

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, October 9, 1975

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Appropriation (No. 2),
Salaries Adjustment (Public Service and Teachers) Act Amendment,
State Bank Act Amendment.

SURVEYORS 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.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mrs. BYRNE presented a petition signed by 1 049 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the abolition of succession duties on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

OLD LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL BUILDING

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (September 16).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been informed that detailed consideration has been given by departmental officers to the need and justification for retention of the various elements of the old Legislative Council building. However, it has been difficult to achieve unanimity on this subject. Simultaneously with the discussion taking place in the House, a recommendation was made by the departmental Historic Buildings Committee that the Director of Environment and Conservation be requested to forward an application to the Australian Heritage Commission for an allocation of funds to enable an environmental study to be undertaken on the future of this particular complex. This proposal envisages the use of consultants. The above study

is being arranged and a particular recommendation will be sought in respect of the future of the original Parliamentary meeting room.

RACING INDUSTRY

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (October 1).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will not be possible to introduce a new racing Bill to Parliament this calendar year. However, it may be possible for such a measure to be introduced in February, 1976, but this will depend on the legislative programme at the time. A Bill to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act in respect of the constitution of the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board will be introduced this session. This action is necessary as a result of the amalgamation of the metropolitan racing clubs.

VEHICLE REGISTRATION

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 10).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: For the purposes of registration, vehicles are classified solely with regard to their construction. It is considered that the standard Land Rover is basically constructed for the carriage of goods and not passengers and for this reason they have been classified as commercial vehicles. The standard Land Rover, as manufactured, is not fitted with a row of cross seats, fixed or folding, upholstered or sprung with back rests similarly upholstered or sprung, as suggested by the honourable member. The standard vehicle provides only an unpadded plate attached to the wheel arch on each side and no seat belts are fitted in the back of the vehicle. Access cannot be gained from the side of the vehicle to the area behind the front seats but only from the rear. It should also be noted that if the Land Rover were classified as a passenger carrying vehicle, then it would not attract the 50 per cent concession on the registration fee or the reduction in third party insurance premium, when owned and used by primary producers. However, if an applicant advises the Registrar of Motor Vehicles that his short wheel base Land Rover has been modified to provide padded cross seats with back rests and that reasonable access can be gained to this seating from the rear of the vehicle, he would be prepared to have it inspected to assess whether it should be classified as passenger-carrying. Other Land Rovers have been so assessed. A comparison of the registration fees and third party insurance premiums payable for a Land Rover, based on a power weight of 41-45 (tare weight 1 320 kg, horsepower 15) is as follows:

| | Private | | Commercial | | Primary Producer | |
|---|----------|---------|------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | 12 mths. | 6 mths. | 12 mths. | 6 mths. | 12 mths. | 6 mths. |
| | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| <i>Within 20 miles radius from G.P.O., Adelaide:</i> | | | | | | |
| Registration..... | 33.80 | 17.70 | 42.00 | 22.00 | 21.00 | 11.00 |
| Third Party Insurance..... | 58.00 | 30.40 | 70.00 | 36.70 | 47.00 | 24.70 |
| | 91.80 | 48.10 | 112.00 | 58.70 | 68.00 | 35.70 |
| <i>Outside 20 miles radius from G.P.O., Adelaide:</i> | | | | | | |
| Registration..... | 33.80 | 17.70 | 42.00 | 22.00 | 21.00 | 11.00 |
| Third Party Insurance..... | 58.00 | 30.40 | 64.00 | 33.60 | 17.00 | 8.90 |
| | 91.80 | 48.10 | 106.00 | 55.60 | 38.00 | 19.90 |

BUSES

In reply to Mr. WHITTEN (October 2).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Municipal Tramways Trust has had no problem in obtaining supplies of gas for refrigerated air-conditioning units. The air-conditioning unit in the coach concerned had a leak in a gas pipe. The air conditioner is not used in the winter, as it is for cooling, not heating. Repairs have been carried out to the air-conditioning unit, which is now in operation ready for the coming summer.

RAILWAY ROLLING STOCK

In reply to Mr. CUMBE (August 27).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The figure of \$348 000 quoted by the honourable member represented expenditure by the Rolling Stock Branch only on plant, machinery, motor vehicles and sundries in the 1974-75 Loan Estimates. Separate lines provided for expenditure by the Rolling Stock Branch of \$454 000 for service stock vehicles with an amount of \$630 000 provided for the Way and Works Branch for plant and sundries. This gave a total of

\$1 432 000 for 1974-75. It is this total amount that is comparable to the amount of \$1 493 000 shown as one line in this year's Estimates; the component parts of which are:

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Rolling Stock Branch: | \$ |
| Motor vehicles and industrial units | 370 000 |
| Plant and machinery..... | 200 000 |
| Service stock vehicles..... | 3 000 |
| Way and Works Branch: | |
| Plant and sundries..... | 920 000 |
| Total.. | \$1,493,000..... |

PENANG VISIT

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 16).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As at October 1, 1975, the persons listed in the attached schedule will be participating in the presentation of Adelaide Week in Penang, and accordingly their expenses will be met (wholly or in part) by the South Australian Government. The State Government will also be meeting the cost of the following members of the South Australian Parliament: Hon. D. A. Dunstan; Hon. B. A. Chatterton; Hon. D. H. L. Banfield; and the Leader of the Opposition, Dr. D. O. Tonkin. The member for Torrens (Mr. J. W. H. Coumbe) will be travelling at his own expense and, at the present time, reservations are being held for at least two other members who have indicated their desire to join the contingent. The remainder of the contingent are persons (265) who have applied to travel at their own expense.

V.I.P. SCHEDULE:

The Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Mr. J. J. Roche;
Mrs. Roche;
Mrs. B. A. Chatterton;
Mrs. D. H. L. Banfield;
Mrs. D. O. Tonkin;
Mr. R. D. Bakewell, Director, Premier's Department;
Mr. R. W. Arland, Town Clerk, Corporation of Adelaide;
Mr. G. J. Inns, Chairman, Public Service Board;
Mr. K. W. Lewis, Director and Engineer in Chief, Engineering and Water Supply Department; and
Mr. M. H. Bone, Director of Further Education.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE:

Mr. W. M. Scriven, Director of Development;
Mr. K. C. Bellchamber, Deputy Director of Development;
Mr. I. I. Kowalick, Supervisor, Industrial Exhibition;
Mr. D. H. Gage, Assistant Supervisor, Industrial Exhibition;
Mr. J. Haslam, Assistant Promotions Officer;
Mr. R. Clarke, Trade Officer;
Mr. D. Martin, Trade Officer;
Mr. T. O'Connell, Projects Officer, Development Division; and
Mr. R. Fuge, Senior Poultry Adviser, Department of Agriculture.
Industrial Representatives Nominated by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry:
Mr. A. K. Sellick, representing food industry;
Mr. W. G. P. Hall, representing building materials;
Mr. M. A. Thompson, representing sporting goods;
Mr. J. D. Astley, representing fabric and textiles;
Mr. L. Laass, representing plastic industry;
Mr. B. Vine, representing automotive industry.

PENANG SECRETARIAT:

Mr. M. U. Sullivan, Co-ordinator of Adelaide Week;
Mr. K. I. Bertram, Assistant Co-ordinator;
Mr. K. J. Winn, Finance officer;
Mr. I. Betts, Senior Personnel Officer;
Mr. R. A. Harris, Secretary to the Lord Mayor;
Mr. S. H. Tully, Materials Officer;
Dr. Seglenieks, Medical Officer, Public Health Department;
Dr. A. Green, Regional Director, Australian Department of Health;
Mr. K. Crease, Press Secretary and Comper;.
Mr. S. Wright, Personal Secretary to the Premier;
Ms. A. Koh, Research Assistant to the Premier.

OUTDOOR ACTIVITY GROUP:

Mr. J. Fearn, Principal Veterinary Officer, Department of Agriculture;
Mr. A. Harris, Wool Advisory Officer;
Mr. R. Fullgrave, Axeman;
Mr. E. Schmidt, Axeman;
(Name to be supplied)—Shearer from Australian Wool Board.

CATERING GROUP:

Mr. G. Latham, Catering Supervisor;
Mr. D. Casey, Food and Catering Lecturer and Chef;
Mr. I. Dunbar, Lecturer and Wine Advisory Officer;
Mr. H. Sich, Chef;
Mr. M. Hogenbirk, Head Waiter;
Mr. D. Leicester, Regional Officer, Australian Dairy Corporation;
Mrs. R. Farmer, Catering Hostess.

ADELAIDE CITY COUNCIL CONTINGENT:

Mr. R. Mills;
Mr. H. G. Anderson;
Mr. M. Williams;
Mr. P. Gutte;
Mr. I. Pitt;
Mr. C. J. Williams;
Mr. N. J. Victory;
Mr. D. Steele;
Mr. A. Cardnell;
Miss V. Adams.

TOURISM AND PUBLICITY:

Mr. R. Dyer, Manager, S.A. Government Tourist Bureau;
Mr. B. Major, Overseas Travel Officer;
Mr. R. Yeeles, Publicity Writer;
Mr. W. St. C. Johnson, Government Photographer;
Mr. G. Michells, Television Producer.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION:

Mr. S. M. Jay, Assistant Director;
Mr. J. L. Ellson, Projectionist.

STATIC ARTS AND CRAFTS:

Mr. R. J. Richards, Curator of Applied Arts, Art Gallery of S.A.;
Mr. A. Bishop, Crafts Lecturer and Demonstrator;
Mr. R. Lewis, Craft Teacher and Demonstrator;
Mr. S. Blackall, Executive Officer, S.A. Craft Authority;
Mr. N. Cheng, Pottery Demonstrator;
Mr. J. Eddlestone, Pottery Demonstrator.

PERFORMING ARTS:

Mr. L. Amadio, Arts Development Officer;
Mr. C. Winzar, Producer/Director;
Ms. C. Westwood, Stage Director;

PERFORMING ARTS—*continued*

Mr. D. Mills, Head Mechanic;
 Mr. D. James, Lighting Technician;
 Miss D. Grey, actress;
 Ms. B. West, actress;
 Miss B. Stephens, actress;
 Mr. L. Dayman, actor;
 Mr. E. Hodgeman, actor;
 Mr. D. Olsen, actor;
 Mr. M. Joshua, actor/writer;
 Mr. A. Bartz, actor/designer;
 Mr. B. Underwood, actor;
 Mr. P. Fraley, actor;
 Miss P. O'Brien, actress;
 Miss T. Bremner, actress/dancer;
 Mr. J. Inguanez, actor/writer;
 Mr. C. Bailey, Musical Director/musician;
 (Name to be supplied) musician;
 (Name to be supplied) musician;
 (Name to be supplied) musician;
 (Name to be supplied) musician;
 Geo. Sayas, Greek dancer;
 Mr. Con Retsus, Greek dancer;
 Miss Ann Moore, Greek dancer;
 Miss Athen Longinidis, Greek dancer;
 Mr. Michael Angelakis, Greek dancer;
 Mrs. Julie Sayas, Greek dancer;
 (Name to be supplied) Aboriginal performer,
 singer and dancer;
 Talbot Barmundura, Aboriginal dancer;
 (Name to be supplied) Aboriginal dancer;
 Dick Bandilil, Aboriginal musician;
 Sonia Bennet, Australian folk singer;
 D. Clark, Australian folk singer;
 S. Knoll, Bavarian/German dancer;
 N. Baleays, Bavarian/German dancer;
 B. Niemiec, Bavarian/German dancer;
 Miss C. Paulkner, Bavarian/German dancer;
 Miss C. Grobitsch, Bavarian/German dancer;
 Miss B. Saim, Bavarian/German dancer;
 Mr. A. Hesse, Bavarian/German dancer;
 Mrs. N. Lucas, wardrobe/seamstress.

GENERAL MOTORS-HOLDEN'S

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say whether the Government will institute an immediate inquiry into union activities at General Motors-Holden's Elizabeth plant in the light of a statement made today before Commissioner Clarkson in the Arbitration Commission that there was something very wrong at that plant? All honourable members know that the present employment situation in South Australia and in Australia generally is extremely poor. We know, too, that South Australia is most dependent on the car manufacturing industry. The record of industrial unrest at the Elizabeth plant of G.M.H. is far higher than at any other plant and is some indication of the degree of activity of union officials at that plant, particularly the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union. It is considered by the Commissioner that the present industrial unrest is unnecessary. A report in today's *News* states:

Commissioner Clarkson said that the dispute started when 17 men went on strike. The matter blew up and it shouldn't have. If the grievance procedures had been followed, then this whole matter would not have got out of hand.

There seems to be a deliberate attempt at the Elizabeth plant by some union organisers to sabotage work at that plant at a time when the State cannot afford such industrial activities. I believe an inquiry is important and is urgently needed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer is "No". The Leader makes these wild charges without any sort of effective evidence.

Mr. Dean Brown: The Commissioner is wrong!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, but what has been quoted does not justify the charges made by the Leader.

Mr. Mathwin: Why not find out?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Unfortunately, relations at the Elizabeth plant have been unhappy, but unhappy from both sides. The attitude that has been taken by management has not been conducive to satisfactory industrial relations at that plant.

Dr. Tonkin: They've had no inducement from the unions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary: other employers in the motor industry have far better relations with labour than does the management of this plant. I have had occasion to draw the attention of officers of the management to difficulties which they themselves have created in the plant. The Government does not propose to institute an inquiry, which I do not believe would serve the cause of industrial peace in the area. I have certainly not been asked by either management or unions to undertake such an inquiry. I believe that the proper processes are there for conciliation and that they should be followed.

