inflation, when people, particularly those on fixed incomes, are complaining (and rightly so) that they cannot make ends meet, but we members of Parliament are going to see that we are ail right!

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMMITTEE SALARIES) BILL

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1427.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. I said earlier that I should have preferred to see its provisions contained in another Bill that the House was considering. I sincerely believe that this aspect should be examined, as it would then place all determinations regarding the remuneration of members of Parliament under the aegis of the tribunal. There could then be no argument whether specific remuneration for committee work should be considered, how frequently it should be considered, and so on. The salaries and allowances referred to in the Bill which have been considered by the Public Service Board take heed not only of remunerations paid in this State for similar activities but also of information that has been gleaned from elsewhere.

The remuneration referred to in the Bill is associated with committee membership and not with the payment to members for out-of-pocket or daily expenses incurred while doing committee work. I realise that amendments in this respect can be made by regulation or administrative act. No member of Parliament called on to fulfil a commitment in the interest of the Parliamentary system should be out of pocket. I realise that problems are associated with

members who must travel much greater distances than others to attend committee inspections but who are not at present catered for. When members are reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses, a public servant or anyone associated with community work should be treated on an equitable basis. I hope that eventually consideration is given to the reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses for members involved in Parliamentary committee work.

The SPEAKER: Order! That remark does not come within the scope of the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: I accept that, Sir. This Bill relates to the responsible service that is given by all members, not only of this place but also of another place, in the interests of the Parliamentary system. Under this Bill we are dealing with the Public Works Committee, the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and the Public Accounts Committee. I point out that, with regard to the Public Works Committee, the last occasion on which fees were increased was in 1960. I look forward to the passage of this Bill without undue delay.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I thought that the Leader was going to use that wellknown phrase "a speedy passage of the Bill"; although he altered it slightly, what he said came to the same thing. He must be getting tired of supporting Government legislation. I oppose this Bill, and I am not tired of opposing Government legislation. Whatever may be the position regarding the two Bills that have just been passed, there is no doubt that the increases proposed in this Bill are payable directly to certain members of Parliament.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's just that you get pleasure from opposing Government measures.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister always tries to reduce the level of the debate to personalities. I suppose that since I have been a member I have served on as many committees and for as long a period as has any member. I was a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee for, I think, nine years, for six of which I was Chairman. I was also a member of the Industries Development Committee. I have never been a member of the Public Works Committee or of the Public Accounts Committee. I make clear that I have no wish to be a member of these committees. However, I have had some experience as a member of Parliamentary committees.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Your current committee meets on Wednesday evenings.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And you get paid \$3 500, plus free socks and boots.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That interjection is so childish that I will not bother to reply to it. However, I hope it is included in *Hansard* so that people may see the standard of remark made by Ministers.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Deny that you don't get paid for Wednesday evenings.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so offensive a remark that I do not intend to answer it directly. It is ironical that I should get this abuse, particularly from the front bench on the Government side, at a time when the Commonwealth colleagues of members opposite are doing everything possible to encourage recruitment to the Army Reserves. I will not say any more about that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be out of order if he does.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I have made that point. I believe that it is improper that we should be increasing at this time salaries and allowances, when other people in the community are being asked to restrain themselves.

Undoubtedly, if we want to, we can make out a good argument in favour of the increases, but it is wrong for members of Parliament to approve increases at this time. Unless my arithmetic is wrong, the increase for the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee is over three times, being from \$600 to \$1 900. The increase for members of the committee is almost three times, being from \$500 to \$1 400. I do not believe that the work of that committee has increased enough to warrant that. I know how much work was done in days gone by, and the volume of subordinate legislation does not seem to me to have increased significantly. Although it may have increased a little, it has certainly not increased sufficiently to warrant a rise in fees of this magnitude at this time. It is a scandal that we should be doing this.

The Public Accounts Committee is a new committee, yet the proposed increase in the remuneration of the Chairman is from \$1 500 to \$1 900, and in the fees of the members from \$1 000 to \$1 400. That is a fairly substantial increase for members of a committee that has been functioning for only 12 or 18 months at the most. What is the justification for such increases at such a time as this? As I have said, I have not served on the Public Works Committee, whose members have always regarded themselves as particularly important people. The increase for the Chairman of that committee is from \$1 500 to \$2 500, and for the members the increase is from \$1 000 to \$1 750. Those are fairly substantial increases. However much they may be justifiable on the grounds of inflation that has taken place, I believe it is a mistaken generosity by Parliament to make the increases at this time. Although I bear no ill will to my colleagues who may be members of these committees, I must oppose the Bill on the same grounds as I have opposed the other two Bills today.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill, at least to some degree, and I disagree with what the member for Mitcham has said. As a member of the Public Works Committee for six years, I have received about \$1 000 a year, although after tax it probably amounts to less than half that sum. As a member, I have not been compensated for expenses I have incurred. For instance, on one occasion (and you, Mr. Speaker, may have been with us) the committee went to Sydney. The expense allowance for a committee member was \$10 a day, yet the cost of the motel into which we were booked was \$18 a day for bed only, and on top of that there were expenses for our additional activities in the area. Those are the sorts of expense that members of this committee have had to pay. To attend meetings or inspections of the committee, I have to travel 100 km, in respect of which I receive no travelling allowance. When those trips over six years are considered, I imagine I have lost some money in this way, as have some of my colleagues.

I believe strongly that members of the committee should attend 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the meetings; they should be absent only when they have other official activities. I have never asked for any increased allowance, having told the Leader and the Premier that I do not want such an increase. However, I object to the fact that I have been expected to pay for expenses for six years. No other section of the community has to bear such a burden. The Premier is fairly easy with his hand-outs. When the member for Frome wanted to visit Oodnadatta once a year, he was given an allowance of \$150 a year for this purpose, representing a sum of about \$4 for each person in that area.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not dealing with the honourable member for Frome.

Mr. McANANEY: I am trying to make comparisons involving expenses. As a member of the Public Works Committee, I may have to spend a night in Adelaide in order to attend a meeting. Some members receive \$15 and more for spending the evening in Adelaide while Parliament is sitting. Why should a member have to pay to be in Adelaide for committee work? I object to such an injustice, although I have not asked for and do not expect an increased allowance. Surely the Government should be fair in its allocation regarding expenses and not expect members of a committee to travel under worse conditions than apply to public servants. Some country members receive additional district allowances of about \$1 500 to enable them to call on a few electors. Although members of the Public Works Committee do work that is of importance to the State, they are not reimbursed expenses in relation to it. It is high time that the Premier worked out what was fair and just in relation to expenses.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. I have said before that there are right and wrong times to give extra salaries to people, but we are not discussing salaries, as was suggested by the member for Mitcham. I am not a member of any of the committees referred to in the Bill. However, I know that members of the committees have difficulty in catching up with their normal work when they attend committee meetings. For the benefit of those who oppose the Bill, I say that I realise we are going through hard times, but the committee members are spending time on committee matters when some other people in business or in professions are earning a salary at exactly the same time. The committee members are contributing to the State by giving their time outside normal Parliamentary time. I support the Bill because it is just.

If committee members were engaged in a business or a profession at the normal rates of remuneration, they would end up with more money than the amount they receive through serving the State. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out that it is 14 years since members of the Public Works Committee had an increase in their allowances, so the increase proposed is not unreasonable. People who make time available to do committee work outside normal Parliamentary time should be compensated for doing so. Those who criticise do not make that contribution; instead, they earn a salary in other fields that more than compensates them for the time they spend outside normal Parliamentary service.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you believe that people who earn money outside their normal Parliamentary service would agree to limit the amount of extra money that they earn?

Mr. EVANS: I would not go into that, but I doubt it. I do not like double standards. The people who give time to committees are entitled to extra benefit, because they are doing more than do those who do not serve on the committees. I support the cause of the committee members.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (38)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, King, Langley, Mathwin, McAnaney, McKee, McKee, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Rodda, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Venning, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (2)—Messrs. Boundy and Millhouse (teller).

Majority of 36 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BOUNDARIES)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1429.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill through the second reading stage to enable a Select Committee to be appointed to consider further the boundaries proposed under the twenty-fifth schedule. I do this in the interests of local government generally, and in order to provide an opportunity for those who believe they may be disadvantaged by the Bill to give evidence before that committee. As the schedule consists of maps delineating boundaries, it would be quite impracticable to suggest amendments at this stage. I have checked the clauses against the principal Act to ascertain that they are in order, and it would be useless to refer to altering a map. I believe this to be a correct and responsible approach to this measure and, accordingly, although there seem to be some genuine objections about aspects of the proposed boundaries, I refrain from dealing with them now but will discuss the broad principles of the Bill. Objections have been raised by several councils (for instance, Henley and Grange, those in the hills face zone area, and the Barossa area), and other councils are not entirely happy with certain sections of their boundaries. I believe the proper place to discuss these matters is at hearings of the Select Committee, and if members have problems concerning council boundaries they should be free to discuss them. That is my attitude at this stage. This Bill effects changes in council areas as a result of boundary alterations, and has aroused tremendous interest throughout the community, and in local government in particular.

Mr. Venning: You can say that again.

Mr. COUMBE: I will repeat it, if the honourable member wishes. Councils, councillors, ratepayers organisations, officers, and private citizens have all given evidence before the Royal Commission. Following the Commission's first report, considerable press comment has been made, protest meetings, and even marches, have been held, and the ordinary ratepayer and citizen have participated in a way that has rarely been seen previously. Members must be aware of the notices displayed in council areas, such as "Don't kill Hindmarsh", "Don't kill Thebarton", "Don't kill Walkerville".

Dr. Tonkin: And Kensington and Norwood!

Mr. COUMBE: Of course. Never before have ratepayers been so aroused as they have been by the issue of the first report of the Royal Commission. The arousing of this interest is highly encouraging for the future of local government, and demonstrates that, when such an issue as this is raised, local people are ready to express their views in no uncertain way. This situation augurs well for local government and illustrates the fact (often argued to the contrary) that people do care about what happens in their local community. Therefore, I welcome the involvement that has been shown. We are considering a Bill which, if passed, will change council boundaries generally for the first time in about 40 years. A remarkably short Bill of seven clauses (and a schedule) provides these tremendous changes. Really, the Bill is a report on a report on a report.

Dr. Tonkin: The Minister of Local Government does that sort of thing.

Mr. COUNBE: The Minister appointed a Royal Commission into Local Government Areas on April 12, 1973, despite the recommendations to the contrary of the Local Government Act Revision Committee. He did this following a letter sent to councils earlier, as a result of which the Minister said that he had 58 per cent support to proceed. The Minister said (and I have checked his remarks) that he would not proceed without majority support. I saw a copy of the letter he sent, and I also know that councils who had returned an affirmative report subsequently wished that they had not done so. The Minister proceeded on the basis of the response from the letter he sent out. Following the release of the first report of the Royal Commission, many objections were made, protest meetings were held in several areas, and in some instances protest marches took place. As a result of these events and questions in this House, together with petitions being presented, the first of which I believe was presented by the member for Mallee—

Mr. Nankivell: From the Pinnaroo area.

Mr. COUNBE: That is an important part of the State with respect to local government. As a result of these events, the Minister called the Commission together again to hear further submissions, and the second report of the Royal Commission, dated September 16, 1974, was issued. I agree with the Minister's actions, because, from the weight of objections, it was evident that the Commission should be called together again. However, there was still a groundswell of local feeling against the proposed changes, not only in the metropolitan area but also throughout areas of the State affected by local government jurisdiction. Then the Minister announced that he and the Government had considered the whole question again and made alterations to the findings of the Royal Commission; these are now embodied in the Bill. They altered the findings of this expert commission which had been set up, and which had heard evidence from all over the State. It had issued a first report, heard further submissions, and made a second report. I am not going to conjecture as to what motives led the Minister to make these alterations, but I repeat that we now have a report on a report on a report, and that is what we are considering.

The number of councils now proposed is much nearer the number originally contemplated by the Opposition than was the original reduction recommended by the Royal Commission from 137 to 72. The voice of the local people has prevailed, and in a democratic society that principle is of vital importance. It certainly is to my Party, and we even had the support of no less a columnist than Max Harris on this subject, in an article published in the *Sunday Mail* before he went on a trip recently.

Mr. Max Brown: He is not the best columnist.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Your best columnist has left the gallery.

Mr. COUNBE: Max Harris is not normally in the gallery.

Mr. Max Brown: Max Harris knows a fair bit about local government, does he?

Mr. COUNBE: Max Harris is concerned about Ronnie and Rita, the small people in this State. So is my Party, and so am I. That is why I suggest this course of action of referring the Bill to a Select Committee. It is important to my Party that the local people have the appropriate say in their own district. As a result of the Minister being forced by weight of public opinion to make certain modifications to the original plans, many more councils (and, more importantly, many more residents) are happier than

they were previously. However, there are still some council areas where objections are being raised. I mentioned some of them earlier. These objections must be fully considered in depth, and it would be, as I see it, the task of the proposed Select Committee to consider those objections. That is why I intend to support the Bill to the stage where a Select Committee can be established so that these objections can be heard in full; it is quite impracticable to alter the maps in the schedule at this stage.

Let me state quite clearly the views of the Opposition on the role of local government in this State: we believe that the maintenance of local government as part of the three-tier structure of government in South Australia is vital. It is, of course, the form of government closest to the people and most responsive to local needs. We wish to see local government as a strong, viable, efficient, separate, third arm of government, responsive to local needs. We want to ensure that the term "local" is maintained in local government. We believe there is a need for some rationalisation in local government areas in this State, but we oppose any move that would reduce local influence and involvement by forcibly introducing unduly (and I emphasise that word) large and unwieldy council areas against the wishes of the local community. We would strongly reject any move by the Government, whether State or Commonwealth, to take over the task at present carried out by local councils. That fundamental principle must be preserved at all costs.

