

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 10 December 1981

The **SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

TECHNOLOGY PARK (ADELAIDE) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, 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.

CONFERENCES

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier)**: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable conferences on the Planning Bill and the South Australian College of Advanced Education Bill to continue during the sittings of the House.

Motion carried.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

The **Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs)**: I have to report that the managers for the two Houses conferred together but that no agreement was reached.

PETITION: CASINO

A petition signed by 63 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set a committee to study the social effects of gambling; and reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia and establish a Select Committee on casino operations in this State was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

STUDENT COUNSELLORS

In reply to **Mr LYNN ARNOLD (14 October)**.

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: The position of adviser to student counsellors in schools is not one of the 45 advisory and seconded teacher positions to be forgone in 1982, and the position and the service provided will continue.

RYE GRASS TOXICITY

In reply to **Mr BLACKER (3 December)**.

The **Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN**: The impact of annual rye grass toxicity in various parts of the State is being assessed on a continuing basis. Good records have been kept of all known outbreaks. Since rye grass toxicity was first recog-

nised in 1956 there have been approximately 8 000 sheep deaths and 250 cattle deaths known to be caused by the problem.

The area known to be affected by rye grass toxicity is increasing, and several new outbreaks have occurred this year. To date, 11 farms have reported losses this year involving approximately 200 sheep.

While no direct financial assistance is provided to farmers, the Department of Agriculture is providing indirect assistance in the form of its research, diagnostic and extension services. Through the provision of timely advice, farmers are able to take corrective action to reduce losses. We believe that the publicity and technical information provided by the department have contributed appreciably to a lower number of stock losses per individual outbreak this year.

GRAIN THEFTS

In reply to **Mr BECKER (22 October)**.

The **Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN**: Further to my undertaking to examine the *National Farmer* article on grain thefts I advise the honourable member that the security associated with this State's Bulk Handling Authority is such that no grain has been stolen from silos since the authority commenced its operations in 1955. The incident at Jamestown to which the honourable member referred involved the fraudulent recording of grain in the wrong name. Outside of the bulk-handling system the Department of Agriculture has learnt of the occasional theft of grain from farmers' paddocks or post silos. In this area departmental officers can do no more than advise farmers of the risks involved and the precautions they might take. Consequential investigation of these offences is obviously a matter for the police.

ABORTION

In reply to **Mr RANDALL (19 November)**.

The **Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON**: The eleventh annual report on abortions notified in South Australia contains a table indicating the category of doctors performing abortions. Registered specialists performed 74.64 per cent of the abortions and 8.64 per cent were carried out by general practitioners. The 681 abortions (16.72 per cent) referred to by the honourable member were all carried out by registered medical practitioners. These doctors were either registrars in training as specialist obstetricians or general practitioners holding appointments in teaching hospitals who have been trained to teaching hospital standards to perform abortions in teaching hospitals.

CURRICULUM DIRECTORATE

In reply to **Mr GLAZBROOK (14 October)**.

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: The numbers of staff currently employed in the Curriculum Directorate of the Education Department and the estimated totals of their annual salaries at current rates are:

1. Public servants and other non-teacher employees: 224 full-time equivalent, \$3 600 000.
2. Seconded and advisory teachers: 198 full-time equivalent, \$4 500 000.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT STAFF

In reply to Mr GLAZBROOK (14 October).

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The following table shows the number of teachers in each of the 10 Education Department regions as at June 1981 and the estimated salaries costs of teachers in those regions for the 1980-81 financial year.

| Region | Teacher Numbers (f.t.e.) | Estimate \$m |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Central Northern | 3 980 | 71.0 |
| Central Western | 2 040 | 36.9 |
| Central Eastern | 1 878 | 36.2 |
| Central Southern | 2 954 | 54.0 |
| Eyre | 538 | 9.3 |
| Northern | 1 301 | 22.5 |
| Yorke and Lower North | 586 | 10.6 |
| Murraylands | 471 | 8.2 |
| Riverland | 459 | 7.9 |
| South East | 825 | 14.5 |
| Total | 15 032 | 271.1m |

Teacher numbers are expressed in full-time equivalent terms and include all teachers in schools and assigned to regional education offices. Teachers on long service leave or any form of paid leave are included, as are their replacements. Excluded from the count are hourly-paid instructors, temporary relieving teachers and any teachers funded through deposit working accounts. The financial data includes costs incurred for salaries, locality allowances, higher duty allowances, cleaning allowances (paid to teachers), leave loading and salaries paid to teachers acting in Public Service positions. Pay-roll tax is excluded.

SCHOOL STAFFING

In reply to Mr OLSEN (14 October).

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Enrolments in Government primary and secondary classes in February 1981 were over-estimated in 1980 by 1 300 and 400 respectively. If one takes the pupil-teacher ratios of 1980 as an acceptable basis of staffing schools, namely, 17.9 primary and 11.6 secondary, then schools staffed on the basis of estimated enrolment could be concluded to have been "overstaffed" by 73 primary and 34 secondary teachers. Such an analysis is false, however, for the following reasons.

1. Staffing formulae are not based on the needs of schools. Rather, they are used to determine an equitable distribution of the available staff, whatever their number, between all schools.
2. Additionally, a significant portion of school staff are appointed not on any formula basis, but in order to respond to agreed special needs of schools and to support specific purpose programmes such as migrant education, the education of the physically and mentally handicapped, and additional effort in socio-economically disadvantaged schools.
3. Many schools experience an increase in enrolments during the year.
4. Declines in enrolments are spread over more than 800 schools, and the drop in any one school may not be such as to warrant a decrease in staff, especially since it may be spread over many classes.

Budgets for salaries, school grants, etc., are set early in the financial year and allocated out to schools then. It is too late in the financial year for major redistribution of available funds in February or March when actual school enrolments become known.

MIGRANT EDUCATION

In reply to Mr LYNN ARNOLD (14 October).

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Teachers specifically engaged to provide appropriate educational support for migrant children are employed under one of three programmes—migrant education (mainly the teaching of English to non-English speaking settled migrant children), multicultural education, and the new arrivals programme (for non-English speaking refugee children and some other new migrants). Of the total teachers engaged specifically in these programmes, approximately 25 per cent are employed on a contract rather than a permanent basis.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT STAFF

In reply to Mr SCHMIDT (14 October).

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Education Department employs social workers and attendance officers in both the central and regional offices. There are currently 10.3 full-time equivalent social workers and seven attendance officers.

CHILD BEHAVIOUR PROBLEMS

In reply to Mr HAMILTON (14 October).

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Education Department does not keep comprehensive statistics regarding the number of pupils considered to be behaviour problems in various categories. There are a number of children seen throughout the State by departmental officers and social workers. Additionally, pupils are supported by project teams (in three out of four metropolitan regions) placed in Willis House, in the South Australian Assessment and Remand Centre, at the Norwood Project Centre, and at the Melbourne Street Clinic School. Since project teams work with groups of pupils as well as individuals, giving varying amounts of attention, and since there are definitional problems for large numbers of other departmental employees also working with 'behaviour problem' pupils, it is not meaningful to provide statistics. Data about the number of children processed by children's aid panels are available from the Department for Community Welfare.

CURRICULUM PUBLICATIONS

In reply to Mr SCHMIDT (14 October).

The Hon. H. ALLISON: A schedule of Education Department curriculum publications available or expected to become available appears regularly in the *Education Gazette*. The latest information was provided in *Gazette* No. 19, Vol. 9, 24 July 1981, and a revised schedule will appear in November. The Publications Branch of the Education Department was established to produce basic curriculum materials, and very few textbooks are printed. Figures on the cost of development and production of publications are accurately kept, but in respect of future publications estimations are less precise. Both revenue spending and the Publications Working Account are subject to scrutiny by finance and audit officers.

SCHOOL SENIOR POSITIONS

In reply to Mr SCHMIDT (14 October).

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Currently there are approximately 50 seniors, that is, senior masters, mistresses and

special senior master/mistresses, employed in excess of school entitlements according to current formulae for their provision. This situation has developed mainly because of the Education Department's inability to require seniors to transfer to country vacancies, which have consequently been filled with acting appointments. The equitable country service scheme recently agreed to by the Education Department and the South Australian Institute of Teachers will make it possible to require seniors to transfer to the country and it is therefore expected that the excess number of seniors will be substantially reduced in 1982.

The salary difference between a senior and a teacher on the top step of the salary scale is approximately \$2 000 per year, and the additional expenditure incurred in 1982 as a result of the excess number of seniors has been approximately \$100 000. In general, the surplus seniors are employed in schools within the schools' total staffing entitlements, that is, in lieu of teachers in non-promotion positions. The placement of these seniors is carefully chosen in relation to identified areas within schools warranting special support.

LANGUAGE PROGRAMME

In reply to Mr SCHMIDT (14 October).

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Funds for the Curriculum Development Centre's language development programme have already been paid for in 1981, with promises of further support until June 1982. The level of funding until June 1982 will be determined after consideration of submissions made by States participating in the programme. There are no guarantees of assistance from the Curriculum Development Centre beyond June 1982, but the Education Department will be using ideas already produced in inservice activities to be conducted for teachers.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BUDGET POLICY

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In his Budget speech on 15 September 1981, the Treasurer informed the Parliament that the Treasury, with the assistance of the Australian Bureau of Statistics, was engaged in the preparation of a document that would summarise the financial operations of the State public sector as a whole. The task is quite a large and complex one, since it involves the compilation of information on the financial operations of semi-government authorities, corporations and boards, as well as those of Government departments and authorities whose finances are included in annual Budget papers.

The document which is being tabled today as a Treasury information paper is intended to be issued on a regular basis. It enables the Budget outlook for 1981-82, together with the outcome for 1980-81, to be viewed in the wider context of the total public sector within a few months of the annual Budget being presented.

As well as providing up-to-date information on all public sector finances, including forward estimates for 1981-82, the document contains comparable data for the decade from 1970-71. This historical perspective highlights the extent of change which has been required to reverse previous trends and policies and demonstrates that the effectiveness of current policies of Budget restraint can only be realistically appraised only over a longer period than annual Budget papers permit. The current outlook of a further

reduction in the rate of public sector spending should be seen as part of a longer term policy.

Mr Hemmings: Are you a bit tired, Roger?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think that everyone is.

Mr O'Neill: He should not make snide comments, either.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know whether the honourable member is tired. I hope that his liver is not affected. As the Treasury information paper shows, public sector spending in this State has now been growing more slowly relative to public sector spending by all other State and Commonwealth authorities for three consecutive years from 1978-79. However, it is of interest to note that, at page 70, the report, referring to public sector expenditures as a whole, points out that:

Whereas, in 1980-81, recurrent spending was the fastest growing component of public sector outlays, in 1981-82, capital outlays are estimated to increase by 20.8 per cent, or at a rate which is more than twice the estimated growth in recurrent outlays and more than double the increase in capital outlays in 1980-81. Within the budget sector, the anticipated growth in capital outlays of 12.2 per cent reverses a downward trend in capital spending which has been evident since 1976-77.

This is just one example of the broader perspective that the Treasury paper brings to bear on the State's public finances. In addition, it provides a great deal of detailed information in a format that facilitates integration within the total context of public sector spending and revenue raising. I am confident that honourable members will find this document an informative and useful point of reference on the State's public finances. Copies will be made available to all members for their perusal. I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the Under Treasurer and his officers for the effort that they put in to compiling this most detailed and innovative information paper.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy) for the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin):

By Command—

Public Finances, Recent Trends in South Australia and the 1981-82 Outlook—Information Paper issued by the South Australian Treasury, December 1981.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. W. E. Chapman):

By Command—

Australian Agricultural Council Resolutions of the 11th Meeting,—Darwin, 3 August 1981.

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton):

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning Appeal Board—Report, 1980-81

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M. M. Wilson):

Pursuant to Statute—

Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1980-81.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WATER RESOURCES PROGRAMME

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I wish to make announcements in respect of additional Commonwealth Government grants under the national water resources programme. In February this year the Government announced that it would spend approximately \$3 000 000 on the design of two water fil-

tration plants to serve the cities of Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta and other towns in the Mid-North of the State and on Yorke Peninsula. The announcement followed the completion of a comprehensive departmental report which reassessed the whole water filtration project.