CRIME PREVENTION

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Chief Secretary whether organisers of the campaign named "Crime Alert Month" intend to present, in major factories in the metropolitan area as well as at major shopping centres, displays on crime prevention methods applying to the home, the car and personal safety? The press report on this plan states that the displays are being concentrated at major shopping centres and, although I agree that these are ideal places for such displays, I believe posters could be displayed in factory canteens and other areas of the larger companies in Adelaide so that all factory workers could see them. I refer especially to cases where both husband and wife are working, their homes, etc., being more attractive to the house-breaker and persons who commit other forms of crime. I should appreciate the Minister's investigating the possibility of expanding this massive campaign to the areas I have mentioned, as I believe this is very important in trying to reduce the number of house-breakings, 20 of which, on average, are now occurring every day.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As there seems to be considerable merit in this suggestion. I will certainly make sure my colleague examines it.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether he intends to introduce legislation to control insurance premiums as a result of his inquiries of insurance companies regarding their charges? Honourable members will recall that in August the Minister made, to use the Premier's phrase, wild charges about rip-offs from insurance companies. As a result of further questioning, the Minister said he would write to the companies and the State Government Insurance Commission and also make other inquiries, and, if he considered that legislation was necessary as a result of those inquiries, he would introduce the legislation. A recent report from the Commonwealth Government's Insurance Commissioner, Mr. M. A. Bassett, as reported in the *Australian* of last week, urges insurance companies to raise their premiums, because,

in his words, "there are manifest dangers to the industry and the policy-holders in a situation where the industry is relying on invested income to fund underwriting losses".

This officer went on to say that, in his view, the companies were not charging enough in the area of workmen's compensation. The Minister undertook to justify his statement regarding rip-offs from companies (this is recorded in *Hansard* of August 14), and said he would write to all the private companies and the committee of review. Further, the Minister stated:

... if after having received correspondence from the committee I am dissatisfied because the premiums are not in accordance with what they should be, I will consider introducing legislation to control them.

I would be very interested in the result of the Minister's inquiries, to see whether indeed his original charge about rip-offs was justified and whether he intends to introduce legislation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have a report, which I received several weeks ago. Consideration is being given to the whole of that report, not just part thereof. That report contains a recommendation that insurance companies ought to be placed in this situation. In the short time that I have been Minister of Labour and Industry, my experience has shown that there have been some occasions when insurance companies have refused to offer coverage to certain employees in certain industries. I am not in any way deviating from my original thoughts on this matter, and when the legislation is ready to be introduced in the House it will contain a provision controlling the coverage given by insurance companies: it will be compulsory for insurance companies to offer workmen's compensation cover to all industries, and not to be selective. Some employers are dissatisfied with the premiums charged by some insurance companies. They are not my words, but are the words of employers. It has been explained to me many times—

Mr. Dean Brown: Which employers?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will nominate the people I want to nominate; I will not be instructed by the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: You can't.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I can, don't you worry about that. I have been told also that it is possible to shop around Adelaide and obtain different percentages from different insurance companies.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And the rip-off is occurring.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The rip-offs occurred immediately they started to claim against Medibank. I do not deviate at all from the position I placed myself in on that point.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have now been asked five questions and I am trying to answer them all at once. In answer to the final part of the honourable member's question, the legislation will contain a clause that will force insurance companies to accept coverage from employees and employers in all industries.

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister ascertain whether the State Government Insurance Office has refused workmen's compensation insurance in relation to some avocations? In reply to a question by the member for Kavel this afternoon, the Minister said that he would introduce legislation compelling insurance companies (and he was having a slap at private enterprise insurance companies,

and referring to rake-offs, etc.) to accept this type of insurance. I believe the Government insurance office has refused workmen's compensation to people engaged in specific types of work. For instance, I refer to the quarrying industry. An application was made by a workman in my district to his own company, it was refused, and through the then member for Pirie this person applied to the State Government Insurance Office, but was refused insurance. Because of the content of his reply to the member for Kavel, will the Minister ascertain whether the State Government Insurance Office has refused workmen's compensation to anyone in this State?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I shall be delighted to obtain that information, because, if the assertions of the honourable member are correct, they strengthen my argument that there should be compulsory coverage for workmen's compensation, irrespective of whether it will apply in the private or Government sectors. I shall have no hesitation, when the legislation is introduced, in including the State Government Insurance Office if its practices are the same. The law would have to provide for that office as well as for others. I doubt whether these accusations are true, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. WARDLE: I direct my question to the Premier, as I believe he has made a statement on this subject. Will he say whether the Government has formed a committee to consider aspects of the Workmen's Compensation Act? I believe that industry throughout the State would agree unanimously that absenteeism alone has risen sharply since the recent additions to that Act. I have had cited to me the case of an industry whose employees worked much overtime for several months and then, because of a lack of demand for the product, had to go back to the normal 40-hour week. The odd situation arose where some employees who were off work during the overtime period were receiving more money by being away than those who were normally back at the industry. I therefore ask the Premier whether any aspects of the Workmen's Compensation Act are now being looked at by any committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The committee was formed some time ago. It has reported, and the Government has considered its report. It is under discussion at the moment with the trade unions. I have had discussions about it with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and it is expected that, when finality has been reached after the Cabinet's consultations, a Bill will be introduced into this House.

PORT AUGUSTA COURTHOUSE

Mr. KENEALLY: My question is to the Attorney-General. I am sure all members will join with me in congratulating him on his appointment. Will he obtain for me a report on the current position of the programme to upgrade court facilities at Port Augusta? The facilities at Port Augusta courthouse are of great concern to the local community, and I have raised this matter in the House before. For the benefit of the Attorney-General, I will read the following few extracts from a letter I received recently from the Secretary of the Flinders Ranges Community Welfare Council for Social Development:

The courthouse is used for the sittings of Supreme Court, District and Criminal Court, Magistrate's Court, Juvenile Court and daily by Justices Court. During the year therefore many hundreds of people are required to attend. Apart from a very small room, there is nowhere for people to wait, and most are forced to congregate outside the building adjacent to Woolworths supermarket and car park.

Of particular concern are the days in the month when juveniles are dealt with. On August 26, 10 juveniles and their parents totalling about 30 people attended the Juvenile Court. The small waiting room was not available for much of the time due to it being used by solicitors taking instructions or interviewing their clients. A juvenile court is a closed court so far as the proceedings are concerned, but it is indeed a very open court so far as juveniles and parents being exposed to the general public outside. Publicity was recently given to the new Juvenile Court facilities in Adelaide with the emphasis on informality and confidentiality. There could be no greater contrast with the situation we have at Port Augusta. Council considers that the provision of a temporary waiting room is a most urgent necessity and that the present situation can only be described as appalling.

I agree with those remarks. In the light of the approaches I have made previously, I ask the Attorney-General whether he will obtain for me an up-to-date report.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I thank the member for Stuart for his kind words and other members for the kind words they have expressed to me on my appointment. I hope this attitude continues to be displayed in future. I will certainly obtain a report for the honourable member. Although I do not have these matters at my fingertips at the moment, I am sure by next week there will be no difficulties of that kind.

NORTH ADELAIDE PARKING METERS

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister of Local Government aware of the considerable unrest that is occurring among people in O'Connell Street, North Adelaide, about the proposed installation of parking meters? Is he willing to review that section of the Local Government Act that deals with the matter? The Minister is undoubtedly aware of the considerable eruption of feeling engendered yesterday (in fact, it has been going on for some weeks, but came to a climax yesterday) when the Adelaide City Council started to install parking meters against the wishes of almost all O'Connell Street traders, many residents, and the North Adelaide Society. Under Part XXIIIA of the Local Government Act a council has power to install parking meters and provide parking stations. There is provision, when the original by-law under this section comes into operation, for its gazettal and subsequent disallowance by Parliament. Unfortunately, section 475c provides that once a by-law is in force (no matter for how many years) a subsequent resolution of the council can provide that parking meters be installed, and people affected by such a decision have no recourse at all. I therefore ask the Minister whether he will examine this matter to see whether people disaffected by the decision can appeal against it. One-hour parking already applies in O'Connell Street. I assure the Minister that the installation of parking meters will not in any way increase trade in the area but will be severely deleterious to it. The action I am suggesting is supported by four councillors from the two wards in the area.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will have the matter examined, but I do not expect that any action can be taken. Indeed, I doubt that any action should be taken by me or by Parliament. Decisions on matters such as these are a proper function of local government. What the honourable member is asking me to do is take away from the Adelaide City Council the authority that has been vested in it by Parliament. Without canvassing the rights or wrongs of parking meters, I do not believe we should take away the authority that is vested in local government. As a Parliament, we should insist on councils' carrying out their responsibilities; indeed, this was the basis of much of the thinking behind the recent

Royal Commission in investigating the need to rearrange boundaries (not for the Adelaide City Council area but for council areas generally) so that councils could carry out the functions for which local government was established. Having said that, I will review the whole matter to see whether I should alter my comments and, if I should, I will inform the honourable member.

TEA TREE GULLY TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport examine the merits of installing a roundabout at the intersection of North-East Road and Hancock Road, Tea Tree Gully, pending the installation of traffic lights. On July 3, I was informed in a letter from the Minister that, based on existing priorities, 59 intersections in the metropolitan area had a higher priority for the installation of traffic lights than did the intersection to which I have referred, and that on the current rate of installation it could be four years before they were installed. Because this is a dangerous intersection (a point that I have made in the House before), I again raise the matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will review the matter to see whether a roundabout can be installed, but I should make clear that it is always a difficult task to allot a priority to a request for the installation of traffic signals. It is a human failing, I think, that we all believe that the intersection we traverse daily should have a higher priority in this respect than should other intersections that we do not know. The allocation of priorities is always a difficult task, but I think that the Highways Department does a creditable job in allotting the priorities, and that is why the intersection has been given the priority to which the honourable member has referred. However, I will have the matter examined to see whether a roundabout would suffice as an interim measure.

RADIOGRAPHERS

Mr. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health to consider increasing the number of radiographers employed at the Mount Gambier Hospital, such consideration not to include the radiographer who is presently employed in private practice and who may be amalgamated with the hospital's services? The one radiographer at the hospital and the one presently employed in private practice are both on call 24 hours a day, and rarely have an uninterrupted weekend. I understand that in 1973 there was a proposed extension of the hospital's services to cover the ensuing 10 years. The amalgamation of the private practice with the hospital will not be an expansion of services but a concentration in the one spot of existing services.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am tempted to remind the honourable member that, only a day or two ago when making a speech in the House, he said that he was wont to handle most of these matters in writing because he obtained considerable satisfaction from Government departments in this way. However, I will bring this matter to my colleague's attention.

LOAD LIMITS

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say what is the present situation concerning the cartage of primary produce, pursuant to the provisions of section 147 (6) of the Road Traffic Act? Has the Road Traffic Board determined the conditions and, if it has, will the Minister give details? Recently, I have been constantly asked by producers what the present situation is, as the harvest is fast approaching. Fortunately, because of useful recent rains the harvest could be much better than was thought earlier in the season.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This has been a vexed problem with which the Road Traffic Board has grappled; indeed, until about a month ago when the Deputy Premier and I went to the South-East to try to solve a problem down there with log hauliers it was even wider and more difficult than it is now. Regarding the cartage of grain, grapes, fresh fruit and vegetables, the board has now determined a policy that is in keeping with the legislation passed in this House and that is, for the time being, there is a 40 per cent permissible overload on the gross vehicle weight of the particular vehicles, provided they are operating in certain circumstances. The first circumstance is that the commodities being carried are the rural commodities of grain, grapes, fresh fruit and vegetables, and that they are being carried from the place of production either to the place of storage or processing or, in the case of Kangaroo Island, to the port of delivery. Secondly, a speed limit is superimposed over the ordinary road traffic speed limits; this means that the vehicles are permitted to travel at a maximum of 50 km/h. Thirdly, the maximum distance the vehicles may travel is determined as being not more than 80 km by road. So, this effectively stops the rural producer, the farmer, from deciding that he will cart his grain from Jamestown to Port Adelaide; such things are not on.

An additional restriction is that this special permission for overloading is restricted to certain areas. For instance, overloading is not permitted within the metropolitan development area at all because of the danger to other road users; likewise, it is not permitted within the boundaries of the Port Lincoln council. Those who know Port Lincoln (and I am sure the member for Flinders will agree) know that it is most hazardous when overloaded vehicles come down the very steep hill coming into Port Lincoln, and a similar situation applies on the Adelaide to Langhorne Creek main road, between Strathalbyn and Aldgate. Again, this arrangement is made for road safety purposes. I stress that this exemption does not abrogate the responsibility involved in the maximum weight on axles. The 6.6 tonnes and 8.2 tonnes on the front and rear axles respectively still apply, notwithstanding the 40 per cent overloading arrangement. The final point to make is that this liberalisation of the legislation is effective for the coming season only. The farmers have virtually been given advance warning that, whilst they will occupy a very privileged position for this coming season, they cannot expect that that will continue.

Mr. Venning: But you—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member wants to create a road hazard, that is his business, but we and the Road Traffic Board will not accept responsibility for the irresponsible action of people such as the member for Rocky River. I expect that in the 1976-77 season the 40 per cent maximum will be reduced to 30 per cent, and I would expect that in the following season it would be back to 20 per cent, which is the requirement that applies to all other road users.

HIGHWAY 12

Mr. NANKIVELL: Is the Minister of Transport aware of a report in the *Pinnaroo Border Times* of September 25? That report states:

Reconstruction grant for Chandos-Pinnaroo section: the Federal and State Governments will provide \$300 000 for reconstruction of the section of Highway 12 from Chandos to Pinnaroo in the current financial year.

I ask the Minister whether he is aware that this report appeared as a result of a letter received by the Commonwealth member for Angas from the Commonwealth Minister

for Transport (Mr. Jones). In the letter, Mr. Jones stated:

Reconstruction of the existing road from Chandos to Pinnaroo will cost \$300 000.