Much has been written about these boundary changes, and I want to look for a moment at some of the comments and recommendations of the Royal Commissioners. I agree entirely with their view that local government should remain local. They made this point quite strongly. They also said that councils should be strong and viable and that they should have the staff and resources to govern their areas effectively. I agree. Again, I agree with the contention that local government must be strengthened and must be made to work for the people it represents; I agree further with the recommendation against the formation of compulsory regional councils and with the statement that the Royal Commission is against the principle of a greater Adelaide proposal. The last two points are most important, especially that relating to regional councils; that is a matter few people in the community seem to have picked up from the report. They seem to have concentrated entirely on council boundaries. Although admitting that this Bill is concerned with boundaries, I point out that that was part of the report. I agree with the Royal Commission's recommendation against the formation of compulsory regional councils and with its opposition to the principle of a greater Adelaide proposal.

I have spoken in this House previously (and from the other side of the Chamber) against the idea of a greater Adelaide. It is obvious that not everyone will agree with all aspects of the Royal Commission's findings in a report such as this. I do not agree with all of them, but some important aspects are dealt with and some fundamental principles laid down in the report which I believe are sufficiently important to be mentioned now. I know some councils do not agree with all the findings, but I believe they are pertinent to the future of local government, and I intend to quote some of them so that they will be on record and can be applied to our thinking on this matter as we progress through what I consider to be an important debate on a measure that will probably affect more people in South Australia than a whole host of measures brought in previously. This certainly hits closer to home. The first observation of the Royal Commission to which I shall refer is paragraph (c) on page 10 of the report, which states:

What was told to us in evidence and in our informal discussions was confirmed by what we observed on our visits to council areas. As we have indicated, we visited every local government area within the State. Obviously, we could not hope to view every aspect of council activity, but what we saw encouraged us to say that local government has been able to achieve much more than is generally realised, and it has provided facilities far greater in extent than is generally known by the public. The nature of the achievements varies from area to area, but this is to be expected and, perhaps, encouraged.

In that we see a most important aspect of the work local government is doing which is not generally realised or appreciated by local residents. Paragraph (f) states:

Along with the witnesses to whom we have previously referred, we believe that local government should be given greater recognition, but that it should be looked at critically, and sympathetically, to see whether it can be strengthened and made more effective. We believe that these aims can be achieved, in part, by a reorganisation of council boundaries where appropriate and in accordance with the criteria set out in our terms of reference.

During and since the hearing, criticism has been made of the terms of reference the Minister laid down, through His Excellency. Some of the findings in the first report were somewhat strange. For instance, I cite the case of the criteria, among other things, set down for metropolitan area councils, namely, \$500 000 a year rate revenue. The city of Brighton, which had a revenue in excess of that sum, thus met that criteria and the other matters referred to, but the whole of its council area was to be excised. Why? It is difficult to understand.

Mr. Chapman: Only until the pressure came.

Mr. CUMBE: This matter has now been resolved, but I wonder what caused the pressure. I believe that people in Brighton and Glenelg are delighted that this has happened. I think that the member for Brighton (the Minister of Education) would be greatly relieved.

Mr. Venning: He may not necessarily lose his seat now.

Mr. CUMBE: They are the honourable member's words. As I have said, I will not conjecture on the reasons why the Minister of Local Government made the alterations; other members can do that.

Mr. Venning: Yes, but we'd like to hear your views.

Mr. CUMBE: I was surprised when the announcement was made, but what I cannot understand is why some areas were to be excised; for instance, Henley and Grange. Why has that area been excised? I do not know how the member for Henley Bench (the Minister of Environment and Conservation) feels about this matter.

Mr. Payne: It tended to meet some of the objections that had been made.

Mr. CUMBE: Paragraph (h) on page 11 of the Commission's report is also important. It states:

We should perhaps add a word of warning. From time to time, it is suggested from various sources that some power or other should be taken from local government and given to another body, not necessarily central government but some *ad hoc* body specifically designed for the purpose. We believe that from what we have seen of local government, provided it is properly staffed and with expert advice from its officers and/or consultants, it is as well equipped to handle its functions as the bodies devised to replace it. The danger that we see is that not only does the transfer of powers destroy the confidence of the public in local government, but also local government tends to lose confidence in itself.

What the Commission is saying is that power should not be transferred from local government to a State or Commonwealth Government, and I use that as an example against the growing centralism in Australia whereby powers are being eroded or taken over by the Common-

wealth Government in Canberra *vis-a-vis* the South Australian Government. An excellent example is given in the Commissioners' comment in this regard. Paragraph (i) states:

One matter that must weigh strongly with us, therefore, is to see that boundaries are so fixed that local government can be strong and effective, properly staffed, and thus able to ensure that its various functions can be adequately carried out.

I agree completely with that comment. Paragraph (e), on page 27, deals with decentralisation and states:

We believe that a number of local governing units are incapable, for a variety of reasons, of adequately carrying out all of their duties. If this state of affairs continues, councils will gradually lose powers to central government until there is little left, and the system will, in effect, collapse. Such a continuing process will effectively concentrate powers and duties in central government. On the other hand, if the local governing unit can be strengthened by realignment of the boundaries so that the unit is better equipped to handle its tasks, then the headquarters for such matters as should be handled by local government will remain in a local town, if not the present local town.

The Commissioners are saying, in effect, that local government must remain strong and stay put, with the boundary changes that are proper and adequate, but the control and maintenance should be with the local people in the local headquarter town, wherever situated. I am not arguing against sensible amalgamations. I am aware of certain problems that exist in the district of the member for Alexandra, particularly in the Encounter Bay and the Victor Harbor areas, and I cite that as a splendid example.

Mr. Chapman: That's a beauty.

Mr. CUMBE: The Commission's second report is stringent in some of its comments and makes some pertinent ones. I am talking now of the desire to strengthen local government so that it is not taken over by a State or Commonwealth Government. Paragraph (1) (a) on page 8 of the Commission's second report states:

It is important that we make our position quite clear. We believe in local government. We do not wish to see the transfer of powers to central government either by default of local government or design by central government. We do not wish to see the transfer of powers from local government to any *ad hoc* bodies specifically set up for a particular purpose. We believe that if it is strong and effective, and properly staffed, local government is the appropriate tier of government to carry out the tasks currently committed to it, and no doubt many others.

At paragraph (d), on page 9, the Commission considers two alternatives that face local government. One is that local government will not retain its rightful place in the community, and the Commission explains why. The other alternative is that there could be some form of regionalisation. I see dangers in that alternative, because it would lead to even greater segments. The Commission, quite rightly in my opinion, rejected both alternatives, saying:

Neither of the alternatives is acceptable to us.

That is an important contention by the Royal Commission in this regard. The Commission talks about the strengthening of local government by proper, adequate adjustments to boundaries. In addition to the two reports from which I have quoted, I have had the opportunity of studying at some length the findings of the Barnett committee in New South Wales, the Johnston report in Western Australia prepared by former Judge Laurie Johnston of South Australia who, incidentally, was appointed to preside over the hearings in connection with several council annexures in South Australia in former years, and I have also studied several papers by Professor Gates.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Judge Johnston's appointment to Western Australia was on my recommendation.

Mr. COUMBE: I agree with that statement. I was aware of that, and I agree with it. I have also examined several fairly long papers on this subject written by Professor Gates, Professor of Economics at the University of Queensland. I have also read the studies, which I think all other members also have received, carried out by Professor J. R. Robbins, of the University of Adelaide. Having examined all those and other comments and papers that I have received, I support the second reading.

Whilst we are considering this matter, I pay a tribute to the sincere and dedicated work undertaken by elected members of councils in this State. The mayors, aldermen and councillors give their time and talents voluntarily, and they are at the beck and call of ratepayers at all hours. I know that to my cost, having served on a metropolitan council for about 11 years. Councillors receive criticism from time to time, but how often do they receive praise? Many members on both sides have served on councils and they know that, as I have said, councillors are at the beck and call of ratepayers and bear the brunt of criticism, but get little praise.

Without the efforts of these people, local government in South Australia as we understand it would collapse overnight. We in this State are extremely fortunate to have officers of such calibre in our councils. In its subsequent reports the Commission will be required to deal with the position and status of council officers, and related matters, as a result of boundary changes. Regarding the work load on councils, councillors and officers have problems that are far more complicated and sophisticated than was the case even a few years ago, especially in connection with zoning and the operation of town planning regulations, the Health Act, the Building Act, and many other Acts that I could cite.

I will deal now with the all-important question of finance. I am not referring to finance between amalgamations, because that will be discussed in a further report by the Commission. However, it has been suggested that, by joining one council area to another, economies could be effected. This could well be the case in some country areas, but not in all of them. It does not follow automatically that there will be economies.

It is easy to assume that the larger the council the more economically it will be conducted, but I do not believe that that is necessarily the case always. I have referred to the metropolitan area. I have served as a councillor in the metropolitan area and I know that area better than I know most other parts of the State, although I know some of those other parts extremely well. The rates levied by some smaller metropolitan councils are lower than the rates charged by their adjoining councils, and I ask how we equate that with the argument that, if we have one large council, economies can be effected or costs can be reduced.

Although some of these smaller councils in the metropolitan area have a lower rate than do their adjoining neighbours, they still provide an effective service to their citizens. I am not saying that that happens in all cases, but I can cite many cases where it does happen. I want to deal with the matter of finance in a wider spectrum. The Minister has said that councils should be self-supporting.

Mr. Chapman: He has said often in this House that they must be able to stand on their own two feet.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, I think they are the words he has used.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you think that that means financially self-supporting?

Mr. Chapman: That's the inference from the comment you've made many times.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister has said that the councils should be self-supporting and should stand on their own feet.

Mr. Chapman: Regardless of whether the people starve, in other words.

Mr. COUMBE: The evidence given to the Royal Commission by the Commissioner of Highways tends to support my contention that councils should be self-supporting. I consider that that is the gravamen of his evidence. Whilst this may be desirable, I do not believe for a moment that we will ever see the day when councils will not need some support from government in some areas. Unless they get support, the rates will go up sky high. We must remember that in many council areas, perhaps in the city of Adelaide, facilities are provided for people from the whole of South Australia. For instance, the people who live in the North of the State travel through Prospect, in my district, and wear out the roads. Certainly, the Highways Department maintains some of those roads, but others are council roads.

The Commission states that the best way for councils to be administered is from the local body, and I believe that there will always be a case for councils to receive support in various areas from government, especially as the State Government continues from time to time to introduce legislation that councils administer on behalf of the Government. I believe that, in most cases, councils welcome this and do not disagree about administering these Acts, provided that they receive the funds to administer the legislation properly.

Under the changed arrangements, the Commonwealth Grants Commission makes grants to councils for specific projects. I consider that the Local Government Office in this State should be strengthened to handle these matters in direct consultation with council representation. After all, the Local Government Act of South Australia (and we know that it is a big Act) is an Act of this Parliament, not of the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. McAnaney: If we had a good Government, it would be rewritten.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's a slur on the Parliamentary Counsel.

Mr. McAnaney: It's a slur on the Minister.

Mr. COUMBE: The rewriting of the Act is long overdue, and I know how much work is going into that matter. I look forward to the day when it is rewritten. The Commonwealth Government has no jurisdiction in this field in South Australia. It has jurisdiction in its territories but it has not jurisdiction in South Australia in relation to local government.

Dr. Tonkin: Not yet!

Mr. COUMBE: I hope that the Commonwealth Government never has that jurisdiction. I suggest that the funds from the Grants Commission, under the changed arrangements, should be administered by the State Government's Local Government Office in liaison with councils, regarding moneys other than highways funds. This is the right way to do it. In respect of the Grants Commission, it was strange to see that certain councils missed out altogether on receiving grants this year. Those councils included the Adelaide City Council, the Walkerville council (both those councils are in my district), the corporation of Henley and Grange, and another council, I think the Garden Suburb. I do not know, and neither do those councils know, exactly why they missed getting grants.

Mr. Becker: Do you think there was interference by the Minister?

Mr. CUMBE: That could well be. If we are to have a strong Local Government Office in South Australia, the present office must be augmented with officers experienced in local government. In saying this, I make no reflection on officers in the existing department.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know that the Royal Commission recommended that we should take the opportunity of getting three or four experienced officers to build up the strength of my office in order to provide a better service.

Mr. CUMBE: I am aware of what the Minister is saying, because I read that same comment myself; indeed, I made those same observations in another matter long before the Royal Commission's report was published. In speaking with local government officers, as well as with mayors and councillors, it is clear that they seek this, too, and I do not believe that any development in this direction would be regarded as empire building. South Australia needs an efficient Local Government Office whereby local government officers and State Government officers can liaise and consult. It is important that such liaison and consultation be developed to obtain a closer relationship between these different areas.

There already exist in section 24 of the principal Act powers for amalgamation or annexation. Such annexations or amalgamations can occur only with the consent of, and at the request of, the local people. Many changes have occurred under this provision, as all honourable members are aware. The most recent annexation was of the area known as Vale Park, the control of which was transferred from the Enfield council to the Walkerville council.

Mr. Mathwin: They asked for that, didn't they?

Mr. CUMBE: They did, and a poll was held. The local residents won that poll, and Vale Park was included in the area of the Walkerville council. The area was classified as a ward, being represented by two councillors. Subsequently, many improvements have been carried out, although certain financial adjustments were required, and time was involved to complete them. That is one example. Another annexation occurred in the South-East, and I believe that some years ago there was another annexation in the Glenelg area. Such powers already exist in the principal Act, and annexations have taken place because the local residents have expressed their wish democratically to change their council area. If this Bill is passed, perhaps other council areas will be changed through the express wishes of the local residents. That is an important aspect, and I refer to the development of Monarto and the development at Red Cliff Point. If those projects proceed as planned, some adjustments to local government areas may be required. Those two areas come readily to mind, but there may be further development in another part of the State, and the provision allowing local people to seek a change in their local government body should be retained in the Act. In this way, the will of the local people will prevail, and changes, if desired, can be implemented.

I hope that we do not experience what has happened in another State, where in country areas boundary changes have occurred almost by stealth, and by what I would call marriages of local councils. The next step to be taken in respect of this Bill, and in respect of local government generally, is the setting up of a Select Committee. That committee will have an important task, and it should not be unduly rushed. Although I do not

believe this legislation should be held up unduly, full weight should be given to the views put before the committee, because the committee will not only have to consider the suggested boundaries set out in the twenty-fifth schedule of the Bill but must also take heed of representations from members of this House who believe that there should be modifications to the Royal Commission's recommendations, as in certain areas much dissatisfaction has arisen as a result of the recommendations. The committee should also hear the evidence placed before it by councils and private citizens who believe they are disadvantaged by the provisions of the Bill.