The first plant was to be built at Morgan on the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline and the second on the Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline. This announcement was followed in April by a statement that the Government had invited five engineering consultants to tender for the design of a water filtration plant at Morgan. Then, in June of this year, the Government announced that detailed design of the first water filtration plant for South Australia's northern towns would start. Consultants were engaged to prepare conceptual and detailed design, specifications and documentation for the plant at Morgan. That work is proceeding and should be completed in October next year.

At the time the Government announced that it would go ahead with the provision of these plants, it was also stated that financial assistance would be sought from the Commonwealth Government under the national water resources programme.

I am pleased to be able to inform the House that I have received formal notification from the Minister for National Development and Energy, Senator Carrick, that the Commonwealth will provide the South Australian Government with a grant of \$240 000 this financial year for the design and construction of a water filtration plant on the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. The Commonwealth contribution represents approximately 30 per cent of the \$824 000 the State Government will spend this financial year on the Morgan plant, and it is the same level of assistance provided by the Commonwealth for the metropolitan water filtration programme.

The acceptance of this plant by the Commonwealth is significant. It means that we can confidently plan to call tenders for the construction of the Morgan water filtration plant in October of next year, the month that design work and tender documents are scheduled to be completed. Construction will take three years, which means the towns of the Iron Triangle and Yorke Peninsula can expect to have filtered water flowing through their taps by Christmas 1985.

The Government will be inviting consultants to register for the design of the second plant on the Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline in the new year, and construction of that plant will start when design is completed. This Government has not only provided funding for this important project: it is also giving a real commitment that it will go ahead. It is quite clear, that the Commonwealth Government has recognised this Government's well documented and persistent efforts in this matter, and I am confident that it will continue to recognise them.

The importance of this project to the people of Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta and residents of the mid-north and Yorke Peninsula cannot be overstated, and I am certain that this news will be welcomed in those regions. Water filtration will not only improve the colour, taste and turbidity of the water: it will also assist in controlling amoebic meningitis.

The Commonwealth Government has also advised that it intends to fund the State Government's \$5 000 000 Torrens River flood mitigation scheme on the basis of 40 per cent of the total cost of the project. In this regard, Senator Carrick in his letter yesterday advised that the Commonwealth Government would provide the South Australian Government with a grant of \$500 000 for this financial year. That is also excellent news, and it means that, subject to a favourable report from the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, we can make a start on this project on 4 January.

The State Government will spend \$1 440 000 on this scheme this Financial year, and now with the Commonwealth's help it can be commenced and the project can become a reality. It is proposed to construct flood mitigation works to protect metropolitan Adelaide from Torrens River floods of a magnitude up to a 200-year return period flood. The return period refers to the average number of years within which a given flood magnitude will be equalled or exceeded once. A 200-year return period flood would cause an estimated \$216 000 000 damages and flood more than 13 000 properties in the eastern and western suburbs.

The last Torrens River flood in 1931 covered 21 square kilometres of the western suburbs and that was a 35-year return period flood. I am sure that this news will also be greeted with great enthusiasm by people in those suburbs whose homes have been threatened with flooding in the past.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following interim reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

River Torrens Linear Park and Flood Mitigation Scheme,

Technology Park Adelaide Development.

Ordered that reports be printed.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr BECKER brought up the annual report for the year ended 30 June 1981 of the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr BECKER: The report summarises the year's activities and gives the current status of 14 matters being investigated by the committee.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER:** Before calling on the honourable Leader, any questions relative to the Premier will be taken by the Deputy Premier, and any questions relative to the Minister of Environment and Planning will be taken by the Minister of Agriculture.

VISITING TRADESMEN'S SCHEME

Mr BANNON: I direct my question to the Deputy Premier, representing the Treasurer. Will the Deputy Premier identify exactly where the \$300 000 allocation for the visiting tradesmen's scheme appears in the Budget papers, and, if not, does this mean that in fact there is a second assistance scheme operated by Ministers, in effect, a Ministerial slush fund, in addition to aid to charitable and other organisations? On Tuesday the Minister of Industrial Affairs told the House that the visiting tradesmen's scheme was widely known throughout the community. He went on to say:

If the honourable member would look at the Budget papers, I think he would see a special allocation of \$300 000 for it in last year's Budget.

He also told the House that details of this scheme were circularised only to Ministers, but yesterday, in answer to a question from the member for Glenelg, the Minister

referred to the line under 'Miscellaneous' for the Minister of Public Works, namely, 'Aid to Charitable Organisations', and an amount that had been allocated for 1980-81 of \$150 000 (that is half the amount stated) and a further amount of \$50 000 that had been allocated for 1981-82. The Minister also referred to his answer to a question from my deputy during the Estimates Committee in October. A check on the *Hansard* record shows that that answer was to a question on the job transfer offers office, the Industrial Affairs Department, and not to this particular line. It is significant that in October the Minister said:

There have also been one or two other schemes we have looked at.

However, the Minister did not explain the discrepancy between the figure that he gave on Tuesday, namely \$300 000, and the actual figures that appear in the Budget. Further information that I have received only this morning leads to the fact that a further scheme is operating in addition to that for charitable and other organisations. Projects to which the Minister referred yesterday in answer to the question from my deputy which related to the electorate of Adelaide were in fact quite small, costing something in the order of only \$3 000.

However, at least \$258 000 worth of labour has been allocated to projects in the electorates of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Agriculture and the Deputy Premier. The vast majority of funds has been spent on works in Ministers' electorates.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I believe that the Minister of Industrial Affairs gave the House the relevant information yesterday. When he was referring to the figure of \$300 000, he might have given the impression that that represented one year's allocation. In fact, that figure refers to the sum that it is anticipated will be spent over at least two years. Last year, the allocation was \$150 000 in a line that the Minister identified as 'Charitable and other organisations'. This year, I think that the line shows a figure of \$50 000, and it is anticipated that a supplementary allocation will be made.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know what members opposite are on about. They seem to be thrashing around in their morass of gloom and doom, trying to find something with which to attack the Government. I am not in the slightest embarrassed.

An honourable member: You ought to be.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If I got down to the gutter, from where the Labor Party is seeking to conduct this debate, I could refer to the fact—

An honourable member: You are in the gutter, with him.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, let us get down to the gutter for a moment with the Labor Party. I could refer to the fact that when members opposite were in Government, the member for Fisher tried for some 11 years to have necessary sewer works done in his electorate, whereas on my side of town, in the Tea Tree Gully area, which was represented then by a Labor member (and very well, too), an enormous amount of work was done in new subdivisions, when people had been living in that area and waiting for many years for work to be done. I did not want to get down to that level.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: One could make that kind of accusation in relation to any Government's spending if one wanted to get down to that level. There is nothing sinister whatsoever in the allocation of these funds. When projects come up, a judgment is made about their priority. If members opposite wish to criticise this, I suggest they talk to the Boy Scouts organisation, the Girl Guides, char-

itable organisations, and sporting bodies that have been assisted. I suggest that the Deputy Leader do his sums again, because I understand that he has not added the four projects that were outlined yesterday by the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I suggest that the Deputy Leader talk to people who will benefit by this scheme to see whether they share his views.

WINDANA HOME

Mr GLAZBROOK: Does the Minister of Health agree with the contents of a letter that appeared in the *Messenger Guardian* newspaper yesterday under the heading 'Windanna is no "prison"', as follows:

With the recent adverse publicity and political double talk, it was with some misgivings I accepted an invitation to attend a recent charity concert at Windana Nursing Home at Glandore.

I am happy to say my misgivings were unfounded.

From the moment I walked through the entrance, I was struck by the total lack of the so-called 'institution-like' atmosphere.

At Windana there are only happy dedicated staff and, as a result, happy and contented day-care residents.

Never did I see any evidence of 'prison-like' rooms or surroundings.

In fact, everything which could possibly be done to provide the best in medical care, in a congenial and comfortable way, has been carried out to perfection.

Every modern facility is ready and waiting for the many elderly citizens who are in desperate need of this type of care.

I understand the only obstacle preventing the centre to carry out this sorely needed function is approval at Ministerial level. This approval must be given now.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, the member for Brighton drew my attention to that letter, and it certainly did not surprise me. It bears out the facts as presented by someone who obviously has no axe to grind on this issue; in other words, a person who was invited to Windana but who had no vested interest one way or another and who simply drew her own conclusions from what she saw.

In referring to Ministerial approval the correspondent to the newspaper is obviously talking about the approval of the Commonwealth Department of Health for the payment of benefits for nursing home beds at Windana. In light of the furore that the Opposition has tried to generate over this matter, a furore that I find extraordinary in view of the fact that many members on that side have called for the occupation of beds at Windana, now that it seems as though it might be able to occur, they seem to be doing everything they can to thwart it.

Mr Trainer: What happens to the waiting list at Windana for people who are expecting those beds—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ascot Park will be silent.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As I have already mentioned, waiting lists, such as those to which the honourable member has referred, can be very much determined by the quality and the kind of services available. People can put their name on a waiting list without being aware of the other support services that can be obtained to enable them to continue living in some form of independence in their own homes with some kind of domiciliary care and community support services.

To return to the Magill Home from which some of the residents will be transferred to Windana if the Commonwealth does approve payment of benefits for nursing home beds, it is worth noting that whilst the Opposition has laid such stress on the fact that the nursing home component of Magill can be a second step for those who have been resident in the hostel, I am advised that very few, barely a handful, of those occupying the 70 beds at Magill Nursing Home were admitted from the hostel. They were, in very large proportion, admitted directly from the outside com-

munity. They were admitted not from the local area but from the whole metropolitan and State area and many of them originally lived in areas to the south and south-west of Adelaide, which, of course, is the general geographic location of Windana.

As the picture emerges, it becomes clear that many of the objections that the Labor Party has raised to this proposal have no grounds in fact and if we are able to obtain Commonwealth approval we can be certain that those people who are transferred to Windana will enjoy the very highest standard of facilities and the best standard of care.

MOUNT GAMBIER LAND

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Education explain whether he was involved in the Mount Gambier land exchange involving the Education Department, and will he inform the House whether the Education Department land disposed of to private interests in the exchange was advertised publicly for sale and, if it was not, will he say why not?

The Leader of the Opposition earlier this year asked the Minister of Education a Question on Notice about the sale of Government assets to reduce the Budget deficit. On 20 October the Minister replied that there had been a land exchange at Mount Gambier from which the Education Department had received \$47 250. Detailed investigations have indicated that the Education Department disposed of a parcel of 23 acres on three land titles in Mount Gambier on 24 April this year for \$47 500, plus the receipt of a small site elsewhere in Mount Gambier. Some of the land is prime residential land that is ripe for development and zoned RI.

The Education Department land was sold to Auvale Pty Ltd, which operates from the same address in Mount Gambier as the real estate company D. M. Fimmell and Company Pty Ltd. The cash cost, excluding the land transferred to the Government, was equivalent to around \$2 000 an acre. However, on 28 September, Auvale Pty Ltd resold a mere half acre of the 23 acres for \$14 250.

Another one-third acre of the total parcel held on a separate title is believed to be worth \$10 000. At the rate of \$14 250 for each half acre, the proceeds from reselling the full 23 acres could total \$600 000, which is a very profitable land deal indeed. I would like to know whether the Minister, with his local knowledge, brought the possibility of the land exchange to the notice of the Education Department and whether the department's land was offered for sale publicly.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am not absolutely certain of the precise nature of this transaction.

Mr Hamilton: You're related to Phillip Lynch.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Keep quiet and you could hear a lot more. I am sure that the circumstances were that the Education Department required land in north-west Mount Gambier for construction of the Gambier North-West Primary School, and that the land adjacent to property that the department may have already owned (I believe it may have been purchased under the previous Government) was required for expansion, so that the area needed for the Gambier North-West Primary School would be adequate.

The land was privately owned, and I believe it was placed in a real estate agent's hands in Mount Gambier, which may have been D. M. Fimmell and Company. That company, in negotiations not with the Minister but with departmental officers, would as part of that negotiation have suggested that a parcel of land that also had been acquired by the previous Government, may be some 15 or 20 years

ago, in the north-eastern suburbs of Mount Gambier should be the subject of an exchange.