It is also stated that this work is part of the priority work set down in this year's works programme, as determined by the Commonwealth roads authority. Can the Minister confirm this information for me (if he is not aware of the facts now) and, if there has been an error, can he explain why an error of this kind has been made public?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know that there has been an error, but I will certainly have the matter checked to find out the situation. I am not aware of the newspaper report that the honourable member has quoted, and I should be pleased to get a copy of it. I do not get the *Pinnaroo Border Times*, which I understand, incorporates the *Murrayville Pioneer* and the *Lameroo Recorder*. However, I will get a copy of the newspaper and I will ask the Highways Department to check the claim, which I think has been made by the Commonwealth member for the district, Mr. O'Halloran Giles, to find out whether he has given the newspaper an accurate report of the information that the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Jones) gave him. I will also check the accuracy of the statement by Mr. O'Halloran Giles.

WAGE INDEXATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether it is proposed to introduce legislation further to amend section 36 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to give the Industrial Commission jurisdiction to prescribe specific guidelines on such matters as wage indexation? We have already, in one Bill that has passed through Parliament this year, made a small amendment to section 36 of the Act, but a report in the *Advertiser* of last Friday of the decision of the Full Bench of the Industrial Commission is to the effect that it cannot, in following the Commonwealth tribunal, lay down guidelines, because it simply has not the power pursuant to the section of the Act that I have quoted. Part of that report states:

In its judgment, the Full Commission says its decision not to prescribe specific guidelines is based primarily on the view that the commission does not possess jurisdiction to do so. Section 36 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act authorises the commission to do no more than vary wages of employees under State awards to recognise in absolute terms corresponding adjustments made by the Australian commission to its awards, it says.

The report also states:

The bench says that, at the same time, it is painfully aware of the existence of anomalous situations within the justification of arbitral authorities in South Australia.

The Minister, when asked to comment on this matter, stated that he was disappointed and that he was going to press his point in another case (I think the radiographers' case), but he did not say anything about amending the section to give the power that the commission found it lacked to do what the Government and employer organisations wanted to do. I know that the question of wage indexation is touchy amongst certain of the Minister's supporters in the trade union movement and, indeed, amongst some members of his Party in Parliament. It is to find out whether he will be deterred by that aspect of the matter that I put the question to him, because it seems to me that the obvious thing to do would be to introduce an amendment to section 36 to give the jurisdiction that is now lacking.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Justice Moore, in his decision a few weeks ago, described wage indexation as an extremely fragile parcel. I think that is probably the best description that can be given to this wage concept that we are trying to implement at present. Of necessity, I applied to the

Industrial Commission, on behalf of the workers of this State, to obtain the 3.5 per cent flow-on granted by the Federal commission, and my application was an exact mirror of the decision brought down by the Commonwealth court. For reasons best known to itself, the State tribunal has refused to accept that application in its entirety. Obviously, it will now be necessary to try to set down South Australian guidelines. If the South Australian commission will not accept a mirror of the Commonwealth decision some other way must be found. Already the New South Wales Industrial Commission has accepted the position as described by the Commonwealth court. The Government and I hoped that that situation would apply in South Australia. However, that is not to be the case. I have instructed the Crown Law Department to intervene in the radiographers' case, which the member for Mitcham has mentioned. That case will be proceeding, with other cases. It is not entirely correct to say that we can find the guidelines only in the radiographers' case, so not only the Government but also the unions and, I imagine, the court are trying to establish the guidelines for future wage claims in this State. The court has agreed to a referral to the Full Bench, and I understand this will take place as soon as possible. That will envelop other awards as well as the radiographers case, and we hope that from there guidelines can be established by the South Australian commission. If the court remains firm, as it is at present (and I do not criticise it for that, because I do not interfere with courts or their decisions), I hope that common sense will prevail and that guidelines will be established, so that the Government, employers, unions, and others will know where we are going. If that happens we will have to consider what to do. Whatever we do, it will follow serious consideration of whatever the Commonwealth Government does: it has indicated already that certain action will be necessary in the Commonwealth courts. If such action is necessary in State courts, consideration will have to be given to it, but only after the next case is heard.

COMPANIES ACT

Mr. WOTTON: I am sure that Opposition members congratulate the Attorney-General on his appointment, provided he proves himself. Will the Attorney obtain a report on the present progress of consolidating the Companies Act? Also, can he say whether the Government intends that South Australia will join the International Corporate Affairs Commission? Concerning the first part of my question, I have been told by students studying company law and accountancy that they are finding it extremely difficult to understand the Companies Act. I understand that there has not been a consolidation or a reprint of the Act since 1968, and at present it is made up of seven different pieces of printing, including many amendments. Those involved in such studies have indicated to me the urgency of this matter, and I ask the Attorney to consider this problem.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I regret to note that the feeling of co-operation to which I referred earlier seems already to have run out on the Opposition benches. The Consolidation of all Statutes is proceeding well. It is hoped that the cut-off date will be the last day of 1975, and that should enable consolidation of many Acts, particularly the Companies Act, to take place some time next year. I appreciate the difficulties in relation to this Act. However, I point out to the honourable member that it is an expensive operation for the Government continually to consolidate Acts such as the Companies Act. Regarding the latter part of the question, I will obtain a report from my department for the honourable member.

WOODVILLE HOSTEL

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say what is the Government's present immigration policy and what effect it may be having on the future of the Woodville Hostel? The Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1975, states that the number of immigrants using the facilities of the hostel has been reduced considerably. In 1972-73, 4 632 passed through the hostel; in 1973-74, the total was 3 714; and in 1974-75, it was 2 519. I also understand that costs have increased: for the financial year ended June 30, 1974, the cost was \$178 000, but that has now increased to \$234 000. I believe that the role of this hostel is changing, as it is now being used by public servants, students, and tourists. The students are generally from country areas, and the hostel has proved a great advantage to them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For some time the Government has not been recruiting immigrants in large numbers, because the general immigration programme for Australia has changed. The honourable member will be aware that nationally we have a restricted immigration programme, and immigrants are restricted to specified categories, other than those who can come as of right, those who come on compassionate grounds, or those who satisfy the requirements of national need (that is, requirements of industry and employment in Australia). In these circumstances, we would not expect to have as many migrants as were once coped with by the hostel. Consequently, we have used it for several other purposes, and have tried to obtain maximum usage of it according to social requirements. For instance, the hostel was fully used at the time of the Darwin emergency. We have also used it for country groups visiting Adelaide for specific purposes, and for students staying in Adelaide. We believe it is a valuable facility that we should retain but, at the same time, we have tried to spread its use for social purposes as far as we can.

OUTSTANDING ACCOUNTS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say when it is intended that long-standing accounts for services rendered to the Education Department, including maintenance of school buses, will be paid? This matter has been the subject of questions in this House and of public statements outside for a long time. The Premier has made assertions that at June 30, 1975, there were no major outstanding accounts that had been rendered to the Government, yet I can instance three cases. The first relates to an engineering organisation in the Adelaide area which provided equipment to the Torrens College of Advanced Education in November last year, submitted an account in February this year, but which has been asked four times to render subsequent accounts. The second case involves a garage at Gawler which services school buses and which now has an account of \$932 outstanding. That account has been as much as \$1 022. One payment has been made by the Education Department since February this year. I instance another case of a garage in the Upper South-East which services buses and which was unable to pay its account to another organisation because of the long drawn-out four to five months delay in the payment of service costs to that organisation by the Education Department. If the situation was, as the Premier said, that at June 30, 1975, the finances of this State were buoyant, obviously they were buoyant because many people had been denied their just payment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member suggests that an account of \$1 000 is a major outstanding account likely to alter the Budget results in South Australia,

it is about time that he started doing some simple arithmetic again. If the honourable member has complaints of this kind about outstanding accounts and if he will give me the details, I will get the reports for him. I point out to the honourable member that colleges of advanced education are autonomous authorities, and their accounts are not directly reflected in the Budget of the State at all. I suggest to the honourable member that, if he has complaints about accounts in this way, he submit the details to me and I will have an inquiry made. The accounts of the State are certainly buoyant. I point out to the honourable member that every other State in Australia now has introduced its Budget. Every other State not only has used capital grant moneys but has used trust fund moneys—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —so as to reduce the amount of its deficit.

Dr. Eastick: Have the suppliers been paid?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not have this continual questioning.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This State has not had to do that. Everything I forecast about the State's budgetary position prior to the elections has been proved to be correct.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Within a few million one way or the other.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not true. Everything that I said was correct, and it is not a few million one way or the other. I said that we would be able to provide a balanced budget with \$26 000 000 to reserve and spend every bit of the Loan money without needing to reserve any of it against revenue. That is what has happened, and no other State has been able to meet that position.

INSTITUTION FACILITIES

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare immediately investigate the use of facilities at McNally Training Centre, Magill, with a view to ensuring that facilities not being fully utilised by the inmates are made available for greater use by outside organisations? The McNally Training Centre presently has an occupancy on a 12-monthly basis of 54 boys at any one time. The total operating costs last year were \$760 000, which represents an annual operating cost of about \$14 000 a boy. The centre has excellent facilities, including a chapel, a large gymnasium, a swimming pool and extensive workshops. I understand that some of these facilities are not being used to their fullest extent, one reason being that the number of inmates has been reduced from about 250 to 50 over recent years. I was told earlier this year that the chapel was not being used regularly. I understand the gymnasium has not been used for some time. I know that some facilities have been used by Morialta High School and Rostrevor College. However, many facilities are at this stage grossly under-used and should be made available to outside organisations as soon as possible.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member has correctly stated that the facilities at McNally not required for inmate use have for a considerable time been made available to outside organisations, including schools in the area.

Mr. Dean Brown: Purely on a restricted basis.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: We have heard this sort of thing from the honourable member before, and I would

prefer it if he would extend me the courtesy of at least letting me answer him. I do not think I interrupted him while he was asking me the question. I am willing to have a look at this proposition that he has put forward, as it is perfectly in line with Government policy on these matters. I need only cite the Government's policy in relation to schools. It was this Government that said to the people of South Australia that schools were not 40-hour-a-week places: they are part of the community, and we are encouraging the community to use them. We would have a similar outlook on facilities of this kind. I shall be happy to look at this suggestion.

BEEF PRODUCERS

Mr. VANDEPEER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to make strong representations to the Australian Minister for Agriculture to have the recommendation of the Industries Assistance Commission report adopted to enable money proposed to be made available to be distributed to beef producers forthwith and to relax terms and conditions of acceptability to allow a wider range of producers to qualify? I will explain the question only briefly, because I think we have been over the subject before. The Minister will understand the reason for the question, because the newspapers contained statements on the I.A.C. report that more money would be available. I feel the question does not need further explanation.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to refer the matter to my colleague. The Minister gave me a brief report, but in it he said that he had not had an opportunity to study fully the report that has been made, so I think it better that I refer the question rather than read from this report.

BOOK ALLOWANCE

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends, when paying the book allowance to independent schools, to include the amount in the per capita grant under the needs system? In past years parents have received payment for books, but it has been suggested that this year the Government will include this amount in the per capita grant. The parents will therefore not receive the advantage of the book allowance. Private schools have to fix their budgets in order to set their fees and it is not known whether parents will have to pay the extra \$30 or more needed, plus the school fees.

The Hon. D. I. HOPGOOD: In general, the honourable member's contention is correct: the amount will be included. However, his assumption that this represents some departure from what happened last year is incorrect, because the same system operated last year. The agreement on the 20 per cent is that it would include the book allowance. When the Premier gave our Party's policy speech before the recent election, he specifically referred to the fact that in this coming year private schools would be funded to the 20 per cent level including the book allowance. That undertaking was given at the election, and I am unable to predict what any future Government decision might be regarding future financial years.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Does the Minister of Local Government recognise and support the extensive deficit budgeting by councils in South Australia and, if so, what alternative financing does he suggest for the future when these councils must find themselves in an impossible financial position? I am informed that the deficit budgeting practice in local government is spreading across South Australia

like the measles, despite the terms of the local government accounting regulations, which require local government authorities to prepare as nearly as possible a balanced budget. I understand also that test cases in the courts have established that budgeting for a surplus in local government is clearly illegal. Whilst it seems at this stage that deficit budgeting has not been tested at that level, such practices must lead to financial disaster, particularly for the smaller councils. I understand that the District Council of Crystal Brook has prepared and adopted a budget providing for a deficit of \$17 000 on a \$55 000 rate revenue, and in today's *Advertiser* it is reported that the Corporation of the City of Port Augusta has announced a budget with a substantial deficit.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know that many councils are engaged in deficit budgeting and, quite frankly, I do not believe there is an alternative to the step they have taken while they maintain the views they have held during recent years. The honourable member, if he checks, will find that I have made many statements in the past predicting the difficulties local government would have in surviving financially unless it was prepared to do something about it. It was given such an opportunity by one of the best Royal Commissions we have ever had. The honourable member can laugh, but it is his attitude and the attitude of people like him that have created the dilemma he is now complaining about.

Mr. Chapman: I am not complaining; I am asking a question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is ironical that the District Council of Crystal Brook is one of the councils that wanted to go along with the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

Mr. Chapman: So your argument flattens.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, my argument is not flattened, because the surrounding councils are adamant that they do not want anything to do with it, and they are allowing Crystal Brook to die on the vine. When this matter has been before the House, that has been the attitude of the honourable member when he has expressed himself on it. If ever a logical case has been stated for the adoption of the Royal Commission recommendations, the honourable member has stated it here today, but he will not take that next step and come out and declare its desirability publicly. We are aware of the financial difficulties in councils, and we are offering what assistance we can offer, but we are aware that that is insufficient. A local government body is coming to see me in a few minutes as a deputation about the same problem. Local government itself has to take the steps that are necessary. Some councils have already done so: two councils in the honourable member's district are in the process of amalgamating. I refer to the councils of Encounter Bay and Victor Harbor. Many more councils will have either to take the initiative to help themselves or, regrettably, to die on the vine.