Following the report of the Select Committee, if the Bill is passed the Royal Commission should again convene, as it said it would, to report on other matters included in its terms of reference, such as industrial awards, officers, and conditions of employment. I support the Bill to the stage where the Select Committee can be established. What I have said today has been to support the future of local government in South Australia. I believe it must exist in South Australia because it is the system of government closest to the people, and the State and the people are better off as a result of it. Therefore, I would fight to the bitter end against any take-over of local government by either the State Government or the Commonwealth Government. I believe strongly that local government should have its own say, and to some extent this has been achieved through the protests and the groundswell of objections raised following the publication of the Commission's first report. I have named some of the councils dissatisfied with the report. Other councils may seek minor adjustments in relation to boundaries, and these councils, too, will have an opportunity to put their views to the Select Committee. The principle I have adopted today is to support this Bill and the setting up of a Select Committee, because I believe it is impracticable to change the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I oppose the Bill outright. My reason for opposing it is fairly clear: I believe it is the overwhelming view of my electorate that the changes are undesirable. Seven district councils, with which I have frequent contact, are represented in the District of Kavel, and they are, with the possible exception of one, completely opposed to this Bill. It seems to me that in the past couple of weeks some unfortunate things have been occurring in relation to this Bill. The Minister has made no bones about the fact that he believes the original recommendations of the Royal Commission were correct, yet he has seen fit, in what must surely be an arbitrary fashion, to make changes to the recommended boundaries to accommodate certain district councils. However, he has not seen fit to make any changes covering the district I represent in this place, where, as I have said, the opposition to changes in boundaries is overwhelming. Imposing political decisions (because that is what they essentially are) on top of what he believes is the correct conclusion has introduced an element of confusion into this discussion that is to be deplored.

Just what were the considerations that the Minister took into account in making these changes? Did he consider the areas that were most vehement in their opposition and got closest to him? Just what were the parameters? What factors led the Minister to accede to the requests of certain district councils and completely ignore the objections of others? It is most unfortunate that in these rehearings the constituents I represent have been completely ignored, and this has introduced into the whole

discussion an element of confusion and an arbitrary consideration that puts the whole exercise beyond rational discussion. As I say, I am completely opposed to the Bill.

The Minister has from time to time made vague references to local government having to stand on its own feet. It is intended that existing staff shall be re-employed, so all we are doing is making the travelling distances longer and the areas larger. Therefore, I cannot for the life of me see that amalgamation can make one iota of difference to the viability of local government unless there is to be some infusion of funds from sources other than rate revenue. The fact that two councils amalgamate and the existing staff and services are retained does not make local government more viable. If the Minister was to substitute a few cold hard facts for vague threats about local government disintegrating if it did not accept the recommendations of the Royal Commission, it would be more appropriate to this exercise, because, as far as I can see, there has been no definition of what the economy will be from making some councils large. In my own electoral district, I think the travelling involved would have the reverse effect and that some of the services provided to get to the centre of operations would be far too expensive.

As the Deputy Leader has mentioned, the Highways Commissioner made a fairly strong submission to the Royal Commission. Obviously, it will make the work of the Highways Department simpler if there are fewer councils to deal with. It will facilitate operations for that department. It will make it easier for the department when sending out the sort of information it does quite often under the regime of the present Minister, pettifoggish instructions about how local government areas should run their own affairs, when they could well be left alone. Nevertheless, it will make it easier for the Highways Department and other State Government instrumentalities in their liaison with local government, but I cannot see merely amalgamating councils and rearranging boundaries to make the districts larger will give better service to the ratepayers. All it will do for many of them is make the centre of local government more remote.

I believe the overwhelming body of opinion in Kavel is opposed to these changes. Let me first mention the Angaston District Council. The council in that district has circularised its ratepayers to find out their views by questionnaire. Public meetings have been held, some of which I have attended, and I have come to the conclusion that very few people in the district would favour these proposals.

Let me now quote from some of the correspondence (I have a sheaf of correspondence, as other members have) in connection with this Bill. I will confine my remarks solely to the district councils in my electoral district; I shall ignore the correspondence connected with district councils outside my electoral district. Some of them have been successful in getting the Minister, when he imposed these political decisions on the recommendations of the Royal Commission, to change his mind. Councils in my area have been singularly unsuccessful in that regard. I shall refer first to the correspondence concerning the District Council of Angaston, which, in a letter to the Secretary of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, stated:

I advise that the District Council of Angaston has given due consideration to the report, and has also reported to its ratepayers on the proposed alterations of the boundaries of councils within the general area surrounding the present area of the District Council of Angaston. I have been directed by my council to advise that it was invited to attend a meeting of the public called by the Angaston Progressive Traders to discuss the First Report of the

Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, and formally report that that meeting unanimously opposed the findings of the boundaries commission in all respects. The Chairman of the meeting—despite several requests—was unable to obtain any person present who was prepared to speak in favour of the proposed council boundary changes, particularly as they affected this area. The District Council of Angaston has circularised all ratepayers of its area informing them of the boundaries of the proposed new council to cover the Barossa Valley area. Now that the ratepayers are aware of the proposed boundaries, the census council has taken in conjunction with the circular referred to above reflects a seven to one vote in opposition to the proposed boundary changes. A meeting of the Angaston Progressive Traders carried the following motion unanimously:

That this meeting opposes the boundary changes to the Angaston council area, and that the decision of this meeting be communicated to the Minister of Local Government, the Angaston District Council and to the members of Parliament representing the district.

I attended that public meeting called by the Angaston Progressive Traders and, as is reported in this letter, the opposition to the changes was unanimous. At short notice today, I again contacted all the district councils in my electoral district to see whether there had been any change of heart or thinking, and there has been none: they are opposed to what the Minister is proposing.

I come now to the District Council of Truro, which, at a public meeting, was unanimously opposed to the proposals put forward at that meeting. To sum up their feelings, they are violently opposed to what is being proposed. I will quote briefly from a letter, a copy of which was sent to me from the District Council of Tanunda, that the council sent to the Minister, as follows:

The point that council fails to understand is that on the one hand the Commission states that it cannot accept opinions based on alternatives where full details of alternatives were not known; and on the other they ask council to consider an alternative, yet give no details of this alternative for an opinion to be expressed.

It would be a summary of the Tanunda council's opinion to say that it is not willing to buy a pig in a poke. It believes that other matters must be resolved before it can say whether the change in boundaries would be beneficial. My discussions with ratepayers and private citizens confirm my view that there is almost total opposition to the Bill. To sum up the view of the Tanunda council, it is not satisfied with the information given about subsequent steps, even if it was prepared to accept the recommendations of the Royal Commission. The following telegram was sent to me following a joint meeting of the Barossa district councils:

A meeting of delegates of the following councils Angaston, Barossa, Freeling, Kapunda, Mudla Wirra, Tanunda, Truro met and considered the second report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas and strongly objects to findings of Commission and reaffirm and express wishes of the ratepayers to retain their present identity.

I have also received letters from the Sedan and Marne District Councils. Conversations I have had with electors in those areas have confirmed the views expressed by the councils. The letter from the Sedan District Council says:

The following resolution was unanimously passed at the Sedan meeting:

There is a preamble saying that ratepayers' meetings were held at Swan Reach and Sedan. The letter quotes the resolution as follows:

That the Royal Commission be advised that this meeting rejects the first report in its entirety and in particular objects to the boundaries recommended because such boundaries conflict with the wishes of the people and in many cases ignore communities of interest.

That is fairly clear. The letter from the Marne District Council says:

Council has considered the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners and is opposed to the general concept of amalgamation. The council cannot see how a reduction in the number of councils as recommended will provide improved services and facilities for the ratepayers and in relation to this area it does not agree that ratepayers' funds should be used for the provision of tourist facilities at Mannum as is recommended by the Commissioners. A further submission is at present being drafted.

Today I contacted the Mount Pleasant council. Because the Bill was introduced only last Thursday, members have had precious little time in which to ascertain councils' reactions to the proposed reorganisation. The Mount Pleasant council has sent me a letter but I have not yet received it. However, as a result of a conversation I had today with the District Clerk, I think I know fairly clearly what the letter says. The Mount Pleasant council circularised its ratepayers, and the rejection of the report was overwhelming. Only three ratepayers, two of whom were non-residents, were possibly in favour of the proposal. So, in the Mount Pleasant council's area the opposition would appear to be almost 100 per cent. In agreeing to an inquiry into local government areas, councils in no way committed themselves to the recommendations of the inquiry. Apparently, it is made clear in the letter that I hope to receive tomorrow from the Mount Pleasant council that it was not doing so.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: In that case, the Mount Pleasant council would not have been in the 58 per cent that I quoted. Councils expressing qualified support were not in the 58 per cent I quoted.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That could well be. The council favoured an investigation, but it in no way prejudged the issue. If I may interpose my own view, it seems strange that a council would commit itself to something when it had no foreknowledge of the result; that would seem to be the logical position of most councils.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I have not said that councils committed themselves: I have said that 58 per cent of councils agreed that a change was needed.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would have to refresh my memory in relation to the correspondence that the Minister initially had with the councils as to the proposal put to them. It has been claimed that the question was vague. Now that the recommendations of the Royal Commission are known, the council and its ratepayers are almost totally opposed to them. The only other council to which I will refer is the Gumeracha District Council. From my knowledge of the district, it seems to me that there is the strongest case for additions to the Gumeracha District Council's area. As I have said here from time to time, the rate revenue of that council has suffered as a result of Government incursions by way of the operations of the Woods and Forests Department in buying up fairly large tracts of land for afforestation; it is going on all the time. The taking over of Chain of Ponds by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for anti-pollution purposes has also reduced the Gumeracha council's rate revenue. This has been a continuing trend in the area.

I shall state my own view (I am not saying that it is necessarily the view of the majority of constituents in my area) about the Hills ward of the Tea Tree Gully District Council. It seems that the Hills ward will remain rural, because it is in watershed zone A, and subdivisional activity is restricted. It therefore cannot become a built-up area. The first rearrangement that could profitably take place

in the Gumeracha council area would be the annexation of the Hills ward of the Tea Tree Gully council to Gumeracha; that would make a significant difference to the Gumeracha council's operations and would to a large extent offset some of the incursions of Government departments in taking over tracts of land.

I am not suggesting that this is a unanimous view. It is one of the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and it seems logical. The area will remain rural even though it is fairly close to the metropolitan area. Even taking this into account, it is perfectly obvious that the overwhelming body of opinion is opposed to the Bill. In these circumstances, because I believe in representative government (I stand here honestly to reflect the views of my district), I have no option but to oppose the Bill as it stands.

It is unfortunate that the Minister has seen fit, against his better judgment (as he says), to make some changes. When one embarks on this type of exercise and makes political decisions against one's better judgment, there is no end to it. I oppose the Bill because of overwhelming opposition to it in my district, and because I believe that is the only option open to me. As I believe in representative government (and I am here as a spokesman for my district), I must oppose the Bill. It would be unreasonable, even if I thought the proposal had merit, for anyone to expect me to support it because it is right for Brighton or Timbuktu. It is not right for my district, in the opinion of my constituents. If the Minister had been able to make some further political decisions that accommodated some of the vehement objections in my district, I might be able to take a different stand on the issue.

No doubt some members' thinking on the matter has changed as a result of the political decisions the Minister has sought to superimpose on the Royal Commission's recommendations. However, what factors led the Minister to make certain changes? One newspaper report suggested that changes being made were in marginal districts (perhaps my district has been given away, but I do not know), but the Minister denies this suggestion. I should like to know the factors that convinced the Minister he should leave Brighton and other sensitive areas alone, and what convinced him that he should not make changes in my district. On the one hand, the Minister confirms that there were political decisions made against his better judgment but, on the other hand, he has said that there have been no political decisions. What are the bases of his decisions? The Minister wants it both ways. He suggests that the original recommendations were correct. He has made political decisions on them, but then intimates that no political decisions have been made. It seems that my district did not come into the scope of his considerations, and, in these circumstances, I am not convinced.

The Minister must be far more convincing concerning the economies he hopes to produce by these amalgamations, and far more definitive as regards the threat he has made to the future of local government, when he states that there will be no retrenchments and that, if the Bill is not passed, local government will wither and die. No logical argument has been advanced to sustain this point of view, and I hope that he will cut out all the hoo-hah (I think Margaret Whitlam has contributed something to the Australian vocabulary) and indicate the sound, solid reasons that led him to make the pronouncements about the future of local government. It seems that the only advantages will be those gained by Government instrumentalities, the Highways Department, and the Minister's officers in contact with councils. As regards giving a service to ratepayers,

the level of rates charged, the decentralising of decision making, and the community of interest, I think the recommendations miss out.

Mr. Becker: What about the will of the people?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think I have made clear that the will of the people in my district (as it has been made clear in other districts) is that this measure should be opposed and, in those circumstances, I oppose it.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): If the introduction of this Bill has done nothing else, it has demonstrated clearly that the people of this State are far more interested in local and community affairs than was thought possible. Anyone who considered that interest in councils was dead in this State (and I suspect the Minister was one who did) can be reassured that this is not so. It is heart-warming to see the people of this State standing up for their rights. They will not be pushed around, and, from their reaction to the imposition of exorbitant water and council rates and to the present council boundary issue, one can be assured that interest is certainly not dead.

The other interesting and heartening aspect of the whole business is that there has been not only a resurgence of interest but also a statement of evident pride in local communities. I believe there is a place in society for parochial pride, and this pride has been expressed by many communities, as a result of this Bill being introduced. It has been expressed in letters, which I think all members have received from councils collectively and from individuals, and at public meetings. I do not oppose the Bill, but I can understand why the member for Kavel opposes it outright. On the understanding that it will be referred to a Select Committee, I am pleased to support the second reading, but I do so because I believe there are still some councils which are threatened by the provisions of this Bill and which should have a further chance to put their case to a Select Committee.

Mr. Becker: Do you think it will do them any good?