I am not sure of the precise nature of the negotiations, but it should be reasonably obvious to all members of the House that ultimately Ministerial approval would have been sought for the land sale transaction. I will bring in a departmental report so that members are fully aware of the situation, since, certainly, my involvement was belated rather than early. Possibly ultimately I had to give approval, as I seem to remember that Ministerial approval was sought for the transaction.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr LEWIS: I want to ask the Minister of Environment about fires in national parks, but in view of his absence I address the question to the Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs will assist the business of the House if he remains silent.

Mr LEWIS: As we are at the beginning of one of the most potentially dangerous fire seasons in recent history, what information can the Minister give the House and landholders, farmers and graziers, near national parks about the fire in Ngarkat National Park at the weekend, and the way, if any, in which National Parks and Wildlife Service firefighters co-operate with C.F.S. volunteers generally?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The honourable member's question is most appropriate, but I do not intend to answer in detail. I will certainly refer his question to my colleague, the Minister of Environment and Planning, whose portfolio includes parks. However, I assure the member that in reports to me, especially relating to the recent fire on the Ngarkat reserve and surrounding areas, co-operation between C.F.S. officers, parks and wildlife officers and private farmers was at a level of which we can all be proud. At the weekend I heard from one of my senior C.F.S. officers that the good relations that existed during that fire, until he returned on Saturday afternoon from the site, were really something to write home about.

Parks and Wildlife machinery was brought in and operated in tandem with private machinery and equipment supplied by C.F.S. operators in the region. Indeed, the fire was brought under control in what was regarded as a reasonable time. I am not aware of any damage resulting from that fire, but a report on the capacity of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to prevent such fires from occurring again would need to be brought in by my colleague. I shall bring the matter to his attention so that that report can be brought before the House.

ANCILLARY STAFFING

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: When will the Minister of Education honour his undertaking to institute a study into ancillary staffing and its contribution to education as recommended by the Keeves Committee of Inquiry, and will the Minister delay recently announced moves regarding the threat to use clause 13 (3) of the School Assistants Award until that study has been completed and in accordance with the recommendation of Industrial Commissioner Stevens? If not, why not? The House will be aware that there is presently some industrial disputation amongst school assistants as a result of the threat by one of the Ministers of Education to impose clause 13 (3) of the School Assistants Award in the Government's efforts to enact a 4 per cent cut in the staffing formula. The House will also be aware

that there is widespread concern amongst the education community over this issue, with a rally having been held today and more advertisements in the daily press.

The Keeves Committee of Inquiry into Education recommended in its first report earlier this year that 'a research study be undertaken to investigate and to document the way in which ancillary staff spend their working day, the extent to which they relieve the teaching staff of more routine tasks, the manner in which they relate to the teaching staff, and the benefits likely to arise from increasing [I note "increasing"] the numbers of ancillary staff to the levels advocated by the Karmel Committee of Inquiry in 1972'.

During a televised debate held at the Marrayatville High School over five months ago, the Minister, in response to a question from myself, indicated that such a study would be proceeded with, yet nothing has happened to date. A number of teachers and school assistants have put the proposition to me that the study should have been undertaken at that time and had that been the case the present issue would not have been inflamed in the way it has been and there would have been more satisfactory results.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I apologise, Sir. The House should also know that the Industrial Commissioner presently considering this issue has stated:

There is, I believe, a degree of merit in the proposition that the commendable efforts that all Parties have engaged in in the voluntary rationalisation period should be allowed to continue for a period extending into 1982. There is also apparent somewhat indecent haste in forcing school assistants to come to a decision about their long-term future in the hectic last days of the third term.

In considering that, he made the following recommendations:

I therefore propose and do recommend to all parties for their serious consideration, and in an endeavour to settle an impending industrial dispute between them, that—

1. The moratorium period on implementation of clause 13 subclause 3 of the School Assistants' Award be extended by the employer until Friday 12 February 1982.
2. That if the employer accedes to this recommendation that the industrial action planned by the unions for this Thursday be called off and, further, that no industrial action be entered into in the intervening period between now and Friday 12 February 1982.

There were two other recommendations concerning the ongoing rationalisation. This considered pacifying approach by the Industrial Commission was viciously maligned by the Minister of Industrial Affairs—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: While the member for Salisbury may be so intoxicated with a sense of self-importance as to believe that he sees two Ministers of Education before him, let me assure him that he will always be the shadow and not the substance as long as he continues to make specious remarks such as that.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The Leader of the Opposition has got his eye on him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The obvious reply to the earlier question—one of several which the honourable member addressed to me—is that the Keeves Committee of Inquiry still has to report in finality. The last two terms of reference have to be addressed, and they are obviously the most important ones (the two terms of reference referring to curricula and curricula development) and, until the recommendation comes forward in that regard and tells the Education Department generally in which direction it should be proceeding, we will consider the Keeves Report

in its entirety and not in part. I suggest that there are quite a number of recommendations in addition to this single one which still have to be reported on to the House and acted on.

In fact, only one recommendation has so far been adopted, namely, that concerning the formation of a very small Ministry of Education, which is currently working precisely on the very issues that the honourable member has raised in the House. I am pleased that the honourable member also raised the question of the ancillary staff dispute and the comments that were made by the Commissioner in the Industrial Commission. In fact, I believe that I should report to the House that, irrespective of what happened in what was allegedly an inflammatory situation yesterday, no schools came out on strike today. Yesterday, of course, it was reported that some schools would be coming out today. Subsequently, during the day, those schools took a very responsible approach to the whole thing and rethought the situation, had a second vote, and decided that they would not come out in support of the ancillary staff.

Mr Langley: You ran away from them today, I saw you.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I will address that question, too. Furthermore, a number of ancillary staff who actually came out on strike today, out of some 6 000 to 6 500 individuals, was about 200, as reported to the Director-General of Education through the personnel officer earlier today. Therefore, it was a very small proportion. There again, I suggest that the whole of the Education Department staff has acted in a very responsible manner.

As to running away from that relatively small group of people which turned up on the steps of Parliament House today, I point out that the mission with which the Minister was confronted was one of urgency and that it was House business; in other words, I was chairing a meeting of a conference between the Lower and Upper Houses at precisely 12 o'clock, the time I arrived at the House and the time at which I was asked to join in with, and I believe to receive a small submission from, that group. I submit that that representation can still be made through the proper channels, through the Public Service Association, which has chosen to make a number of representations on this issue recently. The recommendations that the Commissioner made yesterday were very similar in background to the situation that pertained in 1977 when an identical situation confronted the then Government, and the then Department of Education, and when the former Minister said that he could not defer, could not accept that there would be no reductions of staffing hours, and when there was no hint of politicising or emotionalising from either of the two unions involved. The matter went along almost as quietly as it has done today.

Commissioner Stevens in his recommendation knew very well when he made it that the parties involved, the Public Service Board and the Education Department had advised him in writing that any recommendation to defer the implementation of clause 13 (3) would not be acceptable. Previously the Commissioner had said, 'I will not make recommendations when I do not think that they will be accepted.' However, in fact, on the previous occasion a recommendation was made from the Public Service Association. So, although I did not make a Ministerial statement yesterday, let me make quite clear to the House that I am concerned about the inconsistency attached to the Commissioner's own statement (no other). I say no more than that; the House can simply judge the situation.

The fact is that the Minister was told to defer the implementation of clause 13 (3). Let me suggest to members of the House that the facts that have been peddled around by the A.L.P. (by the shadow and not the substance)

over the past several weeks have been highly erroneous. In fact, the Education Department has never intended to implement clause 13 (3) until the beginning of the second term, which is only a few days earlier than the date indicated by the Commissioner yesterday before that voluntary conference. It was voluntary and not mandatory as both Parties agreed to attend. The recommendations were not binding, as was suggested yesterday when it was hinted that the Minister of Industrial Affairs was acting improperly.

What really happened was that the Education Department erred on the side of generosity. Under the industrial award for ancillary staff, it is necessary for staff to be given two weeks notice of the department's intention to effect any change in staffing hours. What has happened is that the department has given six weeks notice, with the intention of cutting off hours not at the end of December or mid-December, but early in February, when the second term starts. How does that affect the two categories of ancillary staff? The people who are not full-time are automatically paid up until the end of December; they automatically receive, during the whole of the year, a loading for being part-time, and therefore their holiday pay is automatically covered under the award.

What happens to the people who are permanent? They are automatically paid during the Christmas holidays and, therefore, they would be paid up until the beginning of February, when there may be a possible change of hours. What is the gross impact throughout the ancillary staff? It is that about 700 or 800 of the 6 500 people in the ancillary field might be involved at the very outside, many fewer, given the high rate of voluntary co-operation that has been achieved traditionally in moving ancillary staff by reduction of hours or voluntary transfer. Nowhere near the number of staff is involved that members opposite and the union leaders have suggested. I believe that is reflected in the degree of upset that has occurred today. There has been a commonsense appreciation of the position. I am very appreciative of that.

Mr Langley interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I notice one of the members opposite keeps interjecting that he saw the Minister go down the stairs.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I appreciate that, Mr Speaker, and therefore I will not respond to the interjection. However, I remind the House that the conference that was held today was held on the basement floor in the Legislative Council committee room, so that any member who attended that meeting would have had just cause to go downstairs rather than upstairs, being a commonsense sort of person. I would have taken the lift downstairs, knowing that that was where the conference was being held.

Mr Langley: I saw you—no worries.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member is obviously seeing far better this morning than he was yesterday.

Mr Langley: You are getting personal, now. If you want to keep that up, my turn will come.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We are all very tired. We have matches in our eyes to keep them open. The truth of the matter is that the recommendation that was made, asking the Education Department to defer, was really a recognition that the department was already doing that. We are not implementing a hasty, rash decision. The real background is that this matter has been going on for two years. It was not rushed upon the unions, the P.S.A., the institute, or the ancillary staff. It has been going on continuously for two years.

My concluding remark is that, when previously we decided at the beginning of the year to give the ancillary

staff notice, we were told that we could not possibly do that at the beginning of the year when everyone is so busy, when youngsters are coming into the schools and when so much work has to be done. Now, when we accept the sort of advice that was given previously and err on the side of giving six weeks notice at Christmas time, we find once again that a different argument is put forward to say that we are wrong. In other words, one can never do the right thing. The previous Government did not waste a single minute when it made its decision. It erred not on the side of generosity but on the side of immediacy in saying, 'No co-operation.'

FIRES

Mr BECKER: Will the Chief Secretary give an assurance to the public and members of this House that all possible avenues regarding the motive behind the three recent, well-publicised fires are being investigated by the police? Some weeks ago there were three fires in a short space of time, all of which involved night clubs of some kind. I understand that there was considerable speculation regarding the causes of each fire. One theory that was given considerable publicity was that there was reason for concern over possible underworld or criminal activities or motivation in these circumstances. I believe that the general public would feel a lot safer in this pre-Christmas festive period if they were sure that the Government was investigating the possibility of whether organised crime or the underworld was involved in any way at all and whether the Police Commissioner is prepared to look at offering a substantial reward for information leading to the cause of the fire.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Last Thursday the member for Stuart asked me whether a special investigation squad was being put on to this and whether the City of Adelaide was being adequately policed to ensure that the people were protected. The answer I gave the honourable member did not satisfy him because in the space of an hour on 'News on the Hour', the honourable member was having his message broadcast to all and sundry that the answer was quite unsatisfactory, that I did not know what I was about, and that that was the story. We have the spectacle of the honourable member with his rubber mouth racing out of this House at high speed to an obviously previously arranged meeting and within an hour South Australia is treated to publicity that is worrying the Leader. The Leader went to the *News* on Tuesday, not with a rubber mouth but with a rubber neck, looking all ways at once. I can well understand, and I commend him for his agility in fixing himself up with such equipment when he has to put up with what he is putting up with.

Mr Trainer: Your goose is cooked. You are a dead duck, and this is your swan-song.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member never wants to be too worried about dead ducks. They get up again. I can tell you a story about one that came back to earth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. I ask the honourable the Chief Secretary to proceed with the answer to the question that he was asked.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: On the night of the fire, which was in a coffee lounge that was under an area which was, of all places, a shop that provided bedwear—

Mr Hemmings: He is setting you up, Allan.