DORSET VALE PROPERTY

Mr. EVANS: When does the Minister for the Environment intend to acquire the property at Dorset Vale belonging to Tom Chapman and his family? Mr. Chapman is a young man who, when he was 15 years of age, took on the responsibility of the farm after his father was killed on the property. He also helped his mother to raise a family of five children. The department notified him about 18 months ago that it intended to acquire the property for a regional park, and the Minister of Works has shown an interest in the land for the protection of the quality of water. The property covers about 95 hectares. Mr.

Chapman was stopped from cutting trees on the property (which is correct, if we are thinking of conservation), but he was capitalising on the trees to pay some debts. He has an opportunity to buy a property in the Mid-North, but the department now flatly refuses to buy the property, and the owner is placed in an impossible situation. He now has a young family, and his mother and the whole family have their money tied up in the property. They cannot develop the property (and we do not really want them to do so). I therefore ask the Minister to take urgent action to acquire the property and let this man leave the area we want him to leave, so that he can start again in the Mid-North.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not know anything about this matter, but I will have the matter investigated and deal with it urgently and as sympathetically as possible.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Dover Gardens Co-educational High School conversion (Stage II).

Vermont Co-educational High School conversion (Stage III).

Ordered that reports be printed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (GIFT DUTY AND STAMP DUTIES) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SURVEYORS BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the registration of surveyors and the regulation of the practice of surveying; to repeal the Surveyors Act, 1935-1971; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is intended to replace the Surveyors Act, 1935-1971, and to provide a system of registration of surveyors and regulation of the practice of surveying, which accords with the modern practice of surveying. The present Surveyors Act, 1935-1971, was drafted in 1935, but in many respects dates back to the previous Act of 1857. All these Acts cater almost exclusively for legal surveys (in this Bill referred to as "prescribed cadastral surveys") and have little or no reference to the much greater field of activity now within the province of the professional surveyor.

The principal provisions of the Bill are intended to ensure that a person who holds himself out to the public as a "surveyor", qualified to perform the wide range of activities sought from "surveyors" by the public, is so qualified. Accordingly, the Bill sets out the basis for registration of persons properly qualified in surveying, and proscribes the use of the title of "surveyor" by persons not so registered. Persons who perform activities quite distinct from surveying, as defined, and use the word "surveying" qualified by another word to describe such activity, are not to be subject to this provision. The Bill also provides for the discipline of registered surveyors. The Bill has been prepared in consultation with the South Australia Division of the Institution of Surveyors and provides full recognition of surveyors registered under the principal Act.

I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure comes into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the measure. Clause 4 provides for the repeal of the Surveyors Act, 1935-1971. Clause 5 sets out the definitions used in the measure. "Cadastral survey" is a term intended to describe the activity most commonly associated with surveyors, that is, boundary surveying. "Prescribed cadastral survey" is intended to describe legal surveys, that is, surveys that are, for example, for the purposes of the registration of an instrument of title under an Act. Attention is drawn to the general definition of "survey" and to the categories of "registered surveying graduate", "registered surveyor" and "licensed surveyor". A registered surveying graduate as the term implies is to be a person academically qualified as a surveyor and registered while obtaining practical experience. A registered surveyor is to be a person both academically qualified and experienced, who, upon showing experience in cadastral surveying, can operate as a licensed surveyor and perform legal surveys.

Clause 6 provides for the establishment and incorporation of the Surveyors Board of South Australia. Clause 7 provides that the Surveyors Board be constituted of the Surveyor-General, three registered surveyors nominated by the South Australia division, two registered surveyors nominated by the Surveyor-General, and a registered surveyor engaged in teaching surveying. Clause 8 sets out the terms and conditions of office of the board. Clause 9 provides for the payment of allowances and expenses to the members of the board. Clause 10 regulates the meetings of the board.

Clause 11 provides for the validity of acts of the board and immunity for its members. Clause 12 provides for the appointment of a registrar and enables the board to make use of the services of public servants when necessary.

Clauses 13 and 14 regulate the finances of the board. Clause 15 sets out the categories of registration, namely, surveying graduate and surveyor; licensed surveyor being treated as a sub-category of registered surveyors. Clauses 16 and 17 provide the basis for determining whether a person is qualified for registration, the detail being left for the regulations. Paragraph (b) of clause 17 is intended to provide the means for registration of surveyors registered by bodies corresponding to the board with which the board has entered into reciprocal arrangements.

Clause 18 sets out the procedure for applications for registration, and clause 19 makes provision for the annual renewal of registration. Clause 20 provides that the board shall register or renew the registration of persons qualified for such upon payment of the registration fee. Clause 21 provides for endorsement of the registration of registered surveyors to the effect that they may perform prescribed cadastral surveys, if the board is satisfied they have the requisite experience of cadastral surveying. Clause 22 provides, in effect, that persons who are licensed surveyors under the present Act shall be licensed surveyors under the new Act. Clause 23 provides that the registrar keep registers of persons registered, and clause 24 provides that the registrar furnish certificates as to the registration of any person.

Clause 25 makes it an offence to hold oneself out as a surveyor unless registered as such but, at subclauses (2) and (3), allowance is made for those other occupations

presently using the word "surveyor", such as marine surveyors, quantity surveyors, or building surveyors. Clause 26 prohibits the performance of prescribed cadastral surveys by persons who are not licensed surveyors. Clause 27 sets out the grounds for disciplinary action against persons registered under the measure, and under clause 28 the board may investigate the conduct of such persons. Clauses 29 to 33 provide for the establishment of a disciplinary committee constituted of a legal practitioner and two registered surveyors nominated by the South Australia division. Clause 34 provides that the disciplinary committee may, upon the complaint of the board, or any person, hold an inquiry into the conduct of a registered person to determine whether there is cause for disciplinary action under subclause (2) of this clause.

Clause 35 sets out the procedure upon such inquiries, and clause 36 sets out the powers of the committee upon such inquiries. Clause 37 provides the committee to order costs. Clauses 38 and 39 provide for an appeal against a decision of the board relating to registration, or the committee relating to discipline, to the Supreme Court. Clause 40 continues the present power of a surveyor to enter land where that is reasonably necessary for the purposes of performing a survey. This power is essential to the activity of surveying but, in nearly all cases, the occupiers of land readily consent to the surveyor having such access. Subclause (2) ensures that the surveyor is, of course, liable for any damage he causes.

Clause 41 provides that it is an offence to interfere with a survey mark. Clause 42 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 43 provides that notices may be given by post. Clause 44 provides that offences against the Act are to be heard by courts of summary jurisdiction. Clause 45 makes provision for moneys for the purposes of the Act. Clause 46 is the same as section 41 of the present Act. Clause 47 empowers the making of regulations.

Mr. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (REGULATIONS)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 2 (clause 2)—After line 4 insert subsection as follows:

"(19) When a council has, before the commencement of the Planning and Development Act Amendment Act (No. 3), 1975, acted on the assumption that planning regulations to which subsection (17) of this section applies are invalid, or suspended, any consent given by the council under Part V of this Act is, for the purposes of this Act, sufficient authority for the person who has the benefit of the consent to do anything for which the consent was sought and granted, and no further consent or authorisation is required under the planning regulations by reason of the provisions of subsection (17) of this section."

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for Planning and Development): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to. The amendment is a rather lengthy new clause. All it does is overcome a minor point that was picked up during the passage of the legislation in another place. Members will recall that the court found a real doubt existed whether planning regulations and interim development control powers could be combined. The original Bill sought to validate any councils' actions in good faith under either of those powers. It was pointed out that at least one council (and possibly other councils), after reading the court judgment, made decisions only under interim development control. By validating any decisions made under regulations or interim development control

we would create a situation in which people could challenge the validity of such decisions by saying they should have been made under regulation. The amendment prevents that happening and validates the action any council has made in that direction.

Mr. RUSSACK: Some councils acted under interim development control, and this amendment validates specific decisions that have been made. No further appeals or approvals can therefore be given apart from those already given. When the original Bill was before the Chamber, the Opposition opposed it because of the principle of retrospectivity. We feared that that principle could create more appeals and applications. From the Minister's explanation, it seems that the amendment inserted in another place approves specifically what has been done in good faith by councils. I understand St. Peters council was one of the councils involved. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION (ADDITIONAL POWERS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 2. Page 1066.)

Dr. EASTICK (Light): When I last spoke to this Bill I indicated that, in the best interests of South Australia, officers from the commission could be seconded to other Government departments that required the expertise of people employed by the commission. I have also indicated that Darwin people did not want commission employees to help in Darwin, because they were sick and tired of seeing consultants from the South and elsewhere. They believe that much money associated with Darwin reconstruction is being eroded by employing consultants. Dr. Letts (the Leader of the majority Party in Darwin) and Dr. Ella Stack (the Mayor of Darwin) are not interested in seeing these people.

I sought leave to continue my remarks because I could see that the Minister of Mines and Energy was puzzled about the authenticity of some of the statements I was making. The statements I made were the result of personal and individual contact I had had with these people during the recent Constitution Convention conference in Melbourne about 10 days before this matter was previously debated. I asked them how reconstruction work was going in Darwin and whether there was a need for additional assistance from the south. Both immediately responded by saying, "Yes, if they know how to build. We don't want them if they are only going to tell us how to build." After the debate was adjourned I did further research into the matter and found that the Darwin council at a general meeting on August 27, 1975 (only days after it had been announced in the press that the South Australian Government in consultation with the Commonwealth Government was considering using commission personnel for other jobs) the following motion was moved and carried:

That this corporation reject any proposal to incorporate the Monarto group in the planning/rebuilding of Darwin.

That is a matter of record on the minutes of the city of Darwin. That is their immediate reaction, and it has been subsequently followed through by the personal statements I received from the Mayor. Last Tuesday, I received the following telegram from Mr. Grant Tambling, M.L.A., who is the representative of the majority Party on the Darwin commission. He says that he is an executive member for community development in the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly. His telegram reads:

My personal view re use of Monarto Development Commission personnel in Darwin reconstruction programme is that the scope for any involvement is very

limited. The Darwin Reconstruction Commission has recently curtailed its use of all consultants and will utilise resources of Department of Housing and Construction wherever possible. I believe D.R.C. must use Federal Government and local consultant as first priority and then engage Monarto or other consultants only where specialist professional skills are otherwise unavailable.

Mr. Tambling is a member of the Darwin Reconstruction Commission. I come back to the point which I made to the Minister last week and which I believe is worthy of urgent consideration by the Government, that is, that it should withdraw this Bill and consider altering the Act to allow for the ready secondment to other Government departments of officers who are in the employ of the Monarto commission. I put it in those terms, as it may be that there are difficulties in secondment as normally apply between one Government department and another because the experts we are talking about are employed by the commission. I do not call on the Minister to destroy the legislation in relation to Monarto; it will be debated for a long time whether it is a myth or whether it will be a fact of the future. I seek to divorce any comment along those lines, and I now come back to the importance of using the expert knowledge available within the State in those departments where that knowledge is urgent and important. I do not believe that there is any need for the Bill to be proceeded with until the Minister seeks to amend the Act to allow for that secondment for the advantage of the people of this State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Liberal Movement opposes the Bill. We have for some time gone much further than the Liberal Party in that we face the reality of the situation, which neither the Government nor the Liberals are willing to do, and that is that Monarto is dead. The sooner that is acknowledged publicly, the sooner we will cut our losses and be able to spend what money we have got for the project on something else. The Minister knows that the project is dead, but he simply will not admit it. I do not blame him for wanting to keep one of his jobs alive. He inherited this baby when it was already having its last gasp, and now he is trying to keep it going at an expense of \$1 000 000 (that is almost what the salaries are for the commission). Perhaps when he is replying in the debate, if he does, he will, tell the House what work is being done at Monarto by other Government departments now (the Lands Department, for example, or the Engineering and Water Supply Department).

My information is that all the work they were previously doing has been suspended and that the Postmaster-General's Department (or whatever it is called: I think it has a new name) has been told that the trunk cables will not be needed before 1990, and not to worry about doing any work on it until then. All these things are indications of what we all know (that Monarto is dead), and the Government, to save face, is simply wasting our money by keeping it alive. Ask any State public servant who knows anything about it, and he will say the same thing. There is no secret about it in the Public Service: there is a complete acknowledgement that Monarto is dead and finished and the sooner it is buried the better. Having said that about Monarto, I had better add one more thing while on this topic.

The Minister was surprised the other day that the Liberal Movement members voted with him on another motion concerning Monarto. We did that because it did not go far enough, but the Liberals are too timid to take the final step and to admit that Monarto is dead. Well, their motion would have kept it alive, and that is the

only reason the Minister got support from us on that occasion. We at least are honest about it, we are forthright, and we stick to what we said at the election on this matter. What have we in the Bill? We have a blatant attempt, at the expense of many others in the community, to keep the staff employed or to make some attempt to recoup their salaries of nearly \$1 000 000 a year by their doing other work. I do not believe that there is any other work. The member for Light has spoken about the Darwin Reconstruction Commission, and I have nothing to add to that. I am confident that on this occasion the member for Light was accurate in what he said and I support him in that argument.

Mr. Rodda: That would be the kiss of death.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, the honourable member's political career is already dead, and it does not need a kiss from me to push it on the way.

Mr. Rodda: You're being your piggy little self.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not always understand the member for Victoria. Sometimes he is all sweetness and light, saying he is one of my oldest friends, and at other times he tells me I am being my little piggy self. He must be a moody chap.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What you fail to understand is that sometimes you're your usual piggy self.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is only when one falls out with one's friends that one learns the truth. I seem to have fallen out with both sides at the moment. On September 9, I asked a Question on Notice of the Minister about what work, if any, the Monarto commission had to do, because he had already made hopeful statements about work in Darwin, and so on. I asked:

1. To what work, other than on the Monarto project, is the Monarto Development Commission committed during the current financial year and at what expected remuneration to members and employees of the commission and to the Government, respectively?