Dr. TONKIN: I have the greatest respect for and faith in the deliberations of Select Committees, as members know. How long I will keep that faith and respect I do not know, but I can honestly say that my respect is immense for the Select Committee system. The major concern is what is done with the Select Committee's report, which is, after all, the most important factor. That is a matter which must be considered by Parliament and for which Parliament must accept the responsibility. I will support the second reading of the Bill to enable councils that are threatened to refer their objections and concerns to a Select Committee. Some objections and concerns have already been expressed as a consequence of the publication of the reports.

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

Dr. TONKIN: I believe the Bill introduced by the member for Alexandra providing that councils may conduct a poll of ratepayers on issues such as this is an extremely good one and well worthy of support. It is most important that Governments and councils should find out what people want. They should keep firmly in mind what people want, and I sincerely trust that this succession of episodes has brought home clearly to the Government and to the councils that people are proud of their local government areas and that they are proud to belong to them, as the Premier and I, for instance, belong to the area of the council of Kensington and Norwood. The referring of this Bill to a Select Committee gives those council areas that still regard themselves as being threatened an opportunity to put their case once again.

The case they will put will be not only on behalf of members of the council but also on behalf of the area concerned and, what is most important of all, on behalf of the residents, the people of the area, and in total, therefore, the people of South Australia. The effect of the numerous representations made on this matter, the letters received, and the public meetings has been extremely interesting. This subject has been dealt with by the member for Kavel. In my own council area, I attended a public meeting at the Norwood Town Hall at which total opposition was expressed to the proposed amalgamation of the municipality of Kensington and Norwood with that of Burnside. From inquiries I have made, the feeling in the Burnside area was the same; there was no wish to amalgamate with Kensington and Norwood. The point was made several times at the meeting that there was no need for such amalgamation, and that Kensington and Norwood was one of the oldest council areas in the State with a fine tradition of which council members were proud, as also were the residents. When I asked the Premier whether he would allow a free vote on this subject when the Bill came into this House (and the circumstances, as members well know, were different then), I was distressed when he said that he would not, and that he would vote according to a Caucus and a Cabinet decision, not taking into account the feelings of the people in his district.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I did not say that: you know I did not say that.

Dr. TONKIN: That is how it came over, loud and clear.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Don't misquote me.

Dr. TONKIN: That was clearly the Premier's attitude that he adopted in reply to my questions. If a free vote had been allowed on the Bill as it was intended to have been brought in at that stage, we would have avoided the ridiculous situation that applied at the time of the shopping hours referendum when we had members on the Government side of the House speaking in support of legislation the Government had brought in but in direct defiance of the expressed wishes of the people in their districts. I do not wish to develop that theme, although we on this side of the House know that members opposite are bound by Caucus decisions and are unable, even under extreme conditions, to express and support the majority views of the electors in their districts.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Nonsense!

Dr. TONKIN: You could have fooled me.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That would be the easiest thing in the world; you have been fooled for so long.

Dr. TONKIN: I am not sure whether it is because of the tremendous influence of the Minister of Local Government or the Cabinet decision, or whether perhaps a certain amount of pressure was applied in Caucus but, fortunately, the situation has been avoided, although it was not avoided by giving a free vote and being democratic. It has been avoided simply by deciding that the legislation, when introduced, will avoid those touchy areas such as Kensington and Norwood, Hindmarsh, and so on.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Would you like them included?

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister has been through an interesting exercise, and I believe his actions do him great credit. I am doing my best to be complimentary to him, and that is something I do not often try to do in this House, I must admit. I must pay him a compliment and say that he has managed this very well indeed, and he has let himself off the hook.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Come on!

Dr. TONKIN: No wonder the Minister of Education is so loud in his praise of the Minister of Local Government. He, too, has been let off the hook. It was beautifully managed, but it is a great shame that this change of heart has come about only on the basis of political expediency and not with any regard for the true welfare of the people of those council areas. It may happen to benefit them—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are making that up.

Dr. TONKIN: Indeed, it will benefit them, because the views expressed to me in council areas in which my constituents live showed that there was complete opposition to the proposals as they were. I think this has been a good thing, but it would have been so much better—

Members interjecting:

Mr. Goldsworthy: They had to try to make it look good.

Dr. TONKIN: Exactly. My friend has hit the nail on the head. There has been a certain amount of window dressing, and one could never accuse the Minister of Local Government of lacking window-dressing capability; he is able to dress up anything. As a general principle, I subscribe to the statement that local government should remain local. That statement appeared in the first report of the Royal Commission, and members who are not familiar with it perhaps should look again at the document. Perhaps they have not bothered to study it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why did they let Brighton remain?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Because it is viable.

Mr. Langley: What about Unley!

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: I hope we will hear from the member for Unley on the matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Dr. TONKIN: It is not good enough for the member for Unley to continue asking questions about metropolitan water supplies. I would suggest that he speak in this debate instead of conducting a verbal battle across the floor of the Chamber.

Mr. Langley: You asked the last question on that subject.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: Few people want amalgamated council areas. They do not want regional councils, as proposed, and they certainly do not want compulsory regional councils. It is generally considered that regional councils would not offer significant advantages to the people in the areas concerned. However, they may offer advantages to those people—

Mr. Langley: I hope you're speaking for your district.

Dr. TONKIN: —who wish to manipulate local government and place it into nice little compartments so that it will have more and more direct access to Commonwealth Government funds. Regional councils would not be in the best interests of the residents of the area. The member for Kavel dealt very well with the difficulties that could result from the amalgamation of areas and with the changes that could result from the change of centre of local government in each area. It is Australian Labor Party policy to promote regional councils; as far as possible, to increase the size of local government areas into regions; to centralise local government power into bigger and bigger areas; and,

ultimately, to replace the system of State Parliament, as we now know it, with a series of regional council areas. We are now getting used to this idea; it is nothing new. Because of that policy, we must be suspicious of legislation such as this, because it has been introduced not with the welfare of the people in mind but with the welfare of the Australian Labor Party in mind, and little else.

Mr. Duncan: What benefit will the A.L.P. derive from it?

Dr. TONKIN: I am even more amazed that Government members do not know why they are fiddling to get this Bill passed. Heaven help them, they ought to know. They do not even know what their own Party's policies are or why its policies are being introduced. This shows how blindly they will follow wherever they are led, without understanding why they are going where they are going. This present turn-around (and I regret that the Minister of Local Government is temporarily absent from the Chamber) has been welcomed by many people who believe that no advantages are to be gained by the proposed amalgamations. If the decision to modify the original proposals had been made through a concern for people, I would have said, "Well done, all honour to the Minister; he's done the right thing", but it has been clearly done for political expediency. At least, the people of the State can take heart: they do not have to be pushed around by this Government. They can influence the Government and, even if it reacts only to extreme Party political pressure, at least it will react.

Mr. Dean Brown: You've got to live in the right seat.

Dr. TONKIN: As my colleague has said, one must live in the right seat; it depends on who is holding which marginal seat in which council area. Nevertheless, even if the Bill has been a blatant turn-around for political reasons, I welcome it. Indeed, I support the Bill to the second reading stage and hope that the Select Committee will at least listen to the problems that will be cited by people in other council areas who currently oppose the proposed changes.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I oppose the Bill, perhaps for reasons different from what my colleagues have stated. There has not been a great change in local government in the district I represent, with the exception of the amalgamation of the Corporation of the Town of Naracoorte with the Naracoorte District Council. The Bill as it stands could, I suppose, be described as a chameleon or as being like the curate's egg—good in some parts and bad in others. The Commission's original recommendation has been reduced from about 135 local government areas to only a little more than half that number. There was an obvious reaction from the people in the backfiring that occurred throughout the State when the Minister introduced the Bill. I was interested to read paragraph (7), "The wishes of the people", on page 21 of the Commission's first report, and members might benefit from hearing what the Commissioners had to say in this regard, as follows:

(a) Some councils, in evidence before us, presented petitions, purporting to be signed by considerable numbers of ratepayers, indicating a desire to retain existing boundaries or otherwise dealing in some way with boundaries or proposals for change. We accepted these petitions with a warning that such documents must be treated with some caution as a true expression of the wishes of the signatories. We could not be sure of the reasons for the various petitions being signed. We accept that the reasons expressed in the petitions would be at least part of the reasons, but it is a well known fact that people become signatories to such petitions for all kinds of extraneous reasons. They may have been inspired by a belief that rates will be higher or lower, or they may sign because of dissatisfaction

whether justified or unjustified—matters which in this State have often been said as inappropriate considerations to justify a change in boundaries. We believe that these matters are not appropriate for any boundary considerations. I find that part of the report of the learned Commissioners somewhat strange. Of course, since they made that observation in the report, which has been presented to the House, members have been inundated with many petitions from people throughout the State. As a result of such petitions, the Minister set a date by which additional evidence could be submitted in writing to the Commission. Subsequently, this change occurred, about which, for various political reasons (one involving Franklin Harbor), the Minister of Education castigated some of my colleagues.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Imagine winning a case decided by the member for Davenport!

Mr. RODDA: "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown!" The Minister's Government has a commission to govern and is responsible for the legislation it introduces, but the people of the State are concerned about the inroads being made into local government. I say that advisedly, because certain facets of local government need to be investigated. There are some strange things in the Bill, notwithstanding the padding about places like Franklin Harbor and Minlaton. Some ear-tickling has gone on and the Bill is a prize, not a surprise. It is like a small piece of carrot on a stick. In the South-East, there has been a patchwork redesign in Millicent, and we also have Mount Gambier, the redesigned area of Robe, and Beachport. However, nothing has been done about the municipal area of Naracoorte.

We have heard the Minister say that he wants to make local government viable but, on the many examinations that I have made, I cannot find out how the Bill will make all these changes. I also would be concerned if I was getting some of the reaction that members opposite have had regarding their local government areas. The Bill has pleased some people and it has been heart-rending to others. East Torrens and the Barossa Valley have been mentioned, and the built-up area of Murray Bridge still will be included in the council area. I think the Mayor of Mount Gambier made a pertinent point when he said that rural councils were the best for rural areas and urban councils were best for urban areas. The Local Government Act contains the machinery to rearrange boundaries if the people so desire, but in this Bill everyone is being made to love the baby, whether he likes it or not. This never has made for happy family relations.

It has been argued from both sides that much good can come from the Bill, and I think it can. However, we have had this hypocrisy that reasserts itself on close examination of the Bill and the two reports, and it is difficult to know why some areas are being treated in a vastly different way from others. I think the Minister will have many angry people from across South Australia coming to see him before the Bill becomes law. He has been extremely courteous to deputations that I have introduced to him on this matter, but a large body of public opinion is extremely concerned. I refer to my own area of Naracoorte, where the district council and the corporation will be merged, although each has different problems. Those councils are not pleased about that.

Mr. Duncan: Is the Naracoorte town council opposed to this?

Mr. RODDA: The Naracoorte town council is opposed to the Bill, as is the District Council of Naracoorte. The Commission left the remainder of the district as it was, and in that regard I thought it made a satisfactory decision.

It seems that there has not been much complaint about areas that have not been touched. As the Bill was introduced, it did what the Commission saw fit to recommend. Now we have changed that in part regarding a few other areas which have been thrown in for good measure and which I regard as padding. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): Once again, Government members have had to put up with the usual barrage of conservatism that originates from the Opposition when we are dealing with local government Bills. I say sincerely that local government requires much change. However, when the Government has introduced legislation for some necessary changes, we have had this barrage of conservatism. One does not need to be a lawyer to work out the main problems associated with local government. The first is the way in which it should be financed. The second question that goes with that is the franchise. Each time we try to alter the franchise in local government, we meet the conservatism that we have experienced in this debate. The third point is representation in local government. A previous Bill tried to change that progressively, and again we came up against this conservatism.

In the Bill before us, we are trying to put before a Select Committee something that in my opinion is absolutely vital if local government is to continue. I suggest to the member for Victoria, who has opposed the Bill, that if it is opposed it will not go to a Select Committee and the people will not be given the opportunity to express opposition or support. The member for Victoria may say what he likes: he is opposing the Bill.

Mr. Dean Brown: If it went to a Select Committee, would we get a fair hearing? Of course not!

Mr. MAX BROWN: I accept that interjection as being a load of rubbish. I want to deal now with remarks made by the member for Torrens. I regard that honourable member as a fairly good authority on the Opposition benches regarding local government. I say that to the honourable member kindly. He has said that council boundaries have not been changed for 40 years, and I accept that that is correct. Obviously, there must be a need for change now, and we must consider that change. First, it is necessary because of increased population. That in itself is a good reason why we should examine the matter. The member for Torrens also referred to the Pinnaroo council, which objected strongly about the matter. I understand local councillors even told the member for Mallee where to get off in respect of this matter, but without knowing the people first hand and without knowing the situation applying there, I can only suggest that they are not being progressive; in fact, they are living in a world of their own, in their own select community. The member for Torrens referred to pressure being placed on the Government in respect of this Bill, and I suggest to the honourable member that most of that pressure is coming from the Local Government Association or other conservative elements in local government, and there are plenty of those.

I understand that the member for Kavel is in a difficult situation. He has opposed the Bill outright, mainly because six of the seven councils in his district oppose the recommendations of the Royal Commission but, even so, I wonder whether the honourable member wants to oppose the Bill, or whether he is opposing it simply as a result of the conservative pressure exerted on him by those six councils.

I now refer to the benefits that will accrue through accepting the Commission's recommendations. First, I believe that accepting the recommendations will result in

removing much of the duplication that exists regarding many tasks undertaken regularly, mostly by country councils throughout South Australia. True, Opposition members may say that unemployment will be created by the removal of this inefficient system, and I accept that there is a problem here, but if the matter is properly examined, I am sure a solution can be found. I refer to recent statements made by the Mayor of Walkerville, who referred to the eventual disappearance of his council. However, it was rightly put in a letter to the press by an alderman from a Hills council, that it is not just a question of whether the Walkerville council survives: it is a matter of whether local government itself will survive.

If this matter is examined in a constructive and proper manner, the problem is not whether local government, in terms of an individual council, will survive: it is a matter of whether we support the idea of three-tier government, which indeed I support. It has been said a thousand times but, of the three tiers of government, local government is closest to the people. Unless local government grows, its success in making submissions to the Commonwealth Grants Commission, for instance, will be impaired. I believe that if local government areas were bigger and better organised they would be in a better bargaining position and would be able to make more successful attempts to obtain finance.