The SPEAKER: Order! If there is one more transgression by the member for Napier in respect of the naming of

persons in this Chamber other than by their electorate, he will be banished from the House for the rest of the day.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I assure the House that it is regular police practice at any hour of any day and any day of the week that a scheduled patrol is maintaining vigilance in this City of Adelaide. Thursday night's fire was discovered by a policeman on patrol. On that night, we had more police in the city than obviously people opposite would care to believe. I will quote it for them, because it was a typical night. Seven members of the Star Force squad were patrolling in the area; the Adelaide C.I.B. was on patrol in plainclothes; the Dog Squad, Licensing Squad and traffic police were in Hindley Street. The broadcast that the member for Stuart made with due haste was merely a political ploy and it was derogatory to the police of this State, who are giving adequate service.

Mr Gunn: That is Labor Party policy.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: It is the Labor Party policy to derogate the police. The member for Hanson raised the point of gangland warfare, organised crime, and people referring to the suggestion that people are coming over the border. Action was taken by the previous Government to chase these people back whence they came. And the member for Hanson spoke about a reward.

Rewards are the province of the Commissioner and I will take that matter up with him. I do want to assure members that, despite the ploys of the Opposition, the police do have this matter in hand and on the investigations that have been made they do not find the fears that have been so loudly professed by the Opposition to be a fact.

POLICE FORCE

Mr KENEALLY: Is the Chief Secretary aware that the South Australian Police Force is being forced by financial stringencies placed on it by this Government to ask victims of crimes to pay extradition costs of suspects apprehended and charged in other States, and does the Chief Secretary agree with this policy?

I have been reliably informed that the victims of a major robbery in Adelaide were asked recently to pay costs to extradite two South Australians charged in New South Wales in connection with the robbery. I am told that, when the victims of the robbery complained about the request, they were told by the police that, even though it was a criminal matter and not a civil case, financial limitations imposed by this Government mean that the police in recent months could not afford extradition costs. I am told that, when dealing with interstate matters, detectives are also required to seek the permission of senior commissioned officers before they make S.T.D. calls and there are often severe time limits imposed on these calls.

I am informed that many members of the South Australian Police Force are claiming that they are becoming a laughing stock interstate because when they are pursuing inquiries by telephone they have to garble messages and ask interstate colleagues to ring back so that their State Governments can bear the cost. Does the Chief Secretary believe that the victims of crime should pay such costs, and is the law and order role of the police being hampered by the Premier's financial cuts?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I almost thought that I was back in the Budget Estimates Committee. I thank the honourable member for perhaps a practice run for next year, if that is what he is on about. We have provided an allocation to the Police Force in the Budget that is the highest that has been provided in the history of this State; even taking into account inflation, it far exceeds anything allocated by the previous Government. Based on the past

form of the member, I am apt to regard the question as a figment of imagination, but as he has raised specific points I will take them up with the Commissioner and bring down a reply.

ANCILLARY SCHOOL STAFF

Mr EVANS: My question to the Minister of Education is supplementary to the question answered earlier about ancillary staffing in schools. When referring to the operation of the ancillary staff policy, the Minister referred to the second term instead of, I believe, February, the second month. I ask him to clarify the position.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, I thank the member for his question.

Mr Langley: You gave it to him. I saw you do it.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Well, obviously, if one is aware of the difference between term 1 and term 2, it would be silly to allow members to go away with the impression that term 2 was the operative date.

The logical explanation is that the member for Fisher is very perceptive and, in fact, the operative date for the reduction of ancillary staffing, where it should occur—of course, there will also be a large number of increases in ancillary staffing in schools—whether it is a reduction in some or an increase in others, will be the first day of the first term in 1982. The several weeks notice that we have given are far in excess of the required two weeks notice.

FRIENDLY TRANSPORT COMPANY

Mr LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Transport state what progress the Government has made towards agreement or otherwise for the purchase of the Friendly Transport Company, of South Road, Black Forest (which is in my district) and, further, whether the Government intends to resist the business?

Over a number of years properties along South Road have been purchased by both Governments for the construction of the Emerson overpass to take place. The purchase of this property seems to have reached a deadlock situation and residents in my district would like to know what is happening. It has been reported in the *Unley Courier*, which is the local paper, that the Minister was expected to make a statement before Christmas.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I do not believe I will be able to make a statement before Christmas. I appreciate the concern of the member in this matter. I might add that this has been going on for 10 years and it is one of the problems I inherited. I think the only other problem that existed for a longer period was the question of the Semaphore railway, which was going on for 15 years. I hope we can resolve the question of the Friendly Transport Company sooner than that.

The problem is that it is not just a matter of acquisition, the cost of acquisition and the legality of acquisition, because, as the member knows, the land is not required for the construction of the Emerson overpass. It is also a question of relocation, and that is where an enormous amount of money is involved. I do not resile for a moment from saying that I believe the Friendly Transport Company is trying to make things as difficult as possible for everyone. I believe it is trying to force a solution that would be financially advantageous to it. However, given that, the interests of the residents have to be protected as well and somehow we have to find a solution between those two parameters. I am working on some solution at the moment.

I hope we can bring it to fruition, and when I do the member for Unley will be told as soon as possible.

HIGHBURY ROADWORKS

Mr ASHENDEN: Can the Minister of Transport advise what progress is being made on roadworks on the Lower North-East Road at Highbury? Roadworks were commenced on the Lower North-East Road in April this year on a section of road between Lyons Road and Valley Road in Highbury. During the winter months, through no fault whatsoever of the Highways Department, the wet weather and the heavy rain caused considerable difficulty to the Highways Department in completing its roadworks. Local residents were, of course, concerned at the very long delays that were occurring but did accept the fact that the weather obviously had a deleterious effect on progress.

However, over the past two weeks no work has been done on that section of the road and I have had assurances previously that this section would be completed by Christmas. I have been contacted by residents who are most concerned at this apparent lack of work. Could the Minister please advise as to the reasons for the delays that have occurred and say whether the road will be completed and operational by Christmas of this year?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am pleased to answer the question from the member for Todd. I hope that he takes my answer and not the answer from members opposite. The primary seal will be on before Christmas. The member will be pleased to know that that work will start on Tuesday. There will be a break over Christmas and just before Christmas so that the Highways Department work will not impede access to businesses during the period leading up to Christmas. Obviously, we do not want to bring about a situation where businesses are disadvantaged. The primary seal will be on before Christmas, and after the Christmas break the main seal will be placed on the surface and the southern carriageway will be completed as far as Valley Road. There will be a bitumen surface before Christmas.

DRIVERS' LICENCES

Mr WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Transport consider enabling a medical practitioner to provide a certificate to a person over the age of 70 years certifying that that person suffers no disabilities that would impair his or her competence to drive a motor vehicle?

Alternatively, a signed statutory declaration to the same effect may be acceptable when a person over 70 years applies for driver's licence continuation. It has been drawn to my attention that some elderly persons are under undue stress when taking a driving test, knowing that should they fail they may never again obtain a driver's licence, although they may drive perfectly without an examiner sitting alongside them.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I thank the member for this very important question. The Government is carefully considering this matter, and has had many discussions on the topic. I hope that we can make some announcement in the not too distant future on this. If my memory serves me well enough, some 90 per cent of all aged drivers pass their tests; I think the figure is higher than that. There is no question that some testing undergone by those people can upset them a good deal. In many cases it can affect their test result. We believe that something needs to be done, and we are looking at the matter very closely.

INTRASTATE FLIGHTS

Mr BLACKER: Is the Minister of Transport aware of the publicity surrounding the parallel flight scheduling run by Airlines of South Australia and Commodore Aviation? If so, is his department monitoring these services to ensure that the people of Port Lincoln and Lower Eyre Peninsula will not lose a valued airline service? For many years Airlines of South Australia conducted a regular airline service to Port Lincoln which was a monopoly. No other airline was able to fly a parallel service. Nearly three years ago, the Federal Government lifted controls from regular intrastate routes to enable other airlines to operate on the same route. At that time Commodore Aviation conducted market research and established that there was a market not being catered for by an existing airline. This was an early morning departure from Port Lincoln and a late evening return from Adelaide, which gave business people from Port Lincoln a full business day in Adelaide.

At that time, Airlines of South Australia responded with advertisements questioning the comfort and safety of the light twin-engine commuter service. Commodore was effective in developing the commuter service to meet requirements of Lower Eyre Peninsula people. Despite Ansett Airlines of South Australia's own condemnation of a light twin-engine commuter service, A.S.A. recently commenced a parallel service by chartering light twin-engine aircraft from Rossair with departures leaving 10 minutes prior to Commodore. My constituents are concerned that these actions can only be considered as a cut-throat loss operation by A.S.A. to force Commodore from the scene. Will the Government monitor this situation and, if required, take whatever steps are necessary to maintain the established service?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, I am well aware of the situation, which has been brought to my attention before now. I give an unequivocal assurance to the member for Flinders that the Government will certainly monitor the situation closely. However, he asked me also whether the Government will take whatever steps are necessary to correct the situation. It may well be that one of those steps would be that the State Government would have to move into licensing intrastate carriers. It would think very carefully indeed before bringing about that licensing. The problem arises from the Commonwealth Government's domestic air transport policy review, which was released some three years ago, as the member for Flinders reminds me, which made it obvious that, probably, constitutionally the Commonwealth did not have the power to license intrastate carriers.

Soon after that review, there was a marked improvement in air services available to most South Australian country centres. I think that most members would agree with that. However, I agree that the situation now in some areas is less than desirable, but whether the State Government would be prepared to enter into a licensing arrangement which would require legislation through this House is something that we would carefully consider. Nevertheless, it may well be that that is the only solution. I am not ruling it out, but we would have to carefully consider it.

WHYALLA C.I.B.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Will the Chief Secretary request the Government to take urgent action to renew confidence in the Whyalla C.I.B., following the statements yesterday by a Mr David, acting for the Crown, that nobody could have much confidence in the Whyalla C.I.B.? Yesterday in Port Augusta Mr Michael David, who had been

briefed by the Attorney-General on behalf of the Crown in a matter which has now concluded, I understand, was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying that there was no way that anyone who had heard much of the case could have much confidence in the Whyalla C.I.B. This was a statement being made by an officer who had been briefed to represent the Government. In the light of that statement, I am quite sure that the people of Whyalla are most anxious to hear what steps the Government intends to take to ensure that confidence in Whyalla C.I.B. is renewed urgently.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I had a fleeting glance at the article, I have not read it closely. It is a newspaper article that the honourable member is asking me to comment on, and it refers to a statement made by an officer of the court—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Of the Government.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: It is an officer of the Government, involved in a court case, which I understand has not reached finality. The honourable member says he understands it has been concluded; it may have, but I believe that it would be improper for me, as a Minister of the Crown, to comment on that, and that to all intents and purposes it is still before the court. However, I will obtain a report.

ROAD DEATHS

Mr SCHMIDT: In view of the Government's concern for road safety, can the Minister give detailed accident statistics that may substantiate this concern? Recent articles have indicated that road deaths this year are less than in the corresponding period last year. In view of legislation authorising the use, for example of P plates and seat belts in cars, can the Minister say what effect such safety precautions have had on road accident deaths?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, I should be very pleased to do that. When dealing with statistics, one must always be very careful that the human factor is not overlooked. The number of road deaths to date (as of yesterday) is 201 compared to 253 at the same date last year. Projecting that through to the end of the year would give a number of road deaths this year of 214, compared to last year's total of 269, which is a significant reduction indeed. Of course, I am not saying that that reduction is entirely due to random breath-testing (I would be the last person to say that), but I believe that the publicity surrounding that measure over the past 12 months has had a significant effect.