2. Is any other work, in addition to any above, in contemplation and, if so, what is it?

I gave the Minister the broadest opportunity to tell the House whether there was anything else offering for the commission, but what replies did we get? The replies were:

1. To date there are no other commitments—

and the Minister went on to say that conversations were proceeding with the Australian Government. Perhaps he can bring us a month up to date when he replies and say whether his conversations have got anywhere. The replies continued:

2. Discussions have been held with the Land Commission and the State Planning Authority on the possibility of the commission undertaking planning and related work for these authorities in the Adelaide region.

Then it goes on. The answer was that a month ago there was nothing in contemplation for the commission. From that point of view at that time, there was no point in the Bill. However, the measure before us goes rather further than allowing the commission to do work as the Minister implied hopefully in that answer that there might be. It goes further than allowing the commission to do work for instrumentalities of the Commonwealth or State Government.

Clause 2 (b) provides that "prescribed agreement" means any agreement of a class or kind prescribed for the purposes of the Act. That gives the Government the power to get the commission to do anything, such as private consulting work, work for Government departments or instrumentalities, and so on. Therein lies one of the consequential dangers of this Bill, because it would allow

these Government instrumentalities to go into the private consulting field. I suppose that is good socialist policy, and the Government Party would have no fears about it, but other people in the community do have fears.

I have received two letters about this matter. I received one before last Thursday and would have used it in the debate then, and I have received another letter since. The first letter comes from a wellknown professional man in Adelaide. He is an architect and town planner and I feel I cannot use his name, because I have not his specific permission to do so. That man gave me notes in question and answer form that he had made at the end of August, when the suggestion of keeping Monarto alive in this way was promoted. In his notes, he states:

The questions to be asked and the answers appear to be as follows:

Q. Is the Monarto project moribund and is it expected to be abandoned?

A. If it is so, then the commission should be dissolved and the State Government should cut its losses.

That is precisely what I have said is our attitude. The notes continue:

Q. Is the Monarto project postponed due to lack of finance and is it likely to proceed at a later date?

A. Then. Key personnel only and a skeleton staff of the commission should be retained to carry on with further planning work and refine work done to date in order to have all basic work completed and ready when the green light is given.

Q. Should the commission carry out consulting planning work in other regions in the State or even outside the State?

A. The question is where. If there are no funds for Monarto then there will be no funds for the next in line regional centres mentioned by the Premier, namely, the iron triangle region at the head of the Spencer Gulf and the green triangle region in the South-East.

They are both going to secede and go their various ways, we have heard in the past few days, for different reasons. The notes continue:

Any such work, other than Monarto, is likely to take away work from private consulting firms which find work scarce and have already retrenched staff, and work with key personnel and skeleton staff only.

Q. Is it in the public interest to use the expertise of the commission on other projects?

A. As opposed to the Snowy Mountains Authority, the commission has no proven expertise nor experience, as the Monarto project is still in a state of infancy. The commission is furthermore largely an administrative body. It admitted this by seeking planning and architectural expertise from private consulting firms.

Q. Is the passing of legislation authorising the commission to carry out consulting work outside of Monarto likely to create a precedent?

This, too, is an important answer—

A. Certainly such move could have grave consequences. Other Government departments and instrumentalities such as the Public Buildings Department, Engineering and Water Supply Department, Housing Trust of S.A., etc., will all be short of funds and will seek authorisation to provide paid or unpaid consulting work in other fields. This will be the death blow to private consulting firms (architects, engineers, planners, surveyors, quantity surveyors, etc.) in this State, not to mention the possibility of the Federal Government's using its large departments in a similar way.

Conclusions: The legislation to authorise the Monarto Commission to carry out consulting work other than for Monarto should be opposed and the reasons made known to the public.

In a note that this man sent to me with that information, he states:

The fear I expressed in the penultimate paragraph appears to have come true, in so far as Tom Uren apparently stated a few days ago in the House of Representatives that the Cities Commission will embark on outside consulting work.

That was, of course, the answer to the last question he posed. As far as I know, that man has no political commitment to the Liberal Movement, but he is a professional man in this field in Adelaide and he would be well known to the Minister, as he is to many other members. His view amply supports the stand that my Party takes. More recently I have received a letter, dated October 2, from the Association of Consulting Engineers of Australia, and the association echoes and amplifies the points I have made. I have a copy of a letter, which the Minister may have seen already, because it is a copy of a letter to the Premier. It states:

Monarto Development Commission: The Executive Committee of this chapter has noted with some concern the proposal that the Monarto Development Commission offer its services as a Consultant to the Darwin Reconstruction Commission, the Land Commission and the State Planning Authority (*Hansard*, September 9, 1975, P. 582). It was resolved that the Chapter place the reasons for its concern about such a proposal before the Parliamentary parties. These are:

1. Since its inception, the Monarto Development Commission has functioned as a planning and administrative body, setting guidelines for development of the region and engaging the services of consultants with proven expertise to undertake detailed study. The commission is not expert or experienced in the consulting role.
2. Redeployment of commission personnel as consultants, if successful, may lead other Government commissions or departments to follow the same course to avoid staff retrenchment. Such short-term expediency on the part of the Government will simply shift retrenchments to the private sector.

Of course, that does not worry the Labor Party or the Minister. If the Minister can shift it to the private sector, that is bad luck for the private sector. At least, doing so will keep him in one of his jobs. The letter continues:

3. Government departments have traditionally planned their staff levels on the basis that consultants will be available to handle fluctuations in the workload. Widespread unemployment in the private consulting offices will predictably result in a long term loss to the industry, Government, and the community generally.

4. During the period of economic downturn currently being experienced in all States in Australia, no one sector should be asked to carry an inequitable share of the burden. A recent survey of members of this chapter has revealed a cutback in ongoing workload of some \$2 000 000 in fee value as a direct result of the 1975-76 Federal Budget. This figure, which represents approximately 30 per cent of annual turnover, does not include the loss of ongoing work which would have been expected to flow from the activities of the Monarto Development Commission.

Copies of this letter have been forwarded to Dr. Tonkin and Mr. Millhouse.

That is on all fours with the views I quoted earlier of the architect and town planner and with the views which we, as a Party, express. Therefore, I oppose the view on two grounds. The first is that Monarto is dead and should be buried, and we should cut our losses. It is dishonest of the Minister and the Government not to do that, when they know the facts as well as we do. Secondly, it is creating a most undesirable precedent in that semi-government people are coming into a field of activity that should be reserved for private consultants, and they will cause great damage and loss to the private sector if we give them the power to do so. For those reasons, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I, too, have misgivings about the plan outlined by the Minister in his second reading explanation. Obviously, the Government's plan has been sabotaged by its Commonwealth colleagues, and, as is customary, the people in Canberra have misled others. In his second reading explanation on September 16, the Minister said:

Originally, the Monarto Development Commission planned to spend \$10 000 000 in 1975-76 but the programme has now been limited to about \$4 000 000, of which the Australian Government will make a contribution of \$500 000.

No doubt that \$500 000 was made available to pay off the staff. Not only does this Government wish to compete with private enterprise but it also wishes to set up another Government organisation which has power to advise but which will make no real contribution to the welfare of the people of this State. As I am concerned about what is happening with the commission, I hope the Minister will table the latest plans and reports so that members and the public will be fully aware of what progress the commission has made. When the Minister first announced the programme, television telephones and all modern electronic equipment were to be included in houses to be built at Monarto, but gradually that programme has been downgraded. No doubt it was an election gimmick promoted by the Minister.

Many people are concerned about the Agriculture, Lands, and Environment and Conservation Departments: are they still to be located at Monarto? The Agriculture Department has had a shabby deal, because it has been housed in the worst possible accommodation, and it is deplorable that a Government should allow this situation to continue. This department should have its own office in which are available all necessary facilities for research, so that the department can advise all those engaged in agricultural pursuits. The Government should admit now that this department will not be located at Monarto, because this project seems to be finished, although the Government is trying to save face. The Government should face the realities of the situation and make alternative plans for the Agriculture Department. I am aware that this department is to be transferred to other accommodation, but that is not satisfactory. Many people wish to avail themselves of the information available from this department, and a new headquarters should be constructed at Northfield or at South Terrace, close to the buildings of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, the Wheat Board, the Australian Barley Board, and Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited.

I do not condemn the people employed by the commission or the commission itself: it is not their fault that the situation has deteriorated, but it is the fault of both the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments. The commission should be phased out and its employees relocated in the Planning Section of the Housing Trust, because the State cannot employ a large group without having a specific programme for them and the trust is the obvious place for these people who have special knowledge. The trust built Elizabeth without setting up a separate organisation, but it seems that the Labor Party is keen on empire building, as are its Canberra colleagues. I cannot support the second reading, and I hope that the Minister will clearly indicate the future plans for the commission. If it is to continue, will it compete with the State Planning Authority, other Government departments, or Commonwealth Government Departments? The people of Darwin do not want it to meddle in their business, because they have suffered enough from bureaucratic bungling. I hope the Minister can enlighten us more than he did in his second reading explanation.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I oppose the Bill, because we do not need another consultant body. I appreciate that, because of its philosophy, the Government wishes to take away as much business as it can from the private sector, and this is another method of achieving that

objective. However, I do not accept this philosophy. The Mayor of Darwin (Dr. Stack) made clear that Darwin people had no desire to have the Monarto Development Commission operating in that area. Perhaps the Government through its Canberra colleagues may be able to put pressure on the Darwin people. Those who spoke at the recent Constitution Convention were emphatic that they did not wish to see anyone from the commission moving into their areas. My impression was that those people had already had too much outside interference. They had enough expertise available to carry out the necessary functions to restore their city, if they were given financial help, and that is the taxpayers' money overall and not the Government's money. That is an area that has not requested the Monarto commission, and it is not desirable for it to move in that direction. If consultants and experts are needed in that area let us have them in Darwin, and let us not have them attached to the South Australian administration at all.

The Monarto project is in jeopardy. There is no doubt about that and no doubt that this Government, if it can raise enough money, will attempt to make it go, regardless of the eventual consequences. We, as a Party, have said that we would like to see at this stage only a skeleton staff kept until a proper analysis of the situation is made. Unless more business and industry are encouraged into this State, there will be no need for Monarto. It is possible that under the present Government we will be fortunate to encourage the normal growth of industry in this State; industries will go to the Eastern States. South Australia has a population of 1 300 000 out of a total Australian population of over 13 000 000. The three States on the eastern seaboard have about 9 000 000 of the total population. Therefore, a real incentive is needed for industry to come here, because we are far removed from the areas in which the consumers of most items live. Recently experts have said that even our motor car industry could be in jeopardy by 1980.

Dr. Eastick: There's trouble now.

Mr. EVANS: True, but the situation will be more serious by 1980. If we consider these matters, there is every possibility that we do not need Monarto, and the member for Mitcham may be correct. Now that the land is acquired perhaps we could have a skeleton staff, which would do no harm and could water the trees. Even though the town may not be built, this will be an area that has been reclaimed. We should carry out that function and have the barest of skeleton staffs to maintain some contact and general connection with the Federal Government. If there is a change of Government at the next election and a change of philosophy in this State, this could encourage industry to come here and remedy the serious decline that has taken place in regard to investment.

The member for Eyre has made a practical suggestion: why not take some of the staff members that need to be saved from the Monarto project on the long-term basis, second them over to the Housing Trust to help it in conjunction with the Land Commission, and get a few more houses and allotments on to the market? There is no real shortage of land at the moment: we have just not created allotments in the metropolitan area. The Land Commission has bought about 3 000 hectares or more, but has not provided one subdivision from broad acres to individual allotments since its inception. Some subdivisions that were already started have been completed, but they have not gone any further in their own projects of creating allotments. If in conjunction with the Housing Trust and private developers the people from Monarto can work through

that area to get more allotments on the the market, we will find that it will increase stability in land prices and give people a greater choice. We may also find an upsurge in the housing field. I appreciate that, in this area, the Government has recently made \$8 000 000 available, and that is essential.

Why go on with a massive project such as Monarto, as this involves a duplication of expert personnel? We will continue to have them there just for consulting purposes, and that is not necessary. I know it is difficult for a Government to say to such a group of people, "We are sorry, we led you down a path of disaster. We gave you a job that looked like having some security. Unfortunately we cannot give you that security. The Federal Government, which made some promises that we thought would be sound, could not keep the commitment because it overspent on the overall economy of Australia. For that reason we have to say to you (the same as would be said in private enterprise) that we have not got employment for all of you, but we will transfer a few of you to the Housing Trust or to the Land Commission or both," or, "We are going to scale it down and have a skeleton staff to look after that part of the Monarto project that is in operation at this stage."

There is a conflict of philosophy in this case, and that must be understood. It was probably part of the Government's original plan that this group would ultimately consult in other fields. Even if there had been money available to go on with Monarto, an attempt would probably have been made to give this group wider powers. In the cases of the Government Printer, who has now been encouraged to go into the private sector and look for work, and of the Public Buildings Department and others, we can see the Government's philosophy being pushed into the community. I oppose the Bill strongly.

Mr. Millhouse: Good.

Mr. EVANS: I do not really believe that the honourable member will be far off the mark in the long term, because our economy is in a bad way, but I am sure that if he puts his shoulder to the wheel with the members of the Liberal Party and the Country Party and, if we take control of Government as a united force, we can restore the economy of South Australia, and I put that challenge to him.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I oppose the Bill. I think the grounds for opposition are fairly clear. The Government is in a very difficult situation because the economy of the country and of the State is in a situation where developmental projects are difficult. We are going through times of unprecedented escalation in the cost of building and other types of developmental work that will be necessary if Monarto is to proceed. Moreover, the country is on the verge of a depression. We are certainly in the throes of a most severe recession as a result of the activities of the Labor Government in office in Canberra. In fact, the State Labor Government is in a bind. It has launched into this Monarto project, which is one of a legion of projects that this pace-setting Government has announced with a big flourish and which, like the others, has gone bad on it.