Mr. Coumbe: The city of Adelaide didn't get finance.

Mr. MAX BROWN: No, but I differ from the honourable member (and even the Royal Commission) as regards the city of Adelaide. I believe the Adelaide City Council should be even bigger than it is at present.

Mr. Mathwin: Would you like it to be like the Brisbane council, where the aldermen are paid about \$15 000?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I did not say that: I do not support that concept at all. I do not know where the honourable member has got that idea, because I do not support what has happened in Queensland at all.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Least of all concerning the Queensland Premier.

Mr. MAX BROWN: True, and the Queensland Premier would not be in the game, I suggest, unless the financial situation was right.

Mr. Mathwin: There is a greater council of Brisbane.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes. I accept the principle that the city of Adelaide should be bigger, but not for the reasons espoused by the member for Glenelg. The Whyalla council has already faced numerous problems, especially concerning areas outside the council area. Just before my election to this House (during the time of the Hall Government), difficulty was experienced in the administration of the Eight Mile Creek area, then administered by the Minister of Lands. A pig industry developed in this area, which was outside the city council boundary and, therefore, outside the jurisdiction of the Health and Building Acts. Conditions eventually became substandard, and it was a bad situation indeed.

It was suggested by the Hall Government that the Whyalla council (then the Whyalla commission) take over this area. I was then a member of the commission, and I was not in favour of local government taking over this area, because I could see many problems associated with it. Indeed, I vividly remember strenuously opposing the suggestion, but local government did take over the administration of that area. In fact, today it is true to say that the health and building aspects of that area have

improved considerably. Great problems have still to be looked at but that is being done, and I am sure that in the next 12 months or two years the area will be quite respectable from the point of view of local government. That is just one example of an area that would have become a health hazard if it had not been taken over by local government.

Mr. Coumbe: It was liberalised.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I do not know whether or not it was liberalised but I will accept the interjection. I point out that, in the first year of its being taken over, local government spent about \$16 000 on that area alone. It will be the turn of the century before that expenditure is recovered by way of rates. In my own area, there is an established shack area at Point Lowly.

Mr. Jennings: A pretty low area!

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes; it is a low area, by the bridge. There was a lighthouse there at one time, but not at present. The area lends itself to tourism, but that idea cannot be entertained unless the area comes under local government because, while it is not under local government, there are immediately problems regarding the application of the Health Act and the Building Act. During the consideration in my district of local government boundary extensions, we came to the problems of the townships of Iron Knob and Iron Baron. Half of Iron Knob is under Broken Hill Company Proprietary Limited mining leases and half is on Crown land.

Mr Chapman: Under your control!

Mr. MAX BROWN: Not at all, and it is not under local government control. One of the greatest oppositions to local government came from this area. It is fair to compare the township of Iron Knob with the township of Kimba. If one travelled to Iron Knob, which is not under local government, one would find, without degrading the area, it was obvious that it did not have the restrictions applied to it in respect of the Building Act that were applied to Kimba, which is part and parcel of the system. That is why I believe, if for no other reason, that local government boundaries must be extended.

I pay some respect to the citizens of Iron Knob in their opposition to local government. I know they do not want to accept local government because, whatever we may say, people do not accept change easily, and the proposed change in council boundaries is big. I say to the citizens of Iron Knob that, in my opinion, under the proposed council boundary extensions, the town would receive financial support. However, at present I am afraid the citizens of Iron Knob want money poured into their township but do not want to pay for the work done. I turn briefly to the other opposition in my district to the proposed council boundary extensions, and I speak of those prominent people in my district, the graziers, who showed themselves to be anti-government and anti-everything else. They were frightened; I do not know why, but they gave me the clear impression in their objections to the proposed extensions that, immediately these extensions were made, they would be subject to both State Government and local government charges, including additional rates. I do not believe that, because of a proposal to extend the boundaries to an area outside the city of Whyalla area, it would automatically mean, either immediately or later, that, when the area was taken over by local government, the people would be liable for local government rates.

Mr. Jennings: They may even get more subsidies.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is the point I put in opposition to their suggestion. In my opinion it is feasible that,

if local government boundaries are extended to include them, obviously they must become subject to Commonwealth finance, for a start; they must become subject to State finance, and it is feasible that they will be subject to some local government assistance, too. However, the people concerned do not seem to see it that way, yet ironically in Iron Knob, since opposition by residents to the proposed extension of boundaries, there has been a proposal to build a kindergarten. My point is that they accept these things (which are, after all, finance; the money comes from the State or Commonwealth taxpayers) and I cannot see why they receive these things, on the one hand, and yet put up that conservative attitude that they do not want a change, on the other hand.

Also, the proposal under the Bill is to keep the existing boundaries for the city of Whyalla. I am trying to point out to this House that the city of Whyalla requires a greater local government area to administer. I refer to the *Whyalla News* of, I think it was, last Friday. The front page headline was: "Must have more land". The article, referring to comments of the Mayor of the city of Whyalla, states:

Mr. Norton's comments follow the announcement by the Minister of Local Government that a Bill would be introduced into Parliament to give effect to the majority of the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas. Under the proposals for the Bill, outlined by the Minister, there will be no alteration to the boundaries of Whyalla as at present constituted. Speaking from Wilpena Pound, the Mayor said it was necessary that the boundaries as at present defined must be widened. "We have virtually reached the limits of the existing area under the jurisdiction of the council. The council must press for additional land to be included in its area," he said.

The Mayor pointed out that it had been necessary from time to time to alter the boundaries of the city to meet the growth needs of the community. It appeared desirable for a major addition to be made, rather than to have piecemeal additions.

Later in the article Councillor Ekblom is reported as saying that she agreed with the Mayor that the city boundaries must be expanded to accommodate future growth. This is one area that the proposed Select Committee will be examining.

I and other members have received letters from the Tumby Bay council. When I visited Tumby Bay a year or two ago I interviewed members of the progress association. At that time I suggested that the Tumby Bay, Cleve and Port Neill councils should join on a basis of mutual understanding, and I was surprised at the reaction to my suggestion. Members of the progress association were violently opposed to the idea, and they said that there would not be any common approach in connection with those three councils meeting regularly; I cannot accept that. We must be bigger and broadminded and we must discard the narrow-minded, conservative attitude that has been adopted for about 40 years. I sincerely suggest that this Bill should be supported and that it should be referred to a Select Committee. The Whyalla council will put evidence before the Select Committee, and I think the evidence will support the expansion of council boundaries. This Bill has to a large extent been recommended by people who in most cases are more competent in connection with local government matters than are members of this House. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): This legislation has gone through a most unfortunate history, particularly in the last few weeks, during which the Government has played political football for the sake of survival, thereby ruining the excellent principles which the Royal Commission set

out. I fully support some sort of amalgamation of council areas on the basis that the councils involved are willing to amalgamate. Some rationalisation of council boundaries is necessary. I therefore support the body of opinion that has pressed for some sort of change, provided that the change is based on a suitable fundamental principle. However, the recommendation from the Minister and the Government has completely ignored any principle except the principle of political survival.

The first criterion laid down for the Royal Commission is that any council area within the metropolitan planning area should have a minimum rate revenue of \$500 000, while any council area outside the metropolitan area should have a minimum rate revenue of \$50 000. I tend to disagree with that fixed criterion, which the Government laid down in its terms of reference for the Royal Commission. The second criterion is as follows:

The community of interests of people, whether such interests are economic, social, regional or otherwise.

Unfortunately, the important second criterion was overridden by the first one, particularly in connection with East Torrens, where there is community of economic interest, social interest, regional interest, etc. Because East Torrens is within the Metropolitan Planning Area it had to have a minimum rate revenue of \$500 000, and the Royal Commission therefore had no alternative to recommending that East Torrens be amalgamated with other council areas. I object to the way the first absolute criterion can override other important criteria.

The Royal Commission very carefully assessed the evidence submitted after its first report had been presented. I presented evidence to the Royal Commission before it produced its second report, and at that time I would have fully supported this Bill with little hesitation in connection with a Select Committee because I believed that firm principles were laid down on which the recommendations were based. Unfortunately, since that second report was issued we have seen those principles thrown aside. We have seen the proposals become the victim of political dastardliness. The Government has put political survival ahead of principles. In this connection I refer to the member for Whyalla, who condemned the statements of the Mayor of Walkerville. What the honourable member did not appreciate was that Walkerville council has now been protected. The honourable member criticised the Mayor of Walkerville for his comments yet he, as a Government member, is willing to support the retention of the Walkerville council; that shows the complete lack of principle of the Government.

I am left with the strong impression that, if this Bill goes to a Select Committee, the Government will be completely hypocritical with the evidence submitted to that committee. If the Minister was sincere in making these proposals, why did he not wait for the Select Committee's report before deciding that Walkerville, Brighton, and Kensington and Norwood should be saved? Why did he make the decision before the legislation was introduced? Obviously, he wanted to kill the political sting in those important areas as soon as possible. He was scared to take those important council areas and marginal electoral districts to a Select Committee.

Mr. Langley: Will the Opposition win the Brighton District at the next election?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Let us consider some of the areas that have been protected. They are in 10 per cent marginal districts; for example, Walkerville, Brighton, Glenelg, Kensington and Norwood, St. Peters, and Payneham. In country areas they are Lacedpede, Beachport,

and Robe. Obviously, the decisions of the Minister were based on nothing more than trying to win votes. We have arrived at the stage at which the Government of the State apparently lacks any principles, and I am disappointed that the Premier should have allowed the Minister of Local Government to proceed with these proposals. The Premier has often claimed to be a man of ideals who would stand up for what he believed in: unfortunately, those ideals have been thrown aside and he has realised that, because of pressures brought to bear in his district, particularly from the Kensington and Norwood and St. Peters councils, he has had to back down. The Minister of Local Government has revealed himself as nothing more or less than a hatchet-man, and I did not expect principles to be displayed by him. The member for Whyalla introduced several other interesting points, and suggested that the bigger the council area the better chance it would have of receiving more from the Commonwealth Grants Commission.

Mr. Mathwin: That's a ridiculous statement.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is absolutely stupid.

Mr. McRae: At no time did he say that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I wrote it down as the honourable member said it: he said that the bigger the council area, the better the case before the Grants Commission. He left out "Commonwealth", which I put in. At that time I think someone from this side called out, "What about the city of Adelaide?" I say, "What about the city of Burnside?". That was a stupid statement for the honourable member for Whyalla to make; it reflects on the Australian Government, and the member for Whyalla is a member of that same Party. If the Australian Government allocates funds purely on the basis of size, irrespective of need or for any other purpose, the state of government in Australia has reached a sorry situation. Is that why Victoria and New South Wales receive greater per capita grants?

The SPEAKER: Order! Back to the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was rebutting the stupid argument put forward by the member for Whyalla. That honourable member also implied that the bigger the council the more efficient the council would be.

Mr. McRae: He didn't say that, either.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is a stupid implication. There may be a significant relationship between bigger councils and higher rates. This situation is evident in the eastern suburbs in areas that I have examined. If we consider Burnside, East Torrens, Campbelltown, and several other councils, and compare their size with their rates, we find that the bigger the council the higher the rates.

Mr. McRae: Absolute nonsense and garbage. Walkerville has the highest rates in the metropolitan area.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: How political the move of the Minister has been is shown by the fact that those councils that strongly objected to the proposals of the first and second reports were the areas that have been exempted. The *Advertiser* of September 4 contains a full-page advertisement condemning the Government's proposals. The important point of that advertisement is the list of councils that sponsored it. The advertisement was published on behalf of the Democratic Action Committee, supported by Brighton council, which was exempted and which was in a marginal seat district. East Torrens council is named and that is in the safest Liberal seat in this State: part of the council area is in the district of the member for Heyesen and part is in my district, but that area is to be excluded. Henley and Grange council, which is also referred to, is to

be excluded, and that district seat has a margin of more than 10 per cent. Other councils referred to are Hindmarsh, Kensington and Norwood, St. Peters, Thebarton, Walkerville, and Meadows. The Meadows council area is in a safe Liberal district, and, again, is to be exempted.

Mr. McRae: What's all this about?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member would be aware that the Minister said that the basis for exempting some councils from the proposed changes was the fact that they had strongly objected to the changes. I am saying that those councils lodged the same objections, voiced the same campaign, and did so on a united basis through the Democratic Action Committee, but the Minister has seen fit to exempt certain councils from the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and this action indicates that his recommendation completely lacks principle. It is for those reasons that we must examine the statements made by the member for Whyalla, and I have written word for word what he said: "little, narrow-minded, conservative attitude" are the words he used when criticising Opposition members in this debate. Who has this "little, narrow-minded, conservative attitude"? If this is a fitting description of anyone who bases the principles of such legislation on political survival and political pressure (and that is what the Government has done), I suggest that the member for Whyalla was referring to his own Party. What greater example of conservatism can one find than that of political survival? Yet that is what this legislation means to the Government. Part of the East Torrens council area is in my district.

Mr. McRae: Is that marginal?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This council area is within the metropolitan planning area, and therefore comes under the first criterion of the terms of reference of the Royal Commission in that it needed a rate revenue of at least \$500 000. For the year 1973-74, this council had a rate revenue of \$174 000. It is a fairly small council and, if the member for Whyalla could appreciate the locality in which it is situated, he would realise that it covers an entirety of community of interests of people with economic, social and regional interests. I fully support the retention of the East Torrens council, but, to emphasise how ludicrous these recommendations are, we must examine the new boundaries. The new boundary of this council cuts through Ashton and Norton Summit. One side of the road is in the Burnside council area and the other side of the road is in the Onkaparinga council area.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know you are not right: if you read the speech you will know that has been taken care of.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The member for Heyesen will support my statement that the boundary is defined by this road. Perhaps it does not go around the town, but one side of this road is a closely settled rural area with fruit orchards throughout. On one side of the road, for instance, Tom Playford's orchard is now linked with the Burnside council and the orchard on the other side of the road—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't you want Tom Playford in Burnside?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am delighted that he is in Burnside, but he does not want to be there; he wants to be in the area of the East Torrens council. The Minister's recommendations appear ludicrous when we see an area from Ashton to Norton Summit divided down the middle. The eastern face of the hills face zone has been used as the eastern boundary for the Burnside area. It is

well known that the hills face zone is a characteristic area fitting far better in its nature, in the attitude of the councils, and in the type of work carried on into a Hills council than into a suburban one. Therefore, it would have been preferable (and this is what I suggested in my submission to the Royal Commission) to have used the western boundary of the hills face zone. The areas of Skye and Teringie Heights, which are similar to other Hills areas such as Norton Summit and Ashton, could have been retained in what obviously would have been a community of interest.