I want to point out another significant figure. As regards the fatality rate last year, the standard comparison was 3.79 deaths per 10 000 vehicles, compared with New South Wales, 5.17; Queensland, 4.43; Western Australia, 3.93; Tasmania, 4.36; A.C.T., 2.84; Northern Territory, 13.4; average for Australia, 4.33; and Victoria, 3.38. The fatality rate per 10 000 vehicles this year in South Australia is now down to 3.04, which brings it to the lowest in the Commonwealth.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PETITION: PROPOSED POWER LINE

A petition signed by 511 residents of South Australia, praying that the House urge the Government to undertake a comprehensive investigation into the route of the proposed

powerline through a corridor of land in the far and mid-north regions of the State, was presented by Mr Olsen.
Petition received.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: OWNER-DRIVERS

Mr McRAE (Playford): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr McRAE: During the course of the debate last night on the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill (No. 3), concerning owner-drivers in particular, I referred to various companies, including, among others, Mayne Nickless, United Transport, T.N.T., Brambles, Ansett and Ipec, indicating that at that stage those organisations had not indicated support for the position taken by the South Australian Road Transport Association and the Transport Workers Union. I have since ascertained that at that point they had indicated to the Minister of Industrial Affairs and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition such support. I must now add that I was only 24 hours wrong in what I said, because I have discovered today that they have changed their stance.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That for the remainder of the session Government business take precedence over all other business except questions.

In doing this, I believe that the Government has been generous in allocating time this session to private members' business. The number of days, I understand, has been nine, which is precisely the same as the number of days allocated by the Government last year and which is in excess of the allocation made on averages during the past 10 years. Everybody in this House knows that private members' time must come to an end, the Government believes that the allocation this year has been quite generous, and I do not think that any member would object to this motion.

Motion carried.

TECHNOLOGY PARK ADELAIDE BILL

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish a corporation to be known as 'Technology Park Adelaide'; to prescribe its functions and powers; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

1. Introduction: Technology Park Adelaide is an initiative aimed at improving the competitiveness of local industry and providing an environment conducive to the establishment of high technology industry. A technology park is a specialised industrial complex that typically has the character of an industrial estate with a campus-like atmosphere. It generally has a close association with a local economy that has been, or intends to become, strongly oriented towards scientific research and high technology industries. These parks are further characterised by low density, attrac-

tive settings, above average architectural quality, and rigorous exclusion of incompatible industrial uses. Many are capable of housing a mixture of small and medium sized manufacturing units and are associated with, or close to, a major technology-oriented university. Amongst the many successful examples are Stanford Industrial Park in Palo Alto, California, and Technology Park/Atlanta in Georgia visited by officers of the Department of Trade and Industry.

2. The Economic Context: The economic environment of today is one in which Australian industry is becoming increasingly integrated into a world economy in which survival depends on international competitiveness. One of the important determinants of competitiveness is technology, both the technology which is embodied in a product through its design and the technology used to manufacture a product—firms which do not innovate but persevere with out-date methods and techniques, will have less chance of survival than those that attempt to adapt to the changing economic environment.

However, improving the competitiveness of existing industry is only one part of an overall strategy needed to strengthen South Australia's economic base. It is also necessary to provide an environment conducive to the growth of high technology based industries, industries which can contribute to the widening and deepening of the State's industrial base and reduce the adverse impacts brought about by structural change in traditional industry sectors.

The industries that were responsible for South Australia's prosperity in the 1950s and 1960s, especially motor vehicles and white goods, are now the industries most vulnerable to external pressures from import competition and new technology, and South Australia can no longer rely on these traditional industries to generate expanding employment opportunities.

High technology industry on the other hand, follows a different pattern from traditional industry and is generally regarded as 'foot-loose'. The raw materials are highly educated professionals with scientific and technical expertise and the product is applied knowledge in the form of sophisticated components, processes, designs and information, characterised by their high value added ratio. As a result, the industry is little constrained by transportation costs for its location decision, and is therefore an industry where South Australia's distance from the main population centres is not a significant location disincentive. For these reasons, high technology industry has the potential to strengthen South Australia's economic base and generate future employment opportunities.

The South Australian Government is responding to the challenge of structural change and the employment potential of high technology industry by implementing policies that will set the context and provide the incentive for existing industry to restructure and for high technology industry to establish. Technology Park Adelaide is an integral part of these policies.

The concept of Technology Park is unique in Australia and encompasses far more than the development of an industrial estate. In particular, strong linkages with academic institutions are an important aspect of the development, and the extensive participation of the South Australian Institute of Technology has been recognised in the structure of the management body.

3. Functions of the Technology Park Administration: The development and operation of the proposed Technology Park Adelaide will require the work of an administrative body set up specifically for this purpose. The principal administrative functions which will be required are as follows:

(a) Subdivision of allotments—

Allotments will be subdivided according to the requirements of occupants.

(b) Promotion and marketing

(c) Sale or lease of land

(d) Administration of Covenants—

It is proposed that all leases and conveyances will be subject to covenants, which will enable the management body to exercise detailed control over building activities and the use and development of allotments.

The principal controls which these covenants will enshrine will relate to the design and siting of buildings, landscaping and limitations upon use, to ensure the high environmental standards are observed. However, an encumbrance on a freehold title has no legal force, and in any case is ineffective in a situation where land is sold to a third party. Therefore, the management body must have the power to enforce controls in situations where a proposal cannot be dealt with via existing legislative provisions.

The corporation will have regulation-making powers consistent with the powers of management bodies associated with similar overseas facilities. These powers will relate to land use and performance standards. It is not proposed to introduce a schedule of regulations at this stage. Control over the activities of occupants will be effected through existing legislation or by way of amendments to existing legislation. Regulations will only be introduced if this procedure proves ineffective.

The corporation will not have the power to make regulations that are in derogation of any other law. The provisions of the Planning and Development Act, Noise Control Act and any similar legislation will continue to apply. The corporation will, however, have the power to impose additional controls over and above the provisions of existing legislation to achieve high standards. In particular, the Corporation will have the power to prohibit the ownership or occupation by any person of land situated in the Park. Such a provision is an integral part of controls exercised by overseas management bodies, and experience has demonstrated that where such a power does not exist, circumstances can arise which cannot be dealt with by existing legislation and that jeopardise the operation of the Park. It is not anticipated that such a regulation would be introduced unless there was a particular circumstance which could not be adequately dealt with by any other means.

(e) Maintenance of the park—

The management body will share responsibility for site maintenance with Salisbury City Council.

(f) Liaison and co-ordination—

It is vital for the successful development of the Technology Park that close links be established with the South Australian Institute of Technology and other tertiary institutions, particularly the two South Australian universities and the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education. Similarly, it is necessary that a close relationship be established with private industry and also other organisations involved in research and development. The task of liaising with such groups and co-ordinating action will be an

important aspect of the work of the management body.

4. Summary: Technology Park Adelaide represents a unique opportunity for the Government to implement a project that will give South Australia a significant competitive advantage in encouraging high technology organisations from overseas and interstate to locate in Adelaide. High technology organisations, whether involved in manufacturing or research and development, have the ability to broaden and strengthen South Australia's economic base and therefore reduce our dependence on traditional manufacturing industries, which can no longer be relied upon to generate expanding employment opportunities.

Technology Parks are recognised overseas as important factors influencing the location decisions of high technology companies and in fostering research and development activities.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 sets out the arrangements of the Bill. Clause 4 provides definitions of terms used in the Bill. Clause 5 establishes the corporation. Subclause (3) is an evidentiary provision and subclause (4) provides that the corporation will be under the direction and control of the Minister. Clause 6 provides for membership of the corporation. In addition to the member appointed on the nomination of the Commonwealth Minister the Government intends that the corporation will include members that will represent the interests of industry, educational institutions and the Salisbury council. The term of membership will be three years (subclause (2)) and may be terminated in accordance with subclause (4) or becomes vacant as provided in subclause (5).

Clause 7 provides for the appointment of the Chairman of the corporation and the Chief Executive Officer of the corporation. Clause 8 provides for procedures at meetings of the corporation. Four members constitute a quorum (subclause (1)) and decisions are made by a majority of votes (subclause (3)). Each member has one vote, and in the event of an equality of votes the Chairman has a casting vote (subclause (4)). Clause 9 is a saving provision ensuring the validity of acts of the corporation despite a defect in the membership of the corporation. Subclause (2) provides immunity from legal liability to members of the corporation, and subclause (3) transfers the liability to the Crown. Clause 10 provides for disclosure by a member to the corporation of any interest that he has in a contract that the corporation is a party to or to which the corporation proposes to become a party.

Clause 11 provides for remuneration of members of the corporation. Clause 12 sets out the functions and powers of the corporation. As can be seen from subclause (1) the corporation is designed to promote scientific and technological research and development and the use of high technology in industry. Another important aspect of the corporation's functions is to encourage the exchange of ideas and expertise between the persons and companies making use of the park and the institutions of tertiary education in South Australia. Clause 13 provides for delegation by the corporation of its powers or functions. The Salisbury council is included amongst the recipients of delegated power to allow the council to undertake the upkeep of the open areas that will be a feature of the park.

Clause 14 provides for employees of the corporation to be appointed for the purposes of the Act. Clause 15 allows the corporation to utilise the services of public servants on secondment. Clause 16 provides for investment of moneys of the corporation not immediately required for other purposes. Moneys expended by the corporation must be spent in accordance with a budget approved by the Minister and the Treasurer. Clause 17 provides the corporation with the power to borrow moneys. Clause 18 requires the corporation

to keep proper accounts and requires the Auditor-General to audit the accounts. Clause 19 requires the corporation to deliver to the Minister a report upon the administration of the Act. The Minister is required to lay the report before both Houses of Parliament.

Clause 20 provides that proceedings under the Act will be disposed of summarily. Clause 21 provides for regulations that may be made under the Act. Subsection (2) sets out detailed heads of regulation-making power that will allow the park to be controlled for the benefits of all people and companies using it. Experience gained by similar parks established overseas has shown that it is essential that companies that occupy premises in the park and benefit from the facilities provided do so only with the approval of the corporation. Accordingly subsection (2) (h) empowers the Governor to make regulations prohibiting the ownership or occupation of land in the park without the approval of the corporation. Subclause (3) makes it clear that regulations made under this section do not replace general laws applying to the park. Subsection (4) provides for penalties to be imposed by regulation.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUSINESS NAMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill amends section 34 (2) of the Business Names Act, 1963, which section specifies the matters in respect of which regulations can be made pursuant to the Act. As the Act has remained unaltered since 1963, the limitation of the fee regulating power to an amount of \$20 is unrealistic in present day money terms. This situation has also been recognised in other jurisdictions where changes to comparable regulations have been made.

The present schedule contains some 17 items of fees which are payable to the Corporate Affairs Commission, when various documents are lodged under the Act. Moreover, those 17 items of fees are drafted in unnecessarily complex terminology which may not be readily understood by many small business men who are required to lodge documents in respect of registered names.

The new schedule of fees which will be prepared following this amendment, will halve the number of items of fees prescribed at present, and express the circumstances in which those fees are payable in simple terminology. This reduction in the number of items of fees will result in documents which now attract a fee of one or two dollars being accepted for lodgment without any fee. The need to lodge documentation in respect of a change in registered particulars will remain but the frustration of having to remit or alternatively recover very small amounts of fees will be removed.

This is a very desirable deregulation measure which is in conformity with Government policy, and which will confer a substantial benefit by way of convenience on the small business man, as well as facilitating the administrative process. I commend this simple but nevertheless very desirable amendment to the House. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 34 to permit the setting of fees, without

specifying a maximum amount. The provision is also expanded slightly, in accordance with current drafting practice.

Mr McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (JURISDICTION OF COURTS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 2 December. Page 2285.)

Mr McRAE (Playford): This complex Bill contains some 62 clauses and deals with many divergent matters. It is impossible to find a theme in the Bill and what one must do is look at a number of different items and simply weigh each of those items, or at least the major ones, on their own merits. That can best be done, I think, by starting with the civil jurisdictional limits that apply in the Local and District Courts.

The attitude that the Labor Party has on these matters is forced to be a variable one because there is no clear or discernible policy evident when one looks through these amendments. For instance, the limited jurisdiction of the Local Court is increased from \$2 500 to \$7 500, an increase that the Opposition would not find offensive, granted the long period of time since the last change. The small claims jurisdiction is increased from \$500 to \$1 000, and, again, one would say that that is realistic, given that it is now some years since a change. In fact, as the member for Mitchell says, the Opposition would not object to an increase to \$1 500.