Perhaps some of the factors were out of the Government's control but I suspect that it had not really done its homework properly. Many queries were raised about the initial planning and investigatory programmes. Apart from that, the Government has launched into this programme and it now finds it is unable to proceed with it. It was seeking from the Federal Government about \$9 200 000 for its Monarto programme, and received

\$500 000. It was talking about needing \$600 000 000 by about 1984 for this to be a goer. No-one by the wildest stretch of the imagination could see that money coming to light.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How much?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: About \$600 000 000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Whom are you quoting?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let the Minister correct me if my figures are incorrect. The Government is indeed in a bind. The cost of developmental projects is at an all-time high, escalating at an astronomical rate, and here is this project that the Government cannot get off the ground. All that has happened so far is that land has been acquired, some planning has been done, and some trees have been planted. With regard to construction work, the project is really not off the ground. The commission employs 66 people, and its administration is expensive. The General Manager receives \$28 490 a year; the Director of the Industrial and Commercial Development Division receives \$18 648 and has a staff of eight; the Director of the Environmental Planning Division, with a staff of five, has a similar salary; the Director of the Social Planning Division, with a staff of five, has a similar salary; the Director of the Administration and Finance Division has a staff of nine and a similar salary; the Director of the Town Planning Division receives \$20 202 and he has a staff of nine; the Director of the Engineering Division, with a staff of seven, receives a similar salary; the Director of the Architectural Division, with a staff of six, receives a similar salary; and the Public Relations Division (whose function it is to keep the public and members of Parliament informed) is expensive, as it has a staff of five, with a Director on a substantial salary. I do not criticise the expertise of these people. However, it is a highly expert commission with virtually nothing to do.

Mr. Millhouse: Virtually nothing—nothing!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member wants to quibble about that but the point is made. The commission has no money to enable it to get on with the real business for which it was constituted, that is, the building of a new city. Maybe the Government could not have foreseen the disastrous effects its Commonwealth colleagues' policies in Canberra have had on the economy of the country. No matter what political Party is in power in Canberra it would be difficult to raise the money needed to get building started at Monarto. The Government is in a bind, and there is really nothing for the commission to do.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the commission could carry on with the job for which it was constituted there would be no need for this Bill.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is rubbish, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If that is rubbish, let the Minister refute it when he replies to the debate. The options open to the Government are limited. It will have to cast around for something else for the commission to do, and that is the decision taken.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not the decision.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is what would appear to me to be the case. It has decided to widen the scope of the commission.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why don't you read the second reading explanation?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Reference has been made to the possibility of doing something at Darwin. During the

Constitution Convention I spoke to the people from Darwin and the Northern Territory (Dr. Stack, Dr. Letts and others) and I would not hold out much hope of the commission getting any work up there. One of the features of Labor in office in South Australia has been the fact that it is predisposed to the proliferation of committees and boards and building up the Public Service. An interesting article appeared recently in the *Advertiser* about the growth of the Public Service since the Labor Party came into office, and we all know what the expense has been. This adds to the administrative overburden of the functions of government. No-one could deny the desirability of some of these appointments, but they must all be supported by the taxation structure of the State, and our competitive position in relation to other States must be considered. We have enjoyed a highly competitive position in relation to the other States, but I am afraid we no longer enjoy that position; no longer can the Government claim that this State is a low-cost, low-tax State; it is not.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Average weekly earnings here are 8 per cent to 10 per cent below the Australian average. You keep on stating falsehoods.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What is the point the Minister is making about earnings being lower?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They would be applied to costs.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader must continue with the debate.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The costs of those wage earners are not lower in terms of State taxes. If the Minister wants to pursue that point of view, he will find—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You'll find that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister and the honourable member must not engage in a private conversation. The Deputy Leader must continue with the debate.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, this is of interest to the House. The Minister has interjected, and my point is relevant to the debate. It has been suggested that the average earnings in South Australia are lower than those in other States, but if we look at the State taxes levied in South Australia and apply that to the wage structure we will find that people in South Australia no longer enjoy the position that they did enjoy, compared with the other States, before Labor came into office. Part of the blame for this can be put on the Labor Party, because it has put more people on the pay-roll. If the Minister wants to disagree, let him disagree. The Minister has been given great credit for increasing the teaching force, which is desirable, but it has not been without cost. When he was Minister of Education, the Minister admitted that we could not achieve the student-staff ratio we required because the economy would not stand it. Competing pressures are there all the time.

The Labor Party is usually inclined to throw caution to the wind when these pressures are applied, and we have seen the pressures it has applied to its Commonwealth colleagues. The Minister has said it would be a tragedy to have a slight decrease in educational expenditure, but there are greater tragedies. There are competing interests. I believe the Monarto commission is a case in point. This is an expert body with nothing much to do. If the Minister can justify it, let him do so. The money needed to get Monarto off the ground is just not available, and I cannot see the commission, expensive as it is, remaining as it is. In these circumstances I do not think the decision of the Government to look for other work for the commission is

wise. That work could be undertaken by private consultants or existing Government instrumentalities. I believe the economy of this State is such that the further existence at the present level of the Monarto commission is unjustified, and I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Special Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff): All Opposition members who have contributed to this debate have done so from the standpoint of either wanting to see the Monarto project wrecked immediately or from the standpoint of seeing it wrecked fairly slowly, perhaps after an inquiry. One way or another they do not want it to proceed.

Mr. Millhouse: It's not going to proceed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member says that, but I deny it. The member for Mitcham, in one of his disgraceful displays of arrogance, accused the Government of being dishonest.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course you are over this.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Then the honourable member is a pedlar of extreme untruths. I reject that charge and throw it back to him immediately.

Mr. Millhouse: You'll live to eat your words about that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will not be eating any words, because I have always been a supporter of the Monarto project and still am a supporter. I believe the project is soundly based and an excellent investment for the future. I consider that the attitude of members opposite, especially the attitude of the Liberal Movement, is extremely shortsighted. Any idiot knows that, as a city expands, the costs of additional development are higher because of the need to build better roads, more complicated transport systems, and to do more about pollution problems and so on. The costs of development are greater as a city grows. Members opposite should not believe that, if the Monarto project does not proceed, South Australia will not be involved in expense in the further development of Adelaide. That is a nonsensical proposition. The additional expense in developing Adelaide beyond certain limits will be much greater than developing an equivalent population in Monarto. That is fundamental.

Mr. Mathwin: What about zero population growth?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As usual, the member for Glenelg does not know what he is talking about. The South Australian population is expanding. It will take about 20 or more years before zero population growth occurs, even if there is no further increase in the birth rate. If the honourable member would care to talk to the Public Actuary or someone else who forecasts population changes, he could be given some of this simple arithmetic necessary to understand the situation because, until he understands it, he would do better to keep his mouth shut and not make such silly interjections. As I have said, members opposite have approached this matter on the basis of being against Monarto, and therefore they believe that any sensible proposition that the Government puts forward to continue the Monarto project should be opposed. That is the intention of the Liberal Movement and is also the basic intention of the Liberal Party on this matter.

The member for Kavel decided to come into this debate, probably because his fingers were burnt in debate on another matter over the past two days. He said that the commission has virtually nothing to do. That is not so, because the planning studies involved in development and basic planning of a city are extensive indeed. If the planning of the project is to be done properly (and it will

pay off in the long run to do it properly), the amount of work to be done is extensive. The short deferment involved before construction is commenced will be an advantage to the commission, because the basic planning to be carried out will be done in a more detailed fashion than would otherwise have been the case.

The commission was under pressure to meet a construction deadline at the end of this financial year. The deferment will assist the various studies that remain to be carried out. Let me make clear (especially for the member for Kavel, because it is obvious he did not bother to read the second reading explanation on this matter but decided to say a few things off the top of his head) that the reason this measure was introduced was that the Darwin Reconstruction Commission and the Australian Government asked that the Monarto Development Commission be able to carry out planning work for the reconstruction of Darwin. The planning work was not of a detailed nature for engineering activities or architectural facilities, but involved social and physical planning in the rebuilding of Darwin.

Mr. Millhouse: Why not—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I had to suffer listening to the member for Mitcham in his display of ignorance—

Mr. Millhouse: Come on!

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member wishes to take up matters in the Committee stage, he can do so. A request came from the Darwin Reconstruction Commission and the Australian Government. The South Australian Government and the Monarto Development Commission did not go looking for work of this nature. The request was made to me and was put separately by Mr. Powell, from the Darwin Reconstruction Commission, and by Mr. Uren, the Commonwealth Minister for Urban and Regional Development. There may be citizens in Darwin who say, "Don't worry about planning; enough of that has been done. Rebuild the place." No doubt that sort of attitude now exists in Darwin. If one wanted to be a little uncharitable, and perhaps unnecessarily unsympathetic, one could say that that was what led to Darwin being the type of place it was before the disaster. It was not a well planned city. Maybe there is a case for saying that, but I am not necessarily saying it; it is not the South Australian Government's place to say it. However, there could be a case for arguing that the planning of the rebuilding of Darwin provided an opportunity to do the job properly because, after all, it was not done properly before.

The member for Light at least quoted one Darwin Reconstruction Commissioner (Mr. Tambling) who indicated in his telegram that the Monarto Development Commission could undertake some work in the overall planning and development areas.

Dr. Eastick: That's not what he said.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member quoted Mr. Tambling in a broad way, saying that there was something that the Monarto Development Commission could do to assist.

Dr. Eastick: No, you go back to the telegram.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Perhaps the honourable member would care to produce a copy of that telegram. Those remarks do not suggest that Mr. Tambling is entirely opposed to using the commission, because he is obviously not opposed to it.

Mr. Coumbe: Why don't you sit down?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the member for Torrens wants to make a contribution to the debate I suggest he should do so and show more guts. If he has a view he should express it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The word "guts" is an unsavoury word, especially when it is used to imply that a member in this Chamber lacks guts. I ask the Minister to withdraw the remark. If he were to look up the dictionary he would find that to use the singular of the word is acceptable but to use the plural form is pure slang.

The SPEAKER: It seems to be an accepted Parliamentary word these days. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In deference, not to your ruling, Sir, but to the sensibility of the member for Davenport I will substitute the phrase "lack of intestinal fortitude". What I heard the member for Light refer to—

Dr. Eastick: I read it all.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know. It states:

I believe D.R.C. must use Federal Government and local consultants as first priority and then engage Monarto or other consultants only where specialist professional skills are otherwise unavailable.

That is what the D.R.C. said in its approach to us. It was unable to get hold of all the professional skills required, and that was the basis of its approach. It said, "We don't want you involved in a detailed way or even in a day-to-day way, but we need some help. There's a big job to be done, but we can't get hold of all the specialist skills we require. Will you help?" That should be clear enough.

Dr. Eastick: It doesn't say that it will use them.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member ought to know that Mr. Tambling is a member of the D.R.C., which requested that this help be given because it had been having great difficulty, as anyone with any knowledge of the situation would know, in getting the basic planning work off the ground.

Dr. Eastick: It has had difficulty in keeping planners out of its hair.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is the kind of stupid short-sighted attitude that the honourable member has taken on this matter, and I cannot understand it. That is the kind of attitude which leads to the development of places like Darwin on a higgledy piggledy basis, without any proper planning, and which led to the magnitude of the Darwin disaster. I should have thought that the honourable member, with his background, would consider that point, and I hope that he will consider it again.

Dr. Eastick: It hasn't guaranteed a job for the Monarto commission.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Perhaps not, but the issue arose because it requested the South Australian Government, through me as Minister, to provide assistance: would we be willing to make the services of the Monarto Development Commission available as and when required? That is how the matter arose. That request was made both by Mr. Powell of the D.R.C. and by Mr. Uren.

Dr. Eastick: There's no guarantee—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As it stands now, we would not be able to meet that request unless the amendment was made or unless we did what the Opposition suggests, namely, started seconding people. If we second people, we do two things. First, we damage the morale to a significant extent of the Monarto commission.

Mr. Evans: Don't you think it's damaged already?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is damaged by Opposition members who want to kill it. The Monarto commission knew what would happen to it if the Government had not been returned at the last State election. The prospect of the Government being defeated was damaging to its morale, because the people in the organisation believe in the work they are doing and the work to which they are committed, whereas I know that Opposition members do not believe in it or in decentralisation. They have a short-sighted view of what the future may hold, and they generally display a great lack of knowledge on these overall matters. Secondment is a device that would tend to destroy the identity of the Monarto commission, and that is not the purpose of the Government. The Government wishes the project to proceed and it wishes to retain the identity of the commission and the group of expert people we have in the organisation.

We have an expert group of people. The fact that the D.R.C. and Federal Minister chose to approach the Monarto commission for assistance and not some other statutory authority around Australia is to the great credit of the kind of expertise that lies within the Monarto commission. If we start seconding people out of that commission into other jobs, we start to destroy the commission's identity. It is the kind of policy we would adopt if we wished to discontinue the Monarto project. Although the Opposition may want to do that, the Government does not want to do that. The Government considers that the most appropriate way of proceeding is to ensure that the commission does not have to proceed by way of secondment in relation to these matters.

Some honourable members have said that this proposal will put private consultants out of work. Opposition members, especially the member for Mitcham, would do more damage to private consultants by their attitude to Monarto than anything that the Government might do by this amendment. The bulk of the work of the Monarto commission (more than half of it) is undertaken by private consultants to Monarto.

Mr. Dean Brown: Outside this State.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They use resources in this State. We know the parochial and narrow-minded attitude of the member for Davenport, but would he mind not interjecting for a while? The commission has been involved in an extensive use of consultants within and outside the State, in Government departments and in private industry. If the Monarto project is killed off, as the member for Mitcham wishes, the damage to the employment of consultants would be extensive. The member for Mitcham in his attitude is acting against the interests of consultants. There is no indication that this Government is opposed to the use of private consultants; in fact, in a number of areas it has used private consultants more than has any other Government in the history of this State.