Mr. Duncan: Between Norton Summit and Skye?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: A regional interest, of course.

Mr. Duncan: There is far more community of interest with areas surrounding Skye, such as Wattle Park, and so on.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I appreciate that Elizabeth may have an extremely good member of Parliament, but he obviously lacks knowledge of this area. The people of Skye and Teringie Heights want to be in the East Torrens council area, closely associated with Ashton and Norton Summit, where their children go to school and where they do their shopping, and so on. To say those people do not have that common interest is a sign of the honourable member's ignorance and lack of knowledge of the area. If the Minister is going to bulldoze this legislation through, I ask him at least to look at that proposition.

The other point of view is that the East Torrens council could easily have adhered to the criteria laid down in No. 1 by simply being extended so that part of the area would be outside the metropolitan planning area. That could have been done by extending the present boundary of East Torrens by about .8 kilometre to the east. Once the boundary was moved to the east and was therefore outside the metropolitan planning area, the area could have been declared as outside the planning area with a minimum rate revenue of \$50 000; it already complies with that condition. I hope the Minister will further consider the recommendations of the Royal Commission which has already accepted that standard. As I understand it, the proposed new area No. 26, Onkaparinga, which falls partly within and partly outside the metropolitan planning area, has a rate revenue of less than \$500 000 a year. If that is the situation in that area, why should not a similar situation prevail in East Torrens? On that basis, we see that changes to the present proposal are necessary.

Some rationalisation of council areas within South Australia is long overdue. However, the complete lack of principle exhibited by the Government in looking at the proposals within the past two or three weeks is most unfortunate. The Government decided to announce the list of councils that would no longer be affected by the proposed changes. I am frightened by the attitude the Government may take when this legislation is before the Select Committee. If it is willing to show such a lack of principle before the Bill gets to the Select Committee, we can understand the degree of principle that will prevail when it is before that committee. Therefore, with some reluctance, I shall be forced to vote against the second reading. I do so because the Government has completely lost its rationale and its principle in looking at this legislation. Any Government that acts without principle and without being rational is a dangerous Government and should not be given an opportunity to look further at any legislation until it has regained those qualities.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): In supporting the second reading, I refute the statement made by the member for Davenport that the Minister of Local Govern-

ment modified the recommendations of the Royal Commission, as contained in the first report, in marginal seats purely for the purposes of political survival. In saying that he quoted some poor examples. He did not mention only Labor Party marginal seats, and it is just as well he did not, because he quoted some Liberal Party seats that were not marginal. I commend the Minister for recommending to the Government that the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas should be set up. Obviously, it is easier to do nothing than to do something. That has been evidenced by what has been said in this debate as well as by the public meetings held and the representations made. Some, of course, have been promoted, but some have not.

It is worth remembering that it is 40 years since the previous State-wide Royal Commission on local government boundaries, and since that time few boundary changes have been made. In the main, the amalgamations that have taken place have been between a rural township and the surrounding district council. Therefore, the setting up of the present Royal Commission was desirable and, in my opinion, long overdue. Many of the changes recommended should have been made years ago, because there has been a considerable population increase over the last 40 years. Some areas then rural are now suburbs, and my district would come into that category. I hope that it will not be another 40 years before the present Minister or another Labor Minister (I assume that, when the present Minister decides not to continue in his portfolio, he will be replaced by another Labor Minister, because I expect my Party to remain in Government for many years to come) appoints a State-wide Royal Commission to carry out the work that has been undertaken by this Commission. As all members know, from time to time the State's electoral boundaries are reviewed, and I think that local government boundaries should be similarly reviewed more frequently. If this were done, I believe there would not be the public furore that has occurred on this occasion.

People could make submissions, some of which would be upheld. In some cases, people have second thoughts about their submissions, realising that their submissions may have been incorrect. If such a review of council boundaries were to take place more frequently, I believe that people would probably give deeper consideration to this whole matter.

Obviously, any changes recommended should take not only present-day conditions into consideration, as has been the case hitherto, but should also cater for the future as well. On examining the Commission's recommendations, I believe that this has been done. We all know that the various planning areas, as declared, are based on the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1973.

In referring to the Tea Tree Gully District, I am pleased that the member for Davenport did not say that mine was a marginal seat that received special consideration, because at the last election 62 per cent voted in favour of the Australian Labor Party.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They'll always vote for you, because of the good work you do.

Mrs. BYRNE: I thank the Minister for his kind remark. I refer to the First Report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, page 38, under the heading "Observations on and boundaries of councils within each planning area", paragraph (j) of which refers to the city of Tea Tree Gully and paragraph (h) to the

city of Enfield. I seek leave to have the two paragraphs inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The SPEAKER: As the Commission's report has been tabled in Parliament, no honourable member may seek leave to have part of it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Mrs. BYRNE: That is unfortunate, because I will now have to read out the two paragraphs. Paragraph (h) states:

We believe that the boundaries of the city of Enfield ought to be extended in a northerly direction so that the suburbs of Pooraka and Ingle Farm are included in its area. The suburb of Valley View is presently divided among three councils, one of which is the Corporation of the City of Enfield, and we believe that the whole of this suburb ought to be included in the Enfield council area. The boundary of Enfield with the city of Tea Tree Gully is presently unsatisfactory, and we believe that adjustments should be made which have the effect, as far as possible, of making a distinctive boundary and at the same time keeping suburbs within one area. We have not quite been able to achieve this with regard to the suburbs of Windsor Gardens and Para Vista. We have preferred to use clearly identifiable boundaries rather than the somewhat obscure postal boundaries which exist in this locality. We have already indicated that suburbs in the western portion of Enfield ought to be transferred to the cities of Port Adelaide and Woodville. There ought also to be an adjustment with the Corporation of the City of Prospect whereby the boundary between the councils becomes Regency Road.

Paragraph (j) states:

We have indicated that there should be an adjustment between the cities of Enfield and Tea Tree Gully on the western boundary of the city of Tea Tree Gully, and the same applies to the western boundary of Tea Tree Gully with the Corporation of the City of Salisbury. A petition was referred to us relating to the possible transfer of the most easterly ward of the city of Tea Tree Gully to the District Council of Gumeracha, and in our view this is desirable having in mind the community of interests between that area and Gumeracha. The boundary therefore of the city of Tea Tree Gully on its eastern side should be the top of the hills face zone. The southern and northern boundaries of the city of Tea Tree Gully are not affected by these recommendations except in the north-western portion abutting Salisbury Heights.

Following the publishing of the Commission's first report, submissions were made to the Commission by councils, including the Tea Tree Gully council and the Enfield council, and by ratepayers. I notice in the list from the Tea Tree Gully area the name Mr. Ron L. Alsop and other names in relation to the Valley View section, as well as the names of residents of some streets in Tea Tree Gully. I assume that this refers to the Gilles Plains area. There is also mention of the Teringie Heights Residents Association, from the Modbury North and Para Hills areas. Petitions from these people objected to the recommended changes, and the petitioners stated that they wished to remain in the city of Tea Tree Gully for various reasons, such as community of interest (and we all know how difficult it is to define that term), proximity to the Tea Tree Gully council chambers, and because some residents considered that Tea Tree Gully had a better garbage collection system.

Mr. Becker: That's most important.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes, it is. Another reason was that some residents did not approve of strip commercial development on North-East Road in the area presently governed by the Enfield council. Personally, I should not like to see strip commercial development increase. Along North-East Road, at Gilles Plains, where it has been allowed to take place, many houses (mainly Housing Trust) have been demolished to make way for commercial enterprises. Some of these demolished houses were moderately priced, and I

do not believe that their demolition and the subsequent strip development should have been permitted. As the area is an eyesore to people driving along North-East Road, I should not like to see what has commenced in this council area continued into the city of Tea Tree Gully. I am pleased, therefore, that the Commission upheld the submissions contained in the three petitions.

In addition, I received a copy of a petition from the Valley View and Para Vista Progress Association. I was sent a copy as a matter of courtesy, but these people did not reside in my district. It seems that the Commission has accepted most of the submissions made to it in relation to the city of Tea Tree Gully. The position can be summed up as follows:

The Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully will retain its existing boundaries with Enfield and Salisbury, except near the northern end to take in an alteration recommended by the Commission. Other boundaries will be as recommended by the Commission.

Those changed boundaries would be in the north-western area, abutting Salisbury Heights. I did not receive any petitions on this occasion from residents of that area, but I know that in the past people have petitioned both councils to have this area taken from the Tea Tree Gully council. I consider that that is realistic, because the people there have no real connection with Tea Tree Gully and they are near the Salisbury shopping centre.

The Hills ward will go to the Gumeracha council and the new boundary will be at the top of the hills face zone. That would be at Range Road, Houghton. Again, on this occasion I did not receive any recommendations or submissions from residents of the area, but in the past a petition seeking removal from Tea Tree Gully was signed. I do not say that all residents of that area will be satisfied with the recommendations of the Royal Commission in this respect, but I consider that, as this is a rural area and will remain so, it is reasonable that it should be taken from the Tea Tree Gully council area and annexed to the Gumeracha council area.

To sum up, the Bill gives effect to most of the recommendations of the Commission. It reduces the number of councils from 137 to 88, 25 being metropolitan councils and 63 rural councils. Previously, the Royal Commission had recommended that there be 74 local government authorities. The modification of some of the Commission's recommendations means that eight metropolitan and nine rural councils will retain their existing boundaries. The Bill, with some exceptions, should have the overall support of the public, and I consider that it has that support. Of course, no Bill or alteration will ever meet the wishes of everyone, but this Bill is being referred to a Select Committee, so ratepayers who still consider that their submissions should have been upheld may make further representations.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I oppose the Bill and shall continue to oppose any action that this or any future State Government or Commonwealth Government may take to interfere with the domestic functions of local government. Representatives at local government level ought to be allowed to retain at least the opportunity to make their own local decisions. I accept that the State Government has been responsible for the principal Act. It has accepted that responsibility, and the Government can amend, as it sees fit, the basic criteria by which councils will administer their affairs.

The Commonwealth Government does not interfere with the State Government when the State Government is considering altering its electoral boundaries, and on the same basis this Government and this Parliament have no right

to interfere with local government in that respect. I refer again to the domestic functions of local government. Recently this State Government has tried to direct and dictate to local government about how it will function locally. The Minister introduced a Bill by which the Government tried to tell councils when they should meet, and provisions in the Bill directed councils as to the majorities that would apply when they were making local decisions.

Again, the Bill before us directs councils about the boundaries and geography of their areas, and I do not agree that the Government can be fairly supported in this dictatorial attitude. Section 24 of the principal Act gives councils power to petition the Governor where ward, district, or corporation boundary changes are desirable in the interests of good management of the areas. It is fair to say that many councils have been reluctant, for one reason or another, to change their boundaries or even to consider revising them.

There has been little change in council boundaries since the consolidation of Statutes relating to district councils, corporations and municipalities in 1934. It is understandable that councils have been reluctant to alter their boundaries or to propose such revisions to ratepayers. The councils have not had the assistance or guidance of a State Government on how to take this action, and they have never had any real encouragement to do so. However, in this case they have had encouragement. The Government (and I support it in this action) has appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into boundaries.

Of the councils in the State, 58 per cent agreed that an inquiry into the boundaries should be undertaken, in 1972. When the Government made that offer of an inquiry, I was a member of a district council, and that council supported wholeheartedly the appointment of a revision committee. I still support the action that the Government took at that time. In fact, I go so far as to say that I support most of the findings of the Royal Commission and the principles on which those findings are based. Furthermore, I appreciate the action taken to publish the recommendations in that report so that they are available to the councils concerned.

However, I will not agree that Parliament should take advantage of the Commission's findings and dictate to councils what they shall and shall not do. The Royal Commission report, a comprehensive and valuable document, is evidence of the first positive action that the Government has taken in the 40 years since 1934 to assist councils, and the report should be made available to the public and to councils for their guidance. The member for Kavel has also opposed the Bill, but he has different reasons from mine for opposing it. He said that he had no alternative but to oppose it, and that he was speaking as the voice of his constituents. Fortunately, at this stage I am not in the same position as that of the honourable member. Nine councils serve the District of Alexandra, and at least a clear majority of them is satisfied with and willing to accept the contents of the report, whether by direction or otherwise. If I were to be guided by the majority of councils in my district, I would accept this Bill. However, I do not accept the principle behind the Bill, and there is no way by which I can accept the imposition of such directions on local government from this level.

A fairly comprehensive history of events has led to the consideration of this Bill, which seeks to impose certain directions on local government. In this respect I refer to notes taken on June 29, 1972, at a Victor Harbor meeting

attended by Mr. Hockridge, then an officer in the Minister's department. He addressed the meeting and expressed fairly his personal opinion in guiding the people of the community in respect of the inquiry to be undertaken into local government boundaries. Among other things, Mr. Hockridge said, "The size of councils does not necessarily make them more efficient". He went on to say, "Councils do not necessarily become more efficient as they become larger". He freely admitted, in front of that large gathering, that at least some small councils were efficient, and he thought that the three councils represented at the meeting were efficient.

Clearly, therefore, efficiency does not necessarily rely on the amalgamation of councils. Mr. Hockridge also said that the increased size of councils did not necessarily mean a saving in expenditure on the cost of machinery or administration. Certainly, I would not find it difficult to support that comment. I refer to two neighbouring councils in my district which enjoy the benefits of Highways Department finance to undertake certain road-works and which jointly use plant and equipment. This is a most economic and neighbourly means of using such equipment, and the economic position of both those councils would not necessarily be improved if they were forced to amalgamate.