However, under this particular heading it is the next portion that gives me cause for pause. The full jurisdiction of the District Court has the limit increased from \$20 000 to \$40 000 in the case of property damage, and increased to \$60 000 in the case of personal injuries. That causes members of the legal profession considerable concern. The fact of the matter is that it would be fair to say that 80 per cent of all cases currently decided in the Supreme Court or settled in the course of litigation in the Supreme Court do settle inside that range of \$40 000 to \$60 000. That can be seen by quickly perusing the Law Society Judgment Scheme, or by speaking to solicitors who, one knows, are practising that jurisdiction.

I quite realise that quite a misleading impression can be given when one reads the papers and notes that quite gigantic awards are given from time to time in the Supreme Court and by reading those reports people in the community can extrapolate conclusions that are just not right. In my view, I am correct in saying that 80 per cent of all the matters in the civil jurisdiction in the Supreme Court settle in that \$40 000 to \$60 000 range. The problem is, what effect will that have?

At the moment, the civil jurisdiction of the District Court is very much in arrears: the kindest estimate that I have been able to get from those practising in the field is that one cannot get a case on for hearing inside one year to 15 months, whereas in the Supreme Court, cases are now regularly being listed within six months of being set down. The concern and worry that we all have is that there will be a very large number of cases shifted out of the Supreme Court to the District Court, and, while that will shorten the waiting time in the Supreme Court, it will, on the face of it, greatly lengthen the waiting time in the District Court.

In a debate in another place the Attorney, in commenting on this particular aspect of the Bill, made two observations. First, he said that he wanted to 'raise the status of the District Court judges'. I think that was his phrase. We are

not particularly concerned with the status of judges, but we are concerned with their efficiency and the expedition with which they are dealing with cases. The other comment that he made was of little joy, because the Opposition was not able to extract from him any promise that the number of judges would be increased. My personal observation is that, in addition to the comments I have made, the number of criminal matters that will now be transferred into the District Court will compound that particular problem, but I know that inflation will produce the situation where this \$60 000, within perhaps three or four years, may seem a more reasonable figure, and that time may simply deal with the problem. I point out that it is a real problem.

As I have said, it is difficult to speak in an organised fashion to this Bill because there are so many divergent features to it. The next group of matters deals with certain criminal offences and the grouping of offences into summary, minor indictable, and indictable offences. I think it fair to say that, on the whole, the Opposition would support the majority of the concepts under that heading. One is forced to question precisely why the following statement appears in the second reading explanation:

The Bill empowers the Supreme Court to remit cases to a district court where they may be appropriately dealt with by that court. No case of treason, murder, attempted murder, rape and armed robbery may, however, be referred to a district court for trial. Conversely, the Bill provides that in cases where it is more appropriate for a trial to take place in the Supreme Court rather than in the district court, the Crown or the defendant shall have the right to apply to the Supreme Court for the trial to be removed into the Supreme Court.

I, personally, and my Party are in favour of flexibility inside the system, but one can realise that there are a number of offences (and I can mention abduction to begin with) which rank equally as high in terms of severity of kind as murder, attempted murder, rape or armed robbery. One wonders why that offence does not appear in the list. It appears that there is no particular philosophy behind this Bill, nor can we find in the second reading explanation, for instance, any recommendation by the judges that certain experience in practice has forced this upon them.

Then follows that part of the Bill that deals with the qualification for judicial office. This, I think, is one of the more neurotic outpourings of the present Attorney. He seems to be obsessed with the thought that, because the Labor Party appointed two persons without qualifications to specialised jurisdictions (I stand to be corrected by the former Attorney behind me, but I think they were only two industrial magistrates and a person in the Licensing Court; I cannot recall anyone else, anyway), the Labor Party might, for instance, appoint one of those persons or a person of that kind to the District Court. I do not think that it was ever our intention to do such a thing.

Specialised jurisdictions call for specialised people, and, where they had long experience in the jurisdiction and special qualifications, there was no particular reason why their merits should not be noted. That is the best way in which I suppose one can handle the groupings that appear. There are a number of provisions that amend parts of different Acts without any philosophy lying behind the whole matter. In the circumstances, the Opposition supports the second reading.

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

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 2 December. Page 2285.)

Mr McRAE (Playford): The Opposition supports this Bill and will ensure its speedy passage. The Government intends to provide a much needed reform. The present situation is that *voir dire* arguments can be heard only after the empanelling of a jury. It is eminently sensible that *voir dire* arguments be disposed of before the jury is empanelled, thus providing maximum convenience to the jurors and minimum expense to the State. I support the Bill.

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

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 2 December. Page 2282.)

Mr McRAE (Playford): I support the Bill.
Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

BUSINESS NAMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 2634.)

Mr McRAE (Playford): I support this momentous piece of legislation.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 8 December. Page 2459.)

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): When the Opposition first had notice of this Bill, I think in early December, it felt that there was no real problem in the situation down at Glenelg. I would cheerfully have liked to stand up as my colleague the member for Playford did a few minutes ago and say, 'We support the Bill' and then sit down. However, I think that a few words need to be said about this Bill as it comes from the Select Committee.

When it was first discovered that the water shute was going to be built on land that was invested in a trust and the Minister quite correctly brought the Bill before the Parliament, it seemed that there had just been an oversight. I think that if that had been the case the bill would have had a speedy passage in the other place and in this place. However, I think that the Select Committee established that it was not just an oversight in respect of the Glenelg council. People were aware of what was going on down there, and I think that the Select Committee has clearly established that the Glenelg City Council has been failing in its duty as a local government body and has allowed MacMahon Construction Pty Ltd to build even before this matter had been considered by the Parliament. I consider that a breach of our Parliamentary ethics.

Mr Lewis: Prerogatives.

Mr HEMMINGS: Ethics or prerogatives: I accept that. It seems to me that the Glenelg City Council, after it found that it had made this stupid mistake in allowing MacMahon Constructions to do that, said, 'Everything is going to be fixed up. Do not worry about it. The Parliament will allow

that trust to be disbanded, and the land handed over to the Glenelg Council, and everything will be all right.'

What is the situation now? We are still considering the report of the Select Committee, and the water shute is three-quarters built. If that is not flouting Parliamentary authority, I do not know what is. The Glenelg council deserves everything that it gets if the Minister inquires into the matters surrounding this matter. I should like to congratulate the Select Committee because it asks in its report for an inquiry to be conducted into the matters concerning this project at Glenelg.

The City of Glenelg in recent years has had much criticism levelled at it over its actions regarding real estate and developers. That has been fully canvassed by the Leader of the Opposition in the other place, the Hon. Chris Sumner, but perhaps I cannot really talk about that in relation to this Bill.

I should like to quote one part of the Select Committee's report. It is an indictment of the Glenelg council when a Select Committee goes down there, collects the evidence and has this to say in relation to the actions of the Corporation of the City of Glenelg:

However, your committee expresses its concern at the manner in which the City of Glenelg has permitted development on the site affected by trusts, although it had knowledge that the title of the land was encumbered. Council gave to the developers a permit to occupy the site and approval to commence construction after discovering from a title search the existence of the relevant trust. It is of little justification to argue that the developer, MacMahon Holdings Limited, accepted the right to occupy the site on the condition that final documentation was dependent upon the actions of Parliament. The actions of the council are further compounded by the knowledge that section 481 of the Local Government Act, which gave to the council power to lease operations on the foreshore, expired in 1973. Not only has council continued to issue permits to a number of occupiers in the amusement area but it permitted this large development by MacMahon to commence.

The Select Committee also had this to say:

Your committee objects strongly to the Glenelg council allowing construction to take place on the presumption that Parliament would validate its actions. It is only because of the very major investment already made by the developer and the employment provided by the construction work that your committee is persuaded to support the Bill.

That in effect was blackmail of this Parliament. The City of Glenelg gave MacMahon Holdings permission to build the water shute. I am not going to argue whether or not the water shute is necessary in the City of Glenelg. I am arguing about the actions of the City of Glenelg in the way that it treated this operation. In effect, they said, 'All right. We know that there is a trust. We know that we have to go before the Parliament, but everything is going to be O.K.' They allowed the building, the mounting, to go ahead. Then the Select Committee (I am in no way criticising the Select Committee; in fact, I support its findings) was placed in a situation, because MacMahon Holdings had proceeded right along the line and the water shute was three-quarters completed, because of employment and the large amount of money invested, in which it had no other course than to support the Bill.

If that is the way that local government is going to treat this Parliament, I can assure local government generally that when Labor gets back into Government those kinds of things will no longer happen. Fortunately, the vast majority of councils treat the Local Government Act and their responsibilities in a very serious manner, but in this case the City of Glenelg has not done that.

I have been criticised in this House over the past couple of days for always attacking the Minister of Local Government. Well, on the last day of the sitting I congratulate the Minister of Local Government, because in this case he has gone on record as saying that he objects to what has gone on in the City of Glenelg and that he will institute and

inquiry. Perhaps that inquiry could have gone a little further. As I said earlier, my colleague in the other place, the Hon. Chris Sumner, has had quite a few words to say about certain transactions that have taken place within the City of Glenelg by members of the council.

However, that is not what I have to talk about now. I think that the Minister should look closely at the activities of the Glenelg City Council, and I hope that the member for Glenelg will echo my criticisms and those of the Select Committee. As a former mayor of the city of Glenelg, I am sure that he is not happy with the situation in that city today. The member for Glenelg has frequently in the past reminded me, when I was mayor of Elizabeth, that I should have done certain things, and I hope that in the true spirit of co-operation he will support me in criticising the Corporation of the City of Glenelg.

That is all I need to say on this matter. I think the whole attitude of Glenelg City Council has been extremely shabby. I do not think that the inquiry will really tell us much of what has gone on behind closed doors but, in tune with paragraph 6 of the Select Committee's report which talks about the major investment and the employment that has been provided, I think that Opposition members are being forced to support the Bill.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I would like briefly to address myself to this Bill. I support the Bill, which is basically designed to do two things: first, to discharge a caveat that has been discovered on the piece of real estate known as the Glenelg Amusement Park and, secondly, to abolish a trust which was discovered when MacMahon Constructions applied for planning approval to build a \$1 000 000 complex behind the Town Hall.

That piece of ground at Glenelg covers the amusement park and Colley Reserve from the Town Hall through to the Anzac Highway, and includes a sailing club. It runs from Colley Terrace through to the sea front, which includes structures such as the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club and a large building which is occupied by a dodgem cars operation. I think that we must understand the background to the development to see that the Glenelg council is not quite the villain painted by the honourable member opposite. In 1911 a roadway ran from behind the existing Town Hall through to the Anzac Highway. In 1911 that roadway was closed, and I think in 1912 (I can be corrected on that date) a caveat and a trust were created. From then on, amusements could be erected for a period of only 23 days in a year. As time went on, that particular trust and caveat were lost to obscurity and did not surface again until MacMahons approached the council with its proposal to build this \$1 000 000 slide.

The development is to include the renovation of an 80-year-old merry-go-round, which will be reinstated, a snack bar, take-away food restaurants, bumper boats, an 18-hole miniature golf course, change rooms for users of the slide, and a swimming pool complex to be used by people coming down from a mountain which will be higher than the Town Hall. I am aware that certain residents of the district, including some councillors of the Glenelg council, are concerned about this development. Some of my constituents feel that it will take away from the atmosphere of Glenelg some of the existing life style to which they are accustomed and for which they moved into the area. They are quite entitled to air those opinions, and the proper place and the councillors are the people to whom they should be aired and who have to take heed of objections to the development. Of course, the council is obliged to react as it sees fit.

I have certain sympathies with some of the protesters about what is being built in the area, but this Bill has nothing whatsoever to do with whether the State Government

approves or disapproves of the development within the amusement park. We are merely tidying up the titles and removing from the titles on the amusement park the caveat and the trust that are preventing the development from proceeding.

It is correct to say that Glenelg council should not have proceeded to allow the MacMahon Construction company to occupy the site and commence work until after Parliament had approved the project. If it has erred on that issue, it is up to Glenelg ratepayers to register their protest accordingly. However, I believe that Parliament has acted responsibly, and I congratulate members in another place who have seen the reality of the development and endorsed the council's action. They did not have to do that; they could have declined and rejected the Bill, and Glenelg council would have then have had to face MacMahon Constructions on the basis that they did not have the right to proceed. However, that has not happened. The Bill has been before the Select Committee, and the Glenelg council, once the Bill passes this place, will have vested in it the power to decide what type of development is built in the amusement park and who occupies the land.