Mr. McRae: And been criticised by the Opposition.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, in some cases by some members because some previous Ministers were restricted in the policies adopted at that time to the extent to which private consultants could be used. That has not been this Government's approach. The Government's record is clear on this matter; Monarto's record is clear on this matter; and private consultants have been used extensively and will continue to be used extensively. It is obvious, even to the most narrow-minded individual, that, unless permanent employment is to be assured so far as the commission is concerned, it must continue to use outside

consultants; otherwise, their employment would be going up and down like a yo-yo, and there would be a very unhappy staff in the commission's employment. If the Monarto commission undertakes work for the Darwin commission, or a particular job, it may be that it has two-thirds or three-quarters or even between 80 per cent and 90 per cent of the labour required available within its own organisation, but it is possible that to some extent it may have to call on the help of outside consultants partially to assist in the work being done in Darwin.

That would not be the first time that that type of thing had occurred when consultants were employed by one organisation; that is quite a common situation to occur. The position is clear on these matters. Secondment is a procedure designed to damage the Monarto commission, and nothing the commission does is contrary to the interests of private consultants. As I have already said, the member for Mitcham is the chief force in this Parliament seeking to damage the interests of private consultants, because he wants to put the Monarto commission out of business, and that really would damage the interests of private consultants.

Dr. Tonkin: He can't put them out of business if they're not in business.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They are in business.

Mr. Millhouse: They've got no business to do.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is a fairly arid exercise to be involved in debate in this House in which one states certain things that involve the Government's intentions and one's own intentions and then one finds that the member for Mitcham or the Leader knows more about one's intentions than one knows oneself. The member for Mitcham and the Leader say, "No, that is not true." That is a useless exercise in which to get involved. The Government's commitment and my commitment to Monarto are clear-cut and they will continue.

Mr. Millhouse: At the taxpayer's expense.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: To the ultimate benefit of the people of Adelaide and of this State, even to the ultimate benefit of the member for Mitcham, because what we do will protect his quality of life. He would be quite incapable, even if he was in Government, of doing that for the people of this State, because he is so short-sighted in his attitude and so limited in his view.

I should hope that any figures bandied around by honourable members opposite would distinguish between the sum of money spent by Government and the total that might be spent in the development of any area. The total amount spent by Government will not be \$600 000 000 by 1984. The member for Kavel was starting to quote the member for Davenport as an authority on the matter, and it is difficult to have to put up with the mis-statements by the member for Davenport being regurgitated by the member for Kavel. In the debate last week, I think it was the member for Light who referred to the unemployment of architects as a result of the Monarto Development Commission's doing work for the Darwin Reconstruction Commission. It has been made clear by the Monarto Development Commission and Monarto that they will not be offering architectural services. The basic services available are planning services, and no unemployment in private architects' offices would be involved as a consequence of this Bill. If Monarto proceeds as we wish it to proceed, there will be a considerable increase in the amount of work available in architects' offices.

I refer now to comments made by the member for Davenport about the staff of the commission, because I

assure honourable members that the member for Davenport has agitated the staff of the commission to a considerable degree, and they feel strongly that their professional competence and abilities have been attacked in this House by that member. They also feel that they are in the traditional position of public servants in not being able to reply. Some harsh words have been said consequent on what the member for Davenport said last week. In a report to me, the General Manager of the Monarto Development Commission states:

Some of my staff, however, are far from happy about the matter; and the Directors of the three divisions singled out for attack by Mr. Brown have given me some material (attached) which you might find useful in any response you might care to make.

I think I should, to protect the record, give the House some of this material.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you want to insert it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not intend to ask that it be inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it, because it involves putting the record right regarding comments made by the member for Davenport about people who cannot reply. As recorded at page 1064 of *Hansard*, last week the honourable member stated:

I take as an example the Environmental Planning Division. ... In the Environmental Planning Division, the Director is a Bachelor of Arts (Economics) and, of all the people employed in that division, only one is a scientist, and he is a Master of Science.

That was a general questioning of the competence of the people in the division to do the job required of them. The Director of the division states:

Dean Brown's comments regarding the qualifications of commission staff amount to a personal attack on public servants who do not have the right of reply. The comments made regarding the formal qualifications of E.P.D. staff are wrong for three major reasons:

1. They show a complete lack of understanding of the definition and purpose of environmental planning.
2. They are based on an incomplete knowledge of formal staff qualifications.
3. They totally disregard the importance of ability and experience.

Taking the question of academic qualifications first, the list forwarded to the Minister by the M.D.C. was a brief summary only and was not designed for a full review of the qualifications of specific individuals. The following is a more detailed statement of academic qualifications of E.P.D. staff:

Director:

Bachelor of Economics (Adelaide Uni.)

Postgraduate Diploma in Management Studies (British Institute of Management U.K.)

Has also carried out post graduate environmental studies at Macquarie University N.S.W. and has published papers on environmental subjects in international professional journals.

Mr. Millhouse: What is the point of this?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The point of this (as the honourable member has a complete lack of understanding of people and what makes them tick) is that last week the member for Davenport questioned the qualifications and abilities of certain sections of the staff in the Monarto Development Commission. They cannot reply in the same vein to the member for Davenport, and I intend to reply on their behalf, whether the member for Mitcham likes it or not.

Mr. Millhouse: The qualifications can't be challenged.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Well, the member for Davenport challenged them.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't be silly! Of course he couldn't—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Davenport could not be that silly, but he was. I realise that

he is silly, and I thank the member for Mitcham for supporting me in the matter. The report to which I have referred continues:

Senior Environmental Officer:
Master of Engineering (Queensland 1961).

According to the member for Davenport, he is not a scientist. However, he has carried out this work:

Postgraduate Water Research; foundation fellow at the University of Queensland; member of Institution of Engineers; member of Australian Society of Soil Science; several published scientific papers.

I could go on to the other officers in the division. The report states:

These qualifications must be related to the purpose of environmental planning which Dean Brown obviously does not understand. Environmental planning is an interdisciplinary process with the objective of ensuring that environmental factors are taken into account in the planning process.

Most of the planning that has been undertaken by town planning officers in this State or in any other part of Australia has rarely paid much attention to environmental matters. The information given to me also states:

While the Environmental Planning Division staff have adequate qualifications in the environmental sciences, the academic requirement for an environmental planner is not simply to be a "scientist".

There are several functions of this division some of which are too detailed for me to go into, but I should like to insert a list—

Mr. Millhouse: If you can spend all this time, you haven't much else to do.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is acting against people being able to express themselves.

Mr. Millhouse: No, I am not.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He is. The kinds of function involved include urban planning; evaluation of urban transportation systems and quantification of their associated air, noise and water pollution; environmental impact assessment and preparation of environmental impact statements; and project management involving planning and administration of environmental projects. The member for Davenport made some adverse comments last week about the Director, Town Planning, of the Monarto Development Commission when he said:

I am surprised that the Director of the Town Planning Division . . . has only a Diploma in Town Planning.

Mr. Dean Brown: Read on!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member also said:

Of course, he may have a great deal of practical experience; perhaps the Minister will explain this matter.

If the member for Davenport does not realise that his original statements would be taken by the gentleman concerned as an attack on his suitability for the position, he has no understanding of people. The Director, Town Planning, of the Monarto Development Commission is very well experienced in both the technical and senior management aspects of his profession with regard to large development exercises. An example was his chairmanship in 1973 of the inter-departmental working party on the Noarlunga subregion, a forerunner of the Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Study.

In 1971, he was one of two Australians to be awarded an Anzac Fellowship by the New Zealand and Australian Governments, and more recently was appointed to the Tourist Development Advisory Council of South Australia. He is held in high regard by his professional peers as instanced by his recent election as President of the Royal

Australian Planning Institute (South Australian Division), and his membership of the Federal Board of Education of that body. I think that is enough to indicate that the other reflections, made by the member for Davenport in relation to the general qualification of people in this division, were unwarranted. I should add that all people in the division hold professional qualifications awarded by various tertiary institutions in Australia or overseas. More importantly, these qualifications are accepted in all but one instance as reaching the necessary academic standard for admittance to one or all of the Royal Australian Planning Institute, the Royal Town Planning Institute (U.K.) or the New Zealand Planning Institute. In the one exception the officer concerned is completing his post-graduate thesis to fulfil these requirements. It would be difficult to put together in a Town Planning Division a group of people more competent than we have in this division. The honourable member asked why four research officers were required in the Social Planning Division of the commission. It is almost worth asking why this should need explaining, but several attachments have been provided to me by the commission. Attachment one sets out a more detailed statement of the functions of the division; attachment two lists specific examples of the division's work, and the number of papers and reports that the division has developed since April, 1974; and attachment three details the divisional establishment and officers now holding positions. I ask leave to have the attachments inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

FUNCTIONS OF THE SOCIAL PLANNING DIVISION

1. To develop and administer the social planning programme within the commission's overall planning process;
2. To develop and administer a strategic social plan, as part of the Monarto strategic plan, to guide the social planning process;
3. To advise the commission and other divisions on social policies for community development;
4. To provide the other divisions of the commission with specific social data related to specific development projects to enable social considerations to be translated into physical terms;
5. To ensure the provision in Monarto of the full range of welfare, health, educational, sporting, leisure-time, cultural and community services and facilities commensurate with its stage of development;
6. To interact with relevant Government and private agencies concerned with the provision of social, welfare, cultural and community services;
7. To monitor and evaluate the development of social provision in Monarto and to ensure flexibility in meeting the needs of the community;
8. To foster community participation in the planning process of Monarto and in the development of the community generally;
9. To ensure that the development of Monarto is seen in its regional context and in this respect to include regional changes, as a continual input into the social planning process;
10. To research, monitor and evaluate trends in social issues both in Australia and overseas;
11. To develop a data base and information retrieval system relating to the needs of the community;
12. To prepare for publication, documentary material on the social planning process;

REPORTS AND PAPERS DEVELOPED BY THE SOCIAL PLANNING DIVISION, APRIL, 1975, TO AUGUST, 1975

In-house reports and papers:

| | |
|-------|---|
| 1974 | |
| April | Monarto Objectives—1 |
| May | Housing at Monarto (in conjunction with Architectural Division) |
| May | Residential Density Social Research Programme |
| June | Housing Policy (in conjunction with Architectural Division) |
| June | Local Government Policy Proposal |

In-house reports and papers—*continued*

| | |
|---|--|
| June | Construction Workers Policy Proposal |
| June | Submissions on Local Government Policy |
| July | Monarto Goals and Objectives—2 |
| July | Housing Study—Methodology |
| July | Flexi-time—Interim Report |
| August | The Division and the Community—Research Methodology |
| August | Public Transport in Monarto |
| November | Community Facilities, First Stage of Development; some considerations |
| November 1975 | Population Forecasting—Study Proposal |
| January | City Centre Users' Study: Users' Requirements |
| January | Incentive Project—Final Report |
| April | Legislation and Monarto: Report on Preliminary Considerations |
| May | Historic Buildings Conservation and Community Activity Centres Programme |
| June | Social Planning Division Population Studies Working Paper |
| August | Short-Term Strategy Proposals |
| Reports and papers for public circulation: 1974 | |
| June | Information Release to Public Servants—No 1 P.S.A. |
| July | Information Release to Public Servants—No. 2 MPSRC |
| July | Population Structure Information for Education Department. |
| July | Housing Study—Interim Report |
| September | Social Data Survey—Report of a study conducted in the Departments of Lands, Agriculture and Environment and Conservation. |
| October | Housing Study—Report 1 |
| October | The Social Plan for Monarto—Section 1: Social Planning Methodology |
| November | Design Philosophy and Social Considerations |
| December 1975 | Social Planning for Monarto—Leaflet |
| January | Social Planners' Conference—Social Planning for a New City—4 papers |
| March | Population Notes |
| April | The Report of the National Population Inquiry and its implications for Monarto planning |
| April | A report on the submissions received by the Social Planning Division from people and organisations responding to the Social Planning Methodology |
| June | Tables requested from the A.B.S. from the 1976 Census covering Population and Housing |
| June | Social Plan Working Papers—Section 1: Methodology |
| June | Social Plan Working Papers—Section 2: Population Studies. |
| June | Education Provision for Monarto: Section 10 |
| July | Population Papers Consolidated as at July, 1975. |

DIVISIONAL ESTABLISHMENT AND OFFICERS
PRESENTLY HOLDING POSITIONS*Director:*

1965 B.A.(Sydney), Social Anthropology (Hons. Div. II), Urban Geography (Hons. Div. I); 1971 M.A. (U.P.N.G.), Urban Geography; 1973 M.A. (Nc-u-Tyne), Urban and Regional Planning.

Divisional Secretary Stenographer:

1967 Leaving P.E.B. Certificate.

Research Officer—urban research:

1970 B.A.(Oxford), Physics (Hons. Class 2); 1973 M.A.(Oxford) Physics; 1973 M.Tech.(Brunel), Operational Research; unfinished M.A. Business Administration.

Research Officer—health-welfare:

1969 B.A.(Adelaide), Political Science (Hons.), History; 1970 Dip.Ed.(Adelaide); unfinished Master Town Planning (Adelaide).

Research Officer—community development:

1970 B.A.(Adelaide) Political Science (Hons.); unfinished M.A.

Research Officer—cultural-recreation:

1970 B.A.(Monash), Sociology; 1972 M.T.I.A. and I.M. Industrial Relations.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Davenport has questioned the role of the Research Officer in the Administration and Finance Division. This position was placed within that division for reasons of efficiency, economy, and administration. Apart from the Social Planning Division, other divisions require research work to be carried out on an *ad hoc* basis. It was considered that one person would adequately handle this work, provided that it was effectively co-ordinated and monitored. This is being handled by the Administration and Finance Division.