To the question "Would amalgamation necessarily increase efficient operation?" Mr. Hockridge replied that that was not necessarily so. Several other questions were put to him, and his replies all indicated that that officer, later to become a member of the Royal Commission that inquired into this matter, was sincere in his approach to the subject. I supported his comments then, and I certainly support his comments on that occasion and his subsequent efforts, along with those of his colleagues who comprised the Royal Commission.

This Bill ignores the integrity of local government members. Councillors, many of whom have served South Australia for many years in an honorary capacity, have to be dedicated, otherwise they do not stay in local government; in fact, they could not have got into local government unless they could convince their electors that they would work in their interests and for the welfare of the community. Therefore, I believe it is a slur on the character and integrity of these men that the Government seeks to direct them on how and on where they should operate in respect of local government areas. I do not intend to support this Bill, or any other such dictatorial action by the Minister in this field.

I now refer to the individual councils in my district. In line with the recommendations of the report, the Yankalilla District Council area is left virtually untouched, and the council is happy about that situation. Had the Commission recommended that the area be fiddled around with or grossly adjusted, I believe reaction against the recommendation would have been forthcoming. The area of the Willunga District Council has been enlarged to encompass part of the neighbouring Meadows District Council area. That recommendation, no matter how it is applied, be it through this Government's direction or be it left to the discretion of the councils concerned, is acceptable.

Among other recent steps taken by the Minister, the Goolwa and Port Elliot council has been excluded from the Commission's recommendations, which suggested originally that this council amalgamate with the Victor Harbor and Encounter Bay councils, and the original boundaries are now to be retained. From the outset, I supported the retention of the original boundaries of the Goolwa-Port

Elliot Council. I believe that the arguments put forward in favour of the retention of these boundaries were fair and reasonable. Had this submission not been accepted by the Minister in his recent political manoeuvre, it would doubtless have been accepted by any fair-minded committee later established to examine the matter. The Victor Harbor corporation and the Encounter Bay council are two local government authorities that should have been amalgamated some years ago. The recommendation for this has provided these two councils with the opportunity and the platform to combine. So, most of the councils to which I have referred have welcomed the recommendations of the report.

I now refer to Kangaroo Island and the situation facing the Kingscote District Council, which administers more than three-quarters of the island's area and, excluding Crown land, leaves only a small area to be administered by the Dudley District Council. As a member of the Kingscote District Council, I earlier agreed with and supported the establishment of the Royal Commission. Subsequently, the Kingscote District Council was willing to accept the Commission's report, if the recommendation were also supported by the Dudley District Council. However, the recommendations are not supported by the Dudley District Council, and there is no way in the world in which that council will accept the principle to which I have just referred. The councils on Kangaroo Island will undoubtedly consider the report as a guide. They will now be prepared to take into account the specific findings that have been included in the first and second reports and will no doubt consider the merits of the reports. I assure Parliament that the Dudley District Council ratepayers are bitterly opposed to being directed as to the area to be governed or by whom they shall be governed.

I support the attitude of the Dudley District Council to this extent: it should be granted at least the opportunity of making its own decision about the destiny of its area. There may be considerable merit in having one district council for the island community, but so far the Minister has been unable to convince me in the fields of economics, practical administration and practical operation that a larger council area can be better served than a smaller council area. I persist in referring to this area because it is the only part of my electoral district where there is any great problem about the recommendations facing us, where there is a bitter difference of opinion among some people. It is the only area where I am ready to stand up and support the minority group to have the right ultimately to make its own local decisions. In that area, the plant that is owned by the larger council is available to the minority group for use on its roads. The Kingscote District Council area is a wet area and it is practical and sensible for that council to direct its plant to the drier limestone type of country of the Dudley District Council area in the winter months. Accordingly, by good local management, that situation has applied in the past, and the intelligence and integrity of the local councillors in Kingscote and Dudley have been observed. I hope the Minister will have due regard to their experience and not try, as he does in this Bill generally, to dictate to such councils as to how they shall operate or how their boundaries shall be adjusted.

To summarise, generally I support the Royal Commission's findings. There is much valuable evidence in that report that has not been available to councils since the consolidation of the Act in 1934. It is the first positive attempt by any South Australian Government to assist this area of local government, but I oppose the Government's going so far as to direct and dictate to the councils.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I support this Bill. In doing so, I want to spend a few minutes initially referring to some of the comments made by the previous speaker and some of the earlier speakers on the opposite side. The member for Alexandra based the whole of his speech primarily on what he saw as the principle that the State Government should not dictate local government boundaries to local government. What an extraordinary principle on which to base a whole speech in this House, as local government boundaries (in fact, local government itself) take their whole existence from the powers of this Parliament, and local government is completely responsible to this Parliament! The honourable member's contribution was completely inept, because it started from a complete misunderstanding of the whole operation of the Local Government Act.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It started on a false premise and ended up in bedlam.

Mr. DUNCAN: Precisely. The honourable member's whole contribution was based on a misunderstanding of the Local Government Act. One has only to study that Act briefly to realise fully that local government boundaries must be set by this Parliament, and this Parliament in exercising that power must finally be responsible for the boundaries it sets. In every case where local government boundaries are set in this State, they must be set pursuant to the Local Government Act, an Act of this Parliament, and that explodes the ridiculous argument that the member for Alexandra has tried to foist on us this evening. It was an argument with no basis in fact at all. In that trend, he followed several of his colleagues and tried to mislead the House. The member for Davenport obviously had not read the Minister's second reading explanation, and so had clearly missed the changes that had been made in the East Torrens council area.

Mr. Chapman: Section 24 enables a petition to be lodged.

Mr. DUNCAN: Of course it does. It provides that local councils, ratepayers or voters may petition.

Mr. Chapman: Some have done this.

Mr. DUNCAN: Yes, but the overall situation is that local government in this State, to continue to be a viable entity, urgently needs a redistribution of boundaries to ensure that it can continue to function as local government, and there is no doubt, from the attitude of members opposite, that they realise this. The problem confronting members opposite in this legislation is that they want two bob each way. It is not even two bob each way, because they do not go one way or the other: they really want to sit on the fence because this Bill has placed many members opposite, unlike the members on this side, in a complete quandary. On the one hand, the smaller district councils are saying to them, "Whatever you do, we want this legislation destroyed; we do not want a redistribution because we will go out of existence"; and, on the other hand, the bigger councils are saying to them, "Support the legislation, because we want to ensure that this local government regional area becomes viable."

That is the problem facing members opposite, and that is why they have raised this red herring about politics being involved. I was astounded to hear that earlier this evening and I have been further astounded to hear members opposite continue to push it, because the Minister of Local Government in this Labor Government should be commended for his political courage in setting up the Royal Commission. It was an act of astounding political courage. There was no doubt, when the Royal Commission

was established by this Government, that it would create much heat in the community. The Government and the Minister knew that. Notwithstanding that, the Minister had the political courage and principle to continue on the path he knew was right and all members knew was right, as we have heard this evening from members opposite.

Mr. Chapman: What would you say—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made his speech. Interjections are out of order.

Mr. Chapman: No-one has interfered with members speaking from the other side, although we suffered in that way.

Mr. DUNCAN: The honourable member did not make his speech very well and possibly that is why he has to make further points by interjecting. I commend the Minister for introducing this Bill. As I have said, rather than being an act of political expediency, as has been dishonestly suggested by members opposite, it has taken much political courage on the part of the Minister to introduce this Bill, knowing full well that not everyone in the community would agree with it. Members opposite to whom I spoke privately supported the Minister's setting up a Royal Commission but, now that the results are in, now that the test is really on, and now they have to stand up and be counted, they are looking for holes to hide in, because they know this is a Bill on which they cannot win. If they vote against it, it will upset some of their constituents, while, if they vote for it, they will upset other constituents. This is why members opposite are saying that this Bill has been introduced to save political skins on this side; actually, one finds that that is contrary to the facts of the case, if one reads the Bill and looks at the maps in the schedule.

Mr. Mathwin: It sounds as though you're talking about the shopping hours referendum.

Mr. DUNCAN: I will get to the honourable member's situation later. He is one of the political desperadoes who are caught completely in the cleft stick to which I have referred.

Mr. Mathwin: I will tell you what happened at Brighton.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You sat on the fence.

Mr. Mathwin: I said that I would do what the people wanted me to do.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What do they want you to do?

Mr. Mathwin: I will tell you in a minute.

Mr. DUNCAN: The member for Bragg said he realised that much of the opposition to the Royal Commission's report and to this Bill was based on parochialism. The honourable member said that he supported the right of those people to be parochial. He can support their right, but this Government has an obligation to govern the whole of the State. It must seek the greatest happiness of the greatest number. We cannot go down to each little sleepy hollow and, just because it has had a local council for the past 100 years, subsidise it so that it can continue. We must take an overall view of the situation for the good of the State. The parochialism that the member for Bragg supports is appalling. If this Parliament is to start looking at the interests of each and every rotten pocket borough in this community, we will get to a level that is not in the interests of this Parliament or the people of this State.

Mr. Chapman: You may call them rotten pocket boroughs, but little councils must be preserved.

Mr. DUNCAN: I will get to the term "rotten pocket boroughs" when I refer to the question of the democratic committee.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What was democratic about it?

Mr. DUNCAN: That is the point I will make. Whenever the Government raises the question of local government, members opposite scream "democracy", and it is an astounding perversion of the word when they use it. To members opposite, democracy in local government means the rule of the majority by the tiniest minority.

Mr. Payne: Eight per cent.

Mr. DUNCAN: Yes. I do not want to stray into a discussion about the undemocratic structure of local government in this State. In my own area there are basically two councils, the Elizabeth City Council and the Munno Para District Council. One of the wards of the Munno Para District Council has 200 ratepayers on the roll, and another ward has 10 000 ratepayers on the roll. Is that democratic? That is the sort of thing we get with the present boundaries, which were drawn up many years ago and which have failed to take account of modern demographic trends.

Dr. Eastick: How many councillors are there for each ward?

Mr. DUNCAN: There is one councillor for the smallest ward, and there are two councillors for the largest ward—a ratio of one councillor for 5 000 ratepayers in the largest ward. Surely the Leader of the Opposition is not justifying a gerrymander such as that. If he is, this will be the first time the Leader has admitted the undemocratic spots that he wears.

Dr. Eastick: What areas do they represent?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Councillors represent people, don't they, not areas?

Mr. DUNCAN: The latest report of the Royal Commission basically provides that the Munno Para council and the Elizabeth council will be amalgamated, with a small area of the Munno Para council going to the Gawler corporation, which basically supports the Royal Commission's report. The Munno Para council originally decided to support the report, but some card-carrying members of the Liberal Party are members of the Munno Para council. I believe that they make up portion of the majority on that council. After consultations from above, the majority on that council changed its mind about the Royal Commission's report, and five councillors subsequently voted in favour of the report and six voted against.

Dr. Eastick: Did that include the Chairman?

Mr. DUNCAN: Yes.

Dr. Eastick: Whose card does she carry?

Mr. DUNCAN: To my knowledge, she does not carry any card. One thing I can say about Councillor Luscombe is that she certainly does not belong to the Labor Party (if that is what the Leader is looking for). This shows the lack of democracy in the situation. The six councillors on the Munno Para council who opposed the report represent about 20 per cent of the ratepayers of the area.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What happened to the councillor representing the 200 people in a ward?

Mr. DUNCAN: He was one of the six who opposed the report. He supports the Liberal view on this matter; that is a clear indication of the sort of situation we have in Munno Para. The vast number of people in the Munno Para area support the report but, because of the gerrymandered ward boundaries, their opinions are not fully

reflected. The city of Elizabeth basically contains the majority of my constituents. Therefore, in speaking in this debate and in voting in this House, I shall be guided by the attitude of the people of Elizabeth and the Elizabeth council. So that the House can see the support existing in many areas for this Bill, I shall quote the following letter from the city of Elizabeth:

Dear Sir,

Royal Commission—Local Government Boundaries.

At a recent meeting of the general council it was resolved that the Elizabeth council support and endorse in its entirety, the findings of the Royal Commission into local government boundaries and that the Minister of Local Government be requested to implement the recommendations as expeditiously as possible.

This council calls on the Minister to implement the recommendations, not, as the member for Alexandra has said, that we must wait until each council decides to get off its backside and do something about the boundary situation. This council takes the forward and progressive step of asking the Minister to take action. The letter continues:

This council believes that the reorganisation of council boundaries is the answer to strong local government in South Australia. It feels that local government will cease to function effectively in this changing world, if it only confines itself to just the provision of roads and other essential services. The Elizabeth council is of the opinion that local government must branch out and begin to provide community services, as it does in other countries and, to achieve this end, councils must become larger and more flexible. By pooling all its various resources it can better utilise the people's money, and will also assist in the prevention of further erosion of local government powers.

It is realised that it is absolutely impossible to please everyone, and that people are reluctant to and resist change in any shape or form when it affects them personally; however, these proposed changes will be to the good of the community as a whole. This council requests that you support the amending legislation as it is introduced into Parliament to enable the Commission's recommendation on boundaries to be progressively put into effect. It is imperative that early action be taken in view of the uncertainty that exists in local government at the present moment.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) M. C. Jenkins,
Town Clerk

That letter adequately expresses the attitude of many local government authorities in this State. Unfortunately, because many councils are happy with the report on boundaries, they have not spent large sums of the people's money in opposing it. As a result, the main voices we have heard in this debate about whether the legislation should be supported or not have been the voices of those councils and of councillors, supported in some cases by ratepayers, in areas that are to be abolished or vitally affected in a way that they consider is not in their interests, and they have opposed the legislation.

Mr. Evans: And they were listened to in many cases.

Mr. Goldsworthy: In many cases they weren't.

Mr. DUNCAN: They were listened to in many cases, and due weight was given to their views.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Tell me of any council that wasn't listened to.