Historically, Glenelg council became involved in the amusement park in 1968. At that time it borrowed \$63 000 to commence a redevelopment, and since then we have seen brick structures appearing in the area. Those include the Aladdins Castle and the dodgem cars area. The roadway which runs between the dodgem car building and the Surf Life Saving Club was lost in the title and no-one really knew where it was. As a result, various tenants have not known whether their structures were built adjacent to it or over it. Once this Bill is passed, the council will have the sole right to say what types of construction will be put on the area, and it can also endorse the MacMahon Constructions project, which has already commenced.

I compliment the Select Committee for the manner in which it handled this difficult situation wherein MacMahons already occupy the site and have committed themselves. The Glenelg council should have waited until the title was cleared, but now, by virtue of passage of this Bill, it will be clear, and from now on the trust will be removed and the caveat discharged. In future, the whole amusement park area will be under the control of the Glenelg council, which will then be authorised to make all decisions regarding what types of structure are put on the area. Local residents, if they disagree with the types of structure or amusements that are being built, will have to take up the matter with their local councillors. If local residents object to any of the projects put in by the local council, their obvious recourse will be through the ballot-box in local government elections. I commend the Bill to the House and congratulate the Select Committee on the way it handled the passage of the Bill in passing it to this place.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I am concerned about some remarks made about this Bill in this place by the member for Napier, and about the Hon. Mr Norman Foster's vicious attack, in another place, on the Glenelg council. The adjective he used in a debate yesterday was shocking. I read yesterday's Select Committee evidence, but unfortunately have had little time to thoroughly study it. A Mr Robertson was the main person to strongly attack the council. I do not know what axe he has to grind. He does not live anywhere near where the project is to be erected. From memory, he lives in Harris Street, which is right over the other side of Brighton Road. Nevertheless, he claims to represent some local citizens or some organisation. Whom he attacks is entirely up to him, I suppose. I stand to be corrected, but at one stage of his letter he called the council 'a mob of rogues', or something to that effect, which was rather strong language.

The council certainly made a mistake. It did not act according to the book. Anyone who has had experience in local government would know that often it is faced with projects on which, in certain circumstances and for many reasons, the builder or occupier wishes some progress to be made. The cost of providing plans and specifications is enormous. On occasions, builders or organisations approach local government to ask for approval in principle. Councils of which I have had experience have, at times, given approval in principle, but have warned the people involved that there could be traps in this. Approval in principle is given subject to whatever the arm of government to which plans are submitted decides.

I would be most surprised and disappointed if the Glenelg council, when approached by MacMahons about this project, had not given similar approval in principle and informed the builder of the possibility of a hold-up, or the like. MacMahons is a large building company, which has undertaken big development projects around the coast area, and in Glenelg. Where were their solicitors at the time? With respect to a firm of its size, experience and knowledge, I suggest it would have had legal advice on this matter, which I am sure it had. At what price was that legal advice about whether the project should begin or not to the company?

Mr Hemmings: You're not condoning it, surely?

Mr MATHWIN: We are talking about an investment of \$1 000 000 or more for the project. I suggest, for the sake of the member for Napier, that MacMahons' solicitors and the firm were at fault for allowing the project to proceed. I have already mentioned the council. Let us not attack the Glenelg council wholly. That would be unfair. As the member for Napier knows, I was in local government. I was Mayor of Brighton, not Glenelg, before I was a member of this place, and I have dealt with Glenelg council for many years. Brighton and Glenelg councils work closely together.

From my experience, the Glenelg council has been a good and responsible one. Its membership has fluctuated from time to time, and I suppose that that is good in some circumstances. Therefore, I ask members, particularly those of whom I have already spoken, and Mr Foster in another place, to bear in mind that responsibility for this mistake must be shared by the Glenelg council, MacMahons, the builders, and the builders' legal advisers, whoever they may be. A great deal of responsibility must be shared by the builders and their legal advisers.

Mr Hemmings: There was no contract.

Mr MATHWIN: I agree that so far as the council is concerned it should not have taken for granted what would happen in this Parliament, but let us not completely forget the other people at fault in this matter: the builders and solicitors.

Mr Hemmings: The Select Committee put the blame fairly and squarely on the Glenelg council.

Mr MATHWIN: I am not concerned about what the Select Committee has done. This would not be the first time I have acted against a Select Committee's report in this place, and it will certainly not be the last. I believe in being fair. If we are to be fair and honest about this, let us place the blame on those responsible, not single out the council. Councils are attacked, as the member knows from his experience in local government; some people can be very nasty. When the real facts are known, they are not as bad as they appear outside the council chambers.

The member for Napier said that over the years the Glenelg council has been criticised for what has happened in it, particularly in dealings in real estate. To my knowledge, that criticism should never be levelled at the Glenelg council, and never has been. If one is dealing with personalities, that is different, but if we are dealing with a council,

that is a body of unpaid voluntary people doing a job for their city and State. The Glenelg council, its aldermen and mayors, have been responsible over the years, and have benefited their city, or corporation, as it was. The proof is in Glenelg's development.

In supporting the Bill, I repeat that when looking for a scapegoat or skeleton in the cupboard let us be fair and consider all those people equally responsible for that mistake, which we now know should never have happened. Let us share it equally between the council, MacMahons, which was willing to spend an enormous sum and which must have known the facts, if not from the council then from its employees solicitors.

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

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 December. Page 2568.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition will support this Bill, which seeks to provide greater flexibility for permanent building societies in how they may go about investment and lending as part of their function which primarily, of course, is to provide funds and opportunities for people to build and own their own houses. As has been pointed out in other debates on financial institutions, such as the Savings Bank of South Australia, banking these days has become complicated, as has the work of building societies and credit unions; in fact, all financial institutions face a far more complicated financial framework than they have ever had before.

In a time of rising interest rates there is enormous competition for funds, and the traditional market shares have been changing between the various institutions. It is becoming increasingly hard for institutions to maintain the value of their investments and, as a result, there are a number of moves among all those financial institutions for greater flexibility. In responding to that demand, the Legislature should always be aware of the primary purpose of the institution, its basic philosophy and the reason why it is established. We are not, I believe, about the business of creating a series of banks, all with much the same powers and all operating in much the same field.

Each of those sectors has its particular function and building societies were basically formed as co-operatives to allow the members of those co-operatives to pool their finances and, in turn, to acquire loans under which they could build their own homes. That is their primary purpose, and that is what building societies must be basically about. Any way in which the Act controlling those societies is amended to depart from that must be measured against that primary purpose.

I think that if one looks at the provisions of this Bill, which we are prepared to accept, that basic role of a building society remains unimpeded; although the amendments allow it to go into much broader areas of investment and lending, nonetheless, its primary concentration is on building and residential accommodation. While that remains so, we can certainly support the Bill, because we also recognise that in order to maintain their financial effectiveness and their share of the market, building societies must be more flexible.

I mentioned that there have been enormous changes in the financial institutions and in financing over the last few years. Of course, those changes have been recognised at the national level by the establishment of the Campbell Com-

mittee of Inquiry into Financial Institutions. Their report was released recently and recommended a freeing up of the system, increasing competition between banks and other financial institutions such as building societies. The Campbell Report was a very far-reaching document with major implications for the financial systems of Australia, both at the national and at the regional level. What is going to be done in terms of the recommendations of that committee (there are some hundreds of them), at this stage we do not know: it is in the hands of the Federal Government, which has obviously commenced a consideration of the report and which one would hope would come down with its views in the not too distant future. I think it is important that uncertainty is not allowed to run, as has been the case, for instance, with the I.A.C. recommendations on the motor vehicle industry. The longer any industry stays in a period of uncertainty, the more difficult it is to plan long term, and the more difficult it is to operate effectively in the present. So, one would hope that there would be a fairly speedy response to and analysis of the Campbell Committee recommendations. Many of those recommendations have major implications for South Australia viewed as a regional economy.

I believe that the Government ought to establish as a matter of urgency a top-level committee to investigate the impact of the Campbell Report in South Australia. That committee would concentrate most heavily on the area of home-financing and the role of State financial institutions, those controlled directly by the State—State banks, the State Government Insurance Commission—and those such as the building societies which are located in the State, whose decision-making is controlled from South Australia, and who are an important part of our regional economy. That special committee should investigate their role and what sort of response the States should make to the Campbell Report.

If the report was implemented, every aspect of our financial lives would be affected, from school bank accounts to home mortgage payments. High interest rates are already making home-ownership a nightmare. If interest rates go up further as a result of the report, that would be the last straw for thousands of South Australians and a disaster for our already troubled building industry. It is the theory of some economists that the impact of implementing the Campbell Committee recommendations would be to lower interest rates over the longer-term. I think that that is fairly questionable. One wonders, in any case, whether freeing up the financial system to the extent the Campbell Committee recommendations would help home ownership one whit. It may simply allow institutions to invest in all sorts of high profit-taking areas and not provide for any basic development funds or for the sort of loans that we expect for home owners.

There are obviously major implications. New South Wales has already responded to this: it has recognised the problem and set up a special committee of senior public servants to study the report. I believe that a State committee should be headed by the Under Treasurer, and it would need to include representatives of the State banks and the S.G.I.C. It may well be that some private sector participation would be desirable in that exercise as well, again, concentrating on the regional economic effects of the Campbell Report. In that context, representations from the building society area would be quite appropriate.

I believe that a studied response is needed from the State Government and, the more input it can have and the higher level at which that response is prepared, the better for the State. I do not think it is enough to simply say that the Government is looking at it. Let us have something more profound than that. I believe those remarks are relevant in

the context of this Bill because, as I say, it is part of this pattern of amendments to enable financial institutions to become more efficient, effective and competitive in the current difficult financial environment.

In regard to the second reading explanation I was interested to see (and I think it gives us some added confidence) that the amendments made to the Act earlier this year emanated from an advisory committee that includes the Registrar of Building Societies, a nominee of the Treasurer and the Minister of Housing, and Industry representatives. An advisory committee of this kind has an important role, because it gives us some confidence that amendments proposed will have some relevance.

The second reading explanation stresses that such an expansion is not to be inconsistent with the traditional role of building societies. I think it drew rather a long bow by saying that by allowing an expansion of activities that will have a beneficial effect on home interest rates, this suggests that it is not inconsistent. I think that we should look more at what the building societies intend to do, where they intend to invest, and that is the test I apply to the question of whether this was consistent with their philosophic purpose. As I have said, I believe that it is. There was this extraordinary statement in the second reading explanation:

Government policy is to encourage home ownership and, as an alternative under modern conditions, to encourage the availability of rental accommodation.

I am not sure what other things Government policy could do. Is there another option, such as the encouragement of use of mobile houses or tents for residences, or something of that kind? We are talking about either home ownership or rental accommodation, which are obviously the two parameters. That was a nonsensical sort of statement. However, it was a nod in the direction of the problem I mentioned earlier, namely, the fact that with high interest rates, pressure on finance and the cost of living, more and more people are finding it difficult to obtain a home. That has affected our economic fabric through the collapse in South Australia of the building and construction industry; it has affected our social fabric through the denial of people of the sort of housing that they would hope to acquire and raise their families in. The matter is something towards which we must direct a lot more energy and attention. To the extent that this Bill will help the societies to pump more money into that area, it is to be commended. In relation to investment, it was stated that:

The essential object of the proposed amendment is the statutory opportunity for building societies to increase holdings of shares. The purposes for which such an expansion is sought are for investment in insurance and deposit schemes, the Housing Loan Insurance Corporation or its commercial successors.

In this respect, I was somewhat surprised to read in the *Advertiser* of 8 December a report of the Minister's remarks made during his second reading explanation, namely, that these societies, acquisition of an interest in the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation was denied by a spokesman for the Australian Association of Permanent Building Societies in South Australia. They denied that any such move was being planned. I shall be interested to hear the Minister's comment as to why there seems to be some conflict between the Minister's statement and what the building societies themselves have said in relation to the H.L.I.C.