I ask honourable members to consider this Bill not from the point of view of people who wish to see the end of the work of the commission and a finish to the Monarto project, but from the point of view of the Government, which wishes the project to continue and wishes to see to it that, if the commission is involved elsewhere, it is not involved in a way that damages its identity or the morale of the staff. The member for Fisher's proposition to run down the commission is not reasonable. If this were done, when it is necessary to reconstitute the commission there will be great difficulty in getting experts together again. Perhaps people approached would say, "Well, the previous history of this project has been highly doubtful, so I had better look elsewhere for a job." If the kind of expertise is to remain available, it will do so only if the project continues. That may not be a good argument to continue the project, but it is an argument in favour of stating that, if at this stage someone said that the project should be wound down for 10 years, obviously it would be better to terminate the project now.

Mr. Millhouse: Hear, hear!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is not my opinion or the opinion of the Government. For reasons that have been adduced previously, the Government believes that the project is necessary and should be planned on a flexible basis in order to provide for the future of the Adelaide region. These arguments may not be accepted by Opposition members, but they (particularly the member for Mitcham) should at least have the decency and honesty to recognise that they are arguments that have some degree of substance. It is not good enough for the honourable member in his arrogant way—

Mr. Millhouse: Me arrogant!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —to say that the project is dead, that the Government knows it is dead, and it is being dishonest in not admitting that it is dead.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought you said "elegant".

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member should know me well enough to know that, however else I may describe him, I could not describe him as elegant in relation to his prose, his attitude, or his profile. The Bill is designed so that we can assist with requests that have been received. It is not a consequence of anything that the Government has sought, because the Government has not sought additional work for the commission. We have tried to respond to these requests in a way that ensures that the identity and morale of the commission are retained. I ask honourable members to take those matters into account when deciding on the Bill.

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

Leave granted.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: During this past week I have received a letter from the Monarto Development Commission and I have been in communication with persons who have acted on behalf of the Staff Association of the

commission. During the second reading debate I commented on the structure of the commission, and asked the Minister to explain the qualifications and functions of some of the staff of the commission. In no way was I reflecting on the ability of these individuals to carry out their required tasks. I apologise for any embarrassment that may have been caused to any individual by my questioning. That was never intended by me. I think the Minister realised that. The Minister supplied the information today, and I thank him for it. However, it would be fair for me to reiterate briefly what I said, because I believe my comments should be put in true perspective.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member has made his point, and I see no reason for him to reiterate what he has said and what has been recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I ask members and the staff to refer to *Hansard*, because statements of mine that have been quoted back to me were taken entirely out of context. The Minister tried to do that today. I did not challenge their qualifications; I did not attack them as individuals. I asked the Minister to explain why the commission was structured in such a way, and he has done so. This Parliament must preserve its right to question the numbers and functions of the persons employed by this Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting. I think he has made his point in relation to his personal explanation.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Jennings, Keneally, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Langley. No—Mr. Arnold.

The SPEAKER: There are 22 Ayes and 22 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I seem to be becoming more and more involved in problems relating to our consumer protection laws of this State. I believe our consumer protection laws are the best in the country, and it is probably true to say they would be among the best in the world. Despite this, I find from time to time that constituents get involved in what I call shonky door-to-door deals. The Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs some time ago released a booklet called "Shopping at Home". I welcomed the publication of this booklet, because I believed it was another step forward to protect the ordinary person in the street, the consumer. This afternoon I will deal with some of the problems I have encountered. A newspaper reporter (a person I would not have thought would become involved in such a trans-

action) became involved with a firm called Celebrity Styles. I do not know whether members have heard about that firm, but it is a tailoring firm based in Hong Kong. This man ordered, for \$45, a suit which, it seemed, did not exist for some time. When it was to become available, he had to pay \$50 import duty on the suit, so it would have cost him \$95. It seems to me that people should have some knowledge about the problems they could face by entering this sort of contract.

I took up the matter with the former Attorney-General, stating that there was a firm of that name advertising in this country. I informed the Attorney-General that my constituent ordered the suit, which eventually arrived in Whyalla, but that he had to pay import duty of \$50 on it. Needless to say, the duty amounted to more than the cost of the suit. I have amassed quite a file on the matter, and the last I heard of it was in a reply from the Attorney-General which stated that trading by mail order was legal and that nothing could be done about the matter, as it was difficult to devise legislation to protect people who bought goods in such a way. I do not know whether the man has the suit yet.

It is my experience that, when this sort of case arises, the salesmen always seem to knock on the door of susceptible people. For instance, I do not know whether they have ever knocked on a lawyer's door. I wonder whether they work out whom they will see before they visit them. The second case, which is more serious, concerns an age pensioner who was taken in by a couple of painters who came to my district and offered to paint the pensioner's house for \$150 or \$200 on the pretext that the job would be done properly. The pensioner paid out \$200, but the job that was done left much to be desired.

I also took up this matter with the former Attorney-General and found it was not an uncommon practice in this State. The last I heard about it was that the Attorney-General, through the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch, was trying to trace the painters. Although details have been given to the branch, no trace of the painters has been found. This is a shameful state of affairs, and I appeal to people entering into any agreement to purchase goods covered by consumer protection laws at least to think about what they are letting themselves into. Perhaps in that way there will be fewer of these types of activity going on in South Australia. I hope that my constituents will learn from these mistakes and will realise that consumer protection laws are there to help them if they want that help.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The matter I wish to raise relates to the tendering for the supply of Government equipment, especially furniture for the new education building in Flinders Street. The situation is somewhat clouded and is a matter on which we should challenge the Government and its policies. I understand that a contract to supply furniture for the new education building is worth between \$500 000 and \$750 000. To obtain a supplier for this furniture, four companies (three from South Australia and one from Victoria) were invited to submit tenders, as apparently they were judged by Government officers. I do not know who they were or what expertise they had, but apparently they judged that these were the only companies capable of completing the contract, the condition of which was that sub-contracting could be done only with the permission of the Government.

I understand the Victorian firm was successful with its tender, and that permission has been granted by the Government for the firm to subcontract for the timber to be used in making the furniture. That subcontract, has been given to a Salisbury company on the basis that transport

costs will be saved. What a ludicrous situation: an interstate company is given a contract to supply furniture for the new education building but, to save costs, the timber will be obtained from a Salisbury firm.

There must be something wrong somewhere. Evidently the Salisbury company presented the lowest tender for the timber. No specifications were supplied with the tender for the furniture, and a South Australian company would probably have been better equipped to submit a competitive price had it been given certain guidelines. I believe that, after discussions with officers from the Public Buildings Department, one firm was told that the latest trends in office design, procedure and layout, and the most efficient and economic systems, were required. This company submitted a design based on latest overseas trends, particularly American and Swedish. The tender submitted by this company must have been above the tender price submitted by the Victorian company.

The South Australian company had the knowledge and expertise to provide what was considered to be the best and most up-to-date layout, design and type of furniture required, but it was unsuccessful. The State Government should have ensured that South Australian companies were given, as far as possible, a greater chance to obtain the contract. The questions that come to my mind are as follows: Why are the tenders not open to all South Australian manufacturers, as I believe has been the normal practice? Why was a specification not included with the tender, as has been the normal practice? Will these departures from the previous practice become the accepted practice in future by the Government? The fact that this contract, worth between \$500 000 and \$750 000, has been let to an outside firm appears to me to be a smack in the eye for the local furniture manufacturers, who have every reason to believe that they have not been given a fair go; I support them in that view. If we are to assist South Australian industry and do all we can to ensure full employment in South Australian industry, surely the State Government should be doing everything it can to ensure that South Australian manufacturers are the successful tenderers. Our manufacturers should be given information, help and advice wherever possible. Why should we be looking outside South Australia to obtain our furniture and equipment, or any other type of supply necessary in this State?

One becomes cynical and wonders whether the comments that have been made by various members of the House are what they truly believe. The Government is following the democratic socialist policy of its own Party and, if it carries this policy to the full extent, it will continually bash free enterprise in this State. If it does that, it will be bashing not only free enterprise (the few people who go to the trouble to build up and establish their own companies and provide employment opportunities) but also letting down the workers of South Australia. When Opposition members try to strike a blow for free enterprise and the workers it employs, that is when the criticism comes. There would be even greater unemployment in the State if free enterprise had not been given the base it was given over the years of sound Liberal Government in South Australia. It is only because of that help that free enterprise has been able to carry on and to continue under the terrific hardships that have been created by the State Government and, we now find, by the Australian Government. This section of industry in South Australia believes that it has been severely let down, and people in that industry must wonder what the Government is really trying to do to them.

If I was a worker in the furniture trade as a skilled tradesman or a semi-skilled or unskilled worker, I would be wondering what the Labor Party was doing with regard to my future employment. This matter all hinges around the question of why the State Government has allowed a company from another State to tender and be accepted to supply furniture for the new Education Department building. The major question which arises is why this firm was selected in the first place. Only one interstate company was selected, and it was the successful tenderer. The question arises regarding how honest, sincere and genuine was the approach to that company and the tender from that company, in competition with the South Australian industry. I hope that the Government will look at the situation, and rethink its whole policy. I hope that a full-scale inquiry will be instituted to ensure that this does not happen again. This afternoon, the Premier said that he had advised General Motors-Holden's that he was unhappy about certain administrative stands the company had taken in the past. This is it: the Premier obviously has the power to be able to go to industry and tell it whether in his opinion it is doing the right thing.

On the other hand, an industry that is struggling and feeling the effects of the difficult economy at present should be benefiting from any Government projects. Last financial year, the State Supply Department increased its supplies by almost 22 per cent from \$18 000 000 to \$26 000 000; therefore, there is that opportunity to keep South Australian industry and employment going. It is no use the Premier's saying that he hopes to create 2 000 jobs in a month, when we find that \$800 000 has been provided in the Lands Department for metropolitan unemployment relief and when we believe that that money has already been committed, anyway. Let us hope that we can get the money from the Australian Government so that we can reduce unemployment here. Let the Government not be the one creating unemployment or the situation in which it is taking away the incentive and initiative of free enterprise to keep in employment those people who have worked with it for so long. That is the basis of the whole matter. We must have free enterprise, and a Government willing to assist it. No matter what the hard-line supporters of the Government believe, they should give this assistance. The Government has the responsibility, as we do, to protect the workers of the State, and to ensure that their jobs are safe and that future jobs will be created.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): The act of the member for Hanson is a difficult one to follow. He gave a lecture on the hard lot of the poor struggling capitalists of this world. I am sure that what he tried to do was to inject some humour into what has been a bad week for his Party. However, I will address my remarks to what is an important subject, namely, the secessionist movement in the northern parts of the State.

Mr. Becker: That is a joke!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: You, Mr. Speaker, would be familiar with the resolution passed at the meeting of the Spencer Gulf Cities Association: although not exactly a joke, it was not far off being a joke. All I can say about the resolution is that the fact that it was discussed at all is completely preposterous. I am not concerned about the motives of the gentleman who moved the motion or by the fact that it was seconded by a Town Clerk and not an elected member of the people: what I am concerned about is that the editorial writers throughout South Australia in the city press, and now the country press, have

jumped on to what they consider to be a band wagon and have said that the reason why people have been encouraged to consider such a move is that the Governments, both State and Federal, have been ignoring the welfare of the people in the Spencer Gulf cities. You, Mr. Speaker, would know in Port Pirie, as I know in Port Augusta, and as the member for Whyalla would know in Whyalla that, over the past few years, the State and Federal Governments have been most generous to our cities. The Federal Government during the past year in the Regional Employment Development scheme and by other grants has poured \$1 000 000 into each of our cities.

Mr. Evans: Do you mean "poored"?

Mr. KENEALLY: "Poured" is a similar term to what comes out of the honourable member's mouth at times, but I will not describe what is poured out. The State Government has contributed enormously to the welfare of people in the Spencer Gulf area, and this has been borne out repeatedly by criticism we hear from Opposition members to the effect that the State Government is looking after those whom it says are the people who support the Government.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Not half!

Mr. KENEALLY: Not half are we getting a good deal in the northern parts of the State. If the honourable member believes that it is difficult to understand what the Mayor of Port Lincoln, who was a defeated Liberal candidate at the last election, and a gentleman from Port Pirie, who has at times opposed the Labor Party, are saying when they state that they have been encouraged to take this action because of the negligence of the State and Federal Governments.

Mr. Evans: It's easy to spend money—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: If the honourable member came to the northern part of the State, he would see how well money has been spent and how it has contributed to the quality of life. He would see that people in those cities were getting a good deal from the Governments, as they are entitled to get. He also would see how well those cities are represented. I would not say that that is why money has been attracted to the area, but it may well be true.

Mr. Wallis, the Commonwealth member for Grey, works as hard as any other member of Parliament in Australia, and he is an absolute credit to this position.

He will hold the Division of Grey for as long as he wishes to contest it, because the people there recognise a member of worth when they see one. He has much support from people in the industrial areas of Spencer Gulf, and he can be shown to be the complete alternative to the sort of representation that the people in, for instance, the District of Eyre can get from their State member. All the argument in the editorial columns is specious. The people concerned with the original move never imagined that the press would be so stupid as to make a big issue of the matter, and they are embarrassed about it. The Port Augusta council has dissociated itself from the move, and I hope other councils will do the same thing.

Mr. Venning: They're getting a fairly good spin.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yet the honourable member disagrees with those people in the Spencer Gulf area who say that the area has not been well served. All the time we have this contradiction, with some members recognising that the area has been well looked after and defeated Liberal Party candidates in the area complaining that they are not getting good representation.

I refer now to an editorial in the *Whyalla News*. If one city in South Australia has no reason to complain about the representation and assistance it has had in relation to the Commonwealth Government and the State Government, it is Whyalla. The person responsible for that editorial has been completely irresponsible. The alleged facts given are not facts, and the person concerned tried to suggest to readers, if they were silly enough to believe it, that Whyalla had been ignored. That person has done a disservice to his city, but what he has done will not affect the assistance and representation that the area is given. Governments will not be swayed by some petty editorial comment in a regional city newspaper, but it would be heartening to the people who make the money available to country areas if the editorial policy was responsible and if it was acknowledged that assistance had been given.

Motion carried.

At 5.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 14, at 2 p.m.