Mr. DUNCAN: I now indicate the lengths to which members of the Liberal Party have gone in defending what they see as their vital political interests. The Munno Para council held a public meeting of ratepayers, called at the short notice of about four or five days. I attended this meeting, which was an interesting composition of all the diehard L.C.L. members and supporters in the One Tree Hill area, with a few from the Virginia area. A few people attended from the Elizabeth portion of the council area. The meeting was based on the misconception,

at that stage, that rates would increase if Munno Para was included in Elizabeth, but people at the meeting did not understand, until it was pointed out, that the rates in the Elizabeth area were lower than those in the Munno Para area, and they would be saving money if that council amalgamated with Elizabeth. They had been sold the idea by L.C.L. organisers and supporters in the area that they would pay extra rates if the amalgamation with Elizabeth took place. This point has been sold widely throughout the State to try to defeat this legislation. It is a point that has no validity in many cases: in the case of Munno Para it was a downright lie. However, the rumour was widely spread in order to defeat the legislation, so that L.C.L. members of the Munno Para council could continue to dominate that area from the small and gerrymandered power base.

That was the attitude they had propagated at the meeting, but, when I spoke to them, and pointed out the facts, many people who had been brought along specifically to vote against the legislation changed their minds. The meeting still, by a majority, opposed the Royal Commission's report, and I do not wish to mislead Parliament on that point. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that the meeting had been heavily stacked by rural interests and by people who had been brainwashed into thinking that their vital interests would be dramatically affected by this legislation. The situation in other areas has been referred to. I have received a document (as I suppose other members have) from the District Council of Meadows. It is an interesting document, in that it does not really give any reason why that council should continue. The letter states:

The district of Meadows is developing rapidly and council is now in the position to offer local government second to none in this State. It seems short-sighted to dismember an area which, in a few years, will probably be large enough to be formed into two new councils.

I think that statement perfectly exposes the argument put forward by the District Council of Meadows, and indicates that the council is desperately trying to survive at present. Whether it is the officers or councillors who are anxious about the situation, I do not know, but it seems that the council will not mind being separated in a few years so long as it is not done today.

Mr. Evans: Have you studied the council's area?

Mr. DUNCAN: I have looked at the map to see the area it has, and the proposals that have been made by the Royal Commission tailor in very well. I should think that any reasonable person who read the report as applying to the District Council of Meadows would clearly see the advantages for the people of that area, if the report were implemented.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Many people would see the political disadvantage to certain Liberal members.

Mr. DUNCAN: I believe that the Royal Commission's report on boundaries, which in general is being implemented by this Bill, should be supported unanimously by this Parliament. I earnestly ask Opposition members to take a detached view of this matter, to get away from their local backyards, and to see the matter on a State-wide basis.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DUNCAN: As the Minister has said many times, if Opposition members had read the report and absorbed the facts contained in it, they would have realised why it should be supported in full. The Royal Commission has done an excellent job; I believe that no member would disagree with that statement. It has performed a difficult

job extremely well, and I think its recommendations should be supported by all members by voting for this legislation.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you think it's all right in my district?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It was looking at the whole State.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The honourable member is not worried about my district.

Mr. DUNCAN: I am concerned about the existence of local government in South Australia, and its existence depends on the passage of this Bill.

Mr. Goldsworthy: In what way?

Mr. DUNCAN: If small rural councils are to continue for another 40 years as they have operated in the past, local government in South Australia will collapse.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why?

Mr. DUNCAN: Because of the sheer weight of their economic situation.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you disputing what the Royal Commission said? This is what it said: are you saying it was wrong?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: I again commend the Government and the Minister for the politically far-sighted attitude that has been shown in introducing this legislation. This subject was bound to be a political hot potato.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Don't you—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel has had an opportunity to address the House.

Mr. DUNCAN: The Minister grasped the nettle and he has had the political guts to take the matter right through. I commend him for it, and I commend the Government for introducing this legislation.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): It is always an honour to talk about local government, because it is one of the oldest forms of government. Some recognisable form of local government was in operation in England in the year 925. The first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas states:

Much has been written of the value of local government. It is not our intention to repeat what has already been said, but merely to set out certain of our observations and comments which affect this topic, and relate it to council boundaries.

I do not intend to go back over the history of local government except to say that, in its earlier form, central government in England grew out of local government. However, in Australia local government was appointed by central government and, as has been said many times, South Australia has the proud reputation of being the first Australian State in which local government was established. The Royal Commission was most conscious of the importance of local government. On page 10, paragraph (b) states:

A question which immediately arises relates to the necessity or desirability of local government. Could central government take over the tasks currently carried out by local bodies? There is little doubt that it could—but in our opinion, and we believe, in the opinion of practically all witnesses who gave evidence before us, it could not do so as successfully as local government.

I understand that comment to mean that local government has a real place in our society and that it is a most important establishment. The report continues:

Apart from councils, representatives of various government authorities submitted that for a wide variety of tasks, the best equipped body is the local council. Its role in modern planning, in conjunction with the State Planning Authority, has been accepted in this State. The Weeds Advisory Committee (Agriculture Department), and the Vermin Board (Lands Department), both considered that the local authorities were the appropriate bodies to deal with the important tasks entrusted to them by Statute. The Tourist Bureau indicated that at the local level, tourist activity should be handled by local people. Similarly, the Commissioner of Highways advocated the system presently operating whereby local services are supplied by local councils. These are but a few of many instances which could be given to indicate the value and importance of local government. However, all of the witnesses—both those we have quoted and others—agreed that to fulfil adequately its role, local government must be strong and effective. The witnesses often held divergent views on the method of making the system more effective, but all were agreed on the principle.

In this debate, we are considering a most important aspect of our law making and the administration of our society. The report further states:

In this connection, we could perhaps make reference to the evidence of the Federation of Adelaide Metropolitan Residents Association—F.A.M.R.A.—and that of the Town and Country Planning Association. Both of these bodies gave evidence before us through skilled representatives who had considered the concept of local government. Their respective views as to what ought to be the final position with regard to local government appeared to be diametrically opposed, thus illustrating the variance of opinion that exists and the difficulties of arriving at a correct conclusion. These views were based on the one hand upon a continuance of a system of local government and on the other upon its replacement with a form of regional government. Opinions can be diametrically opposed and, although we accept the concept of local government, opinions vary on how its functions should be carried out and how the boundaries should be arranged. As the years go by, and as various aspects of life change (communications, transportation, areas, and so on), we must accept that change, just as I think everyone accepts that there is a need for a realignment of boundaries in some areas. There is, for instance, the case where a developing town spills out beyond its boundary and into a district council area. Here, very often the ratepayer in the town is paying for the facilities of those living in the district council area. It is obvious that the Royal Commission was well aware of these facts. On page 23, subsection (9) states:

It has been necessary for us to give consideration to the positions of those places outside the metropolitan area known as towns or cities, where there exists a local governing body separate from that controlling the surrounding rural area. We have formed the opinion that these country towns and cities do not operate to the best advantage of local government as separate entities. In saying this, we are not in any way reflecting on the ability and effort of those councillors and officers of such bodies, but we believe that difficulties exist for two main reasons:

- (a) It is an unnatural situation to cut off from the surrounding areas the towns or cities upon which those areas rely—it is a breach of the "community of interest" rule.
- (b) The town or city cannot afford, using that word in its widest sense, to supply the necessary facilities to the surrounding area without the help of the area it in fact services, and the area should not be expected to be separated from the town or city by which it is serviced.

Having mentioned those facts, I bring to the notice of honourable members an area situated in my district. I refer to the major towns in northern Yorke Peninsula (Moonta, Wallaroo and Kadina), situated within the bounds of a district council area. About six years ago an attempt at amalgamation was made in this unique situation. I remember attending a local government conference about 15 years ago when the then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford)

appealed to representatives of councils and corporations to do whatever they could to reassess their situation and their boundaries to bring about desirable changes. Several meetings were held in the area I have mentioned, and even wards were determined, but a breakdown occurred, and the attempt failed. I bring that matter forward to show that attempts have been made in my area to realign and reallocate boundaries to bring about a more equitable situation where there have been difficulties. Because of the Commission's first report, in my district there are some dissatisfied local government bodies, two of which are municipalities and two of which are district councils. The municipalities of Moonta and Wallaroo are dissatisfied. The Bute District Council, which has been viable, was to go out of existence, and the Blyth District Council was to be divided and taken over by neighbouring district councils.

The Royal Commission was approached again, because of public dissatisfaction, and asked to consider written submissions. As a result it was recommended that the Bute District Council be not amalgamated with the towns of Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta and the Kadina District Council, but that it be placed in a separate area with the Broughton District Council. I congratulate these two council's initiatives on meeting together, discussing, and coming forward with a new proposal acceptable to the Commission. A difficulty was ironed out, and the submission of those two district councils was accepted by the Commission. However, it was astounding that, following this, because of the direct opposition of people, particularly in the city and in some country areas, the Government should have departed from the rule and from correct procedure. Instead of going back to the Commission again or perhaps accepting its report as it was, the Government, for one reason or another, came down with a different decision. A report in the *Advertiser* of October 9, under the heading "Reprieves for 17 councils on boundaries", states:

Eight metropolitan and nine country councils have been granted exemptions from boundary changes recommended by the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas. Under pressure from Government MPs and strong Government advertising campaigns, the Minister of Local Government (Mr. Virgo) announced yesterday a reprieve for the following:

The metropolitan corporations and country councils are all named in the report. I wonder whether the position was quite as the report states, namely, that it was under pressure from Government members that the announcement was made. If that is correct, not all Government members were happy with the Commission's report. The article continues:

Mr. Virgo denied that he had watered down the Commission's suggestions for political motives. He said members of the Legislative Council had made it clear they would reject the entire Bill as it stood unless there were some concessions.

It is just as well that the Government has someone to blame; again, it is the poor old Upper House. The article continues:

What the Government was attempting to do was present an acceptable form of legislation which would allow the bulk of the Commission's recommendations to be passed. I wonder whether it was the bulk of the Commission's recommendations. The article continues:

"You could call it a compromise, a watering down, a backing off, or whatever you like," he said. "But what it is, in fact, is a genuine attempt on the part of the Government to have enacted as many of the recommendations of the Royal Commission as it is possible to do." He said if the Bill passed the second reading it would be referred to a Parliamentary Select Committee which would hear submissions from anyone concerned.

What I should like to know is whether the Minister is willing to say why those councils and corporations were the ones to be reprieved, because in my area at least three local government bodies made sufficient submissions with the necessary backing. For instance on behalf of the Blyth District Council, I presented a petition to the House bearing 345 signatures of people in the council area who were absolutely opposed to the council's going out of existence. That district council has been as effective as have many other councils that have been restored to existence by the Government's action. Page 22 of the Commission's first report states:

We regard the effectiveness of the operation as the keynote, rather than its efficiency.

The Blyth District Council has been both effective and efficient also, and it would be remiss of me if I did not read a telegram I received from the corporation of Wallaroo, as follows:

Findings Royal Commission into boundaries have been eroded. Any principles applied have been abandoned. Strongly urge total rejection this undemocratic Bill.

Mr Venning: By whom is it signed?

Mr. RUSSACK: Mayor F. A. Jones. The *Advertiser* editorial of October 9 states:

It is clear, as Mr. Virgo himself concedes, that the reprieve granted the 17 councils—eight metropolitan and nine country—is attributable to the bitter opposition to change evinced by ratepayers in those areas. In that sense it is an undeniable victory for those who made the effort to bestir themselves sufficiently to press their objections publicly.

I take exception to the fact that those who have complained loudest have received a reprieve. Why have those who have a case that is as genuine still been ignored? On behalf of those councils in my district, I ask for a reconsideration of this matter.

Mr. Langley: Do you say there should not be any changes?

Mr. RUSSACK: I am not saying that. Where I say the matter went wrong was that the Government, when it received the first and second reports, made a change regarding 17 councils and gave no reasons other than that public pressure had been applied. Those who were fortunate enough to have applied most pressure were given a reprieve. That is not the same as saying that the change suggested by the Commission has been adopted in its entirety. The Government has done what it considered best in its own interest and for its own survival.

Mr. Langley: That's not correct, and you know it.

Mr. RUSSACK: It must be correct: the facts speak for themselves. Why else would the Government have ignored the report that was submitted and then have made its own decisions? I should like now to refer to a comment by a former Chairman of a district council that will go out of existence. The council is not in my district, but the comment has been mentioned to me, and I have noted it in the report. Many councillors wished to have an indication of what their ratepayers wanted, just as the Minister in 1972 asked all the councils whether they favoured the appointment of a Royal Commission. I think he stated that 58 per cent of the councils favoured it. Therefore, he went ahead with the Royal Commission. In the same way, the council to which I am referring sought an indication from the ratepayers by way of petition. The petition was presented to the Royal Commission, but these words in the report were not appreciated:

We accepted these petitions with a warning that such documents must be treated with some caution as a true expression of the wishes of the signatories.

I agree that in some areas there is a need for change, but not for the drastic change provided in the Bill. I still consider that even some councils that have been given new areas would like further minor alterations made. In my district there are nine councils, and I have contacted them to get their opinions on the matter. Of the nine councils, six accept the proposals. As I have stated, the proposals are not acceptable to the corporations of Moonta and Wallaroo.

The District Council of Blyth, which will go out of existence under the Bill, cannot see that this is justified and, as it has been a conscientious, good and effective council, it can see no reason why other councils should be reprieved when it is being denied survival. Like other members, I commend those persons who are involved in local government. The work load on officers is becoming more and more onerous, and there is a need for adequate staff. I commend the councillors, who spend many hours on council work. Here again, because of the administrative needs in councils, these councillors have to give more time to that work.

In the work of representing people in the three tiers of Government, the work of a councillor possibly is the most

difficult. In the armed services, a corporal was the non-commissioned officer of the lowest rank, but he had to live with his men and know them, and yet get the respect and discipline that was necessary. I liken the corporal to a councillor. The councillor must be close to the people, live with them, know what they want, be strong enough to make decisions, and yet still command the respect necessary from those people. I pay respect to all councillors.

Because of the views of councils in my district, some councils accepting this proposal and some being dissatisfied, I will support the second reading so that the Select Committee may take evidence, and so that the decision eventually made may help other councils in my district. Then, when the findings of the Select Committee are known and the debate on the legislation continues in this House, I will decide whether to support the third reading.

Mr. LANGLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.18 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 16, at 2 p.m.