I might add that the Opposition is very strongly supportive of the H.L.I.C. We think it is scandalous that the Federal Government should be contemplating its sale or disposal in any way. I would hope that the building societies in this State were not interested in acquiring shares in that public institution. There is no justification or reason for them to do it. They have a big enough problem here in South Australia without attempting to expand in that way

and take part in the Federal Government's ideological dismantling of an important element in the housing insurance area.

My colleague in another place moved an amendment to clause 4 by which he attempted to concentrate attention on investment and lending being made in South Australia. The Opposition does not believe that the provision does any violence to the purpose of the Bill; we do not believe that it unreasonably restricts flexibility. At this stage, I do not intend persisting with that amendment, but I give notice that during the Committee stage I will be asking the Minister some questions about it. With those remarks, I commend the Bill to the House and indicate the Opposition's support at the second reading stage.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): The Leader of Opposition has virtually endorsed the Bill and is correct in saying that the amendments proposed will not involve a fundamental shift in emphasis in building society activities; they will simply reduce the present pressure on building societies' viability by permitting societies to undertake controlled expansion of their activities in higher yielding areas including development loans for rental accommodation.

In regard to the reported remarks of the Minister in terms of interest for societies investing in the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation, the possibility of that occurring was raised. The industry and building societies were supportive of that and the Government simply sought to facilitate it. Whether it comes to pass is unclear at this stage. I do not think the Minister suggested that it was *fait accompli*. If the report suggested that, I suggest that the Leader should refer to the *Hansard* report of what the Hon. Mr Burdett actually said. The Government is simply seeking to respond to the expressed wishes of the building societies, which of course support the provisions of this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Restricted loans'.

Mr BANNON: In another place, my colleague, the Hon. C. J. Sumner, moved an amendment to clause 4 whereby he sought to insert after the word 'residence' on page 2, line 3, the words 'situated in South Australia', and similarly he sought to insert after the passage 'of land', at line 5, the words 'situated in South Australia'. The intent of the amendment was opposed by the Government and, I understand, defeated. I say that because we do not have available to us either a copy of the Bill or the *Hansard* report of the debate in another place, which, of course, just indicates the problems under which we are operating today.

The purpose was to ensure that one of the great advantages of building societies raising money and lending it was to assist local industry, the local housing industry, and local residents in South Australia. Over the past few years we have seen a procession of head office companies leaving this State, many of them major investors in the State, which will no longer have any kind of special connection or interest in the State of South Australia.

We need all the financial institutions we can get to concentrate their resources and investments in this State. It would be cutting right across the philosophy of the building societies as co-operative societies formed of people who are resident in a particular area and who deposit their money with the society so that they can borrow to live in a particular community if the building societies saw amendments to the Act such as we are passing today as some sort of licence to chase high interest and capital investment all over the country. That is not the purpose of building societies; that is not why they are protected or regulated by

law in the way they are, and I am sure that that is not why people deposit money with the societies. If people really wanted to be investors and to get the absolute maximum return on their money, they have many opportunities to do that more flexibly. They can go to their stockbroker to get advice.

In the case of building societies, I believe that we must try to retain the concept of depositors being people who are either contemplating the purchase of a home or are at least imbued with the idea that a building society is a local institution that is locally controlled and managed and is sensitive to the local market and to stimulation of local activity. It was for those reasons that the amendment was moved, and I do not believe that it distorted the purpose of the Bill. In the absence of the *Hansard* report, I would be interested to know why the amendment was opposed in the other place, and I indicate that I do not intend to move that amendment at this stage.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I appreciate the reasons outlined by the Leader for the Opposition's moving this amendment and I am sure that the Leader will equally appreciate, when I explain, the reasons why the Government did not accept the amendment. First, no South Australian building society is presently lending interstate, and as far as we are aware, none intends to do that. That, in itself, does not necessarily mean that the law should not prohibit that practice.

Practical operational difficulties are already experienced in regard to interstate lending. In some cases, the society would have to be registered interstate. I stress that the Government has no philosophical opposition as such to the amendment, but practical considerations must be taken into account. The advice that the Minister received was based on the fact that those considerations required careful and detailed study before any legislative action was taken. Nowhere else in the Act is there any restriction on building societies lending outside the State. Questions as to whether societies' activities should be permitted to extend across State borders, and if so, where and to what extent, are important and must be examined.

The Government believes that those matters should be considered on a national basis and that any legislation should be uniform. To that end, I understand that the Minister has stated that he will undertake to examine the question of interstate lending by building societies and have the matter discussed at the next national meeting of registrars. I hope that that undertaking (which I understand was given in another place) will satisfy the Leader as to the Government's good faith in this matter and also as to the need to ensure that unilateral action is not undertaken but that the national implications of any legislative action to prohibit building societies from lending interstate are considered.

Mr BANNON: The Minister has pointed out that nowhere else is there this restriction, either in the existing Act or in this Bill. My response is that this Bill vastly expands the ability of the societies to invest as well as their flexibility. It is at that point (as occurred in relation to the Savings Bank of South Australia) that one must look to see whether those restrictions may not be practicable. It is a pity that neither the committee nor the Minister directed attention to that matter, but at this stage I am happy to accept that the implications and possibilities of the matter are being considered.

I would hope that, as well as consideration on a national basis, there will also be consideration on a State basis, because that is the very point I am trying to make. It is true that building societies are increasingly looking for some sort of national linkage. I understand that the Co-op has acquired an interstate building society. As part of that

process, I would hate to see that society lose its locational connection and its emphasis on locality, because after all, this State, in particular, desperately needs money that is raised here to be put back into the State by way of investment. As well as raising the matter at a national level, we should consider it from a State point of view. The Minister should seek the views of his advisory committee and of the societies. Let us review the operation of the amendments over the next 12 months or so and come back to this point at a future date.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I stress again, because the *Hansard* report is not available, that the Minister has given a firm undertaking that a thorough analysis of the issue will be undertaken.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 9) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

STATE THEATRE COMPANY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 December. Page 2579.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I intended to take this opportunity to make some remarks about the State Theatre Company and the situation in regard to live theatre generally. Unfortunately, the constraints of time today prevent that, and I will have to content myself with referring to the fact that there is enormous concern in the arts community, particularly about the way in which Federal Government seems to be abandoning its responsibility for the support of the arts in Australia. Most recently, this action has hit live theatre very hard indeed. In fact, recently I shared a platform with the Minister of Arts, Mr Hill, and we found ourselves on the same side of the argument. That is not always common, but certainly in this instance I believe that the State Government has maintained the obligation to finance and support the arts in South Australia.

Particularly in these areas of live and alternative theatre, we support the way in which the State Government has attempted to fulfil its responsibilities. Naturally, we are extremely critical of the policies of the Federal Government and in that the present State Government, of course, joins us.

The State Theatre Company itself, as the second reading explanation acknowledges, has in recent times been confronted with a series of problems, which in many respects any vibrant and creative company will experience as the inevitable personnel, directing and work changes occur. It does not reflect any deep malaise or any major basic problems. The State Theatre Company still continues to be able to mount productions of a very high artistic and creative calibre. We have been fortunate, for instance, to see the last two productions that the company put on. They were very much in the long tradition of excellence that this fine company has enjoyed. However, it is true that there has been a drop in subscribers and audiences, and some critical attacks have been made on the company.

Mr McRae: A lot of them unfair, too.

Mr BANNON: Most of them have been unfair, but I do not think that any artistic company, particularly a State

company which is funded by the taxpayer, can shrink from that sort of criticism. They must be able to match it, take it and defend themselves, and I believe that that has been done. Provided that the debate is constructive, there can not be any harm in it. The apparent greater response in both attendances and in subscribers that we are observing is part of the fall-out of that creative discussion that has been taking place. One of the problems that the company has experienced cannot be laid at the foot of artistic direction or the board or whatever; it involves simply the problem that people are finding in being able to attend functions, places, artistic events, and so on.

At the upper end of the market there has not been much change. The Opera Company has been singularly successful and maintained its audiences, in part because much of its audience appeal is in the upper income bracket and those of its audience have been still able to pay the prices, despite the difficult economic times that we are experiencing. However, when we get to the live theatre and the State theatre Company, its audiences are suffering, as audiences all over the country have been, because of economic problems, and in this State more than any. So, let us not just write off what has been happening as the theatre company missing the beat in some way creatively. It has been something to do with the economic climate and with a number of other things that have happened.

I cannot take it any further than that, in view of the time, unfortunately. I would like to have made a much more substantial and definitive statement, but other occasions will arise for that. This Bill simply increases the size of the board. Although I am not sure that a major case has been made for the increase in the size of the board, in principle I do not object to it. I do not know that the analogy of the increase in the trustees of the regional centres is any precedent that must be followed. The theatre company board has worked effectively, but I recognise some of the problems as pointed up by the Minister, namely, that when people are travelling or absent elsewhere there are difficulties of a quorum and having enough governors present.

My objection to the Bill is not so much the increase in the size of the board but the way in which it is proposed to increase it. Far too often we are seeing the present Government increasing the number of direct patronage appointments by the Government. Of course, the Government of the day has a right to make appointments, and must do so. In Government, we did so, and we certainly defend the right of the present Government to make appointments. We also, as the Liberals did in Opposition, reserve the right to criticise those appointments if we believe that they are inappropriate. However, there is a difference between the sort of appointments that are made to the board and the changing of boards in order to ensure greater Ministerial control.

We have had a number of instances of this. The most stark has been the Parks Community Centre, again involving this same Minister, the Minister of the Arts, in a different capacity. A complete departure was made from the concept of community involvement and community dominance in the board. The Minister reserved the right for himself effectively, through Government and Ministerial nominees, to have a substantial majority on the board and, more important, to put on the board those sorts of people whom he thought were most appropriate.

The present Government is very keen to get persons with business qualifications on these boards. I have no objection to that, but I remind the Government that these bodies also are meant to be creating a stimulating and lively arts environment in this State, and, if the board lacks those inputs and skills, the Government funding, however judi-

ciously administered, is absolutely useless. We can have an enormously efficient company with splendidly presented accounts, cost-cutting exercises, and so on, and its artistic output can be nil, its content trash, and we would be better not subsidising it. So, let us not forget the primary aim of Government subsidy to the arts.

A second very important principle is involved, the so-called arms-length policy, whereby the Government should not be seen to be directly influencing the policy of these arts bodies. The greater the extent to which the Minister is involved in making the appointments to a board, the more difficult it is to sustain this concept of an arms-length policy in terms of the way in which a company is run, its content, and so on. This can be overcome quite simply by ensuring that, in increasing the size of the board, we do not distort its membership into the Government nominee sector, as is being done, but we preserve that balance by allowing there to be two further board members, one of which can be a Ministerial appointee—business man, accountant or whoever the Minister has in mind, the other of whom could be the Artistic Director of the company. I give notice that I will move an amendment to that effect. I support the Bill.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):

I am pleased that the Opposition supports this perfectly straightforward and practical Bill and also that the Leader of the Opposition has, albeit perhaps indirectly, recognised the advocacy that the Minister of Arts has had both with the Federal Government and with the community at large for the importance of the arts. In that, I recognise that he has maintained a tradition that has been established in South Australia that the Government is in effect a supporter of the arts and that it attempts to provide leadership. Indeed, it has successfully provided leadership in this field. The Minister was very recently described as a true friend of the arts, and I firmly believe that that is so.

I reject the assertion made by the Leader of the Opposition that appointments to a board such as this, in increasing the size of the board, is a question of direct patronage. Appointments made to boards in the arts area reflect the Minister's extreme sensitivity to the needs of the arts, both in the area of financial management and in the area of artistic and creative ability and sympathy with those who are engaged in the performing or creative arts.

I know that the Minister has given extremely thoughtful consideration to the appointments that he has made, and that they have been based on the competence of the appointees to do the job. Whether the appointees in this case are those rare people who combine financial management expertise together with a creative and artistic ability, I do not know, but I feel quite confident that the board will be enriched by the appointments that the Minister makes.

Ultimately, the Minister accepts responsibility for whether things are going well or badly. I take the point that that arms length attitude is desirable, and I believe that the best way in which a Minister can achieve this is to choose good people and let them get on with the job, and I am sure that that will occur.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'The Board of Governors.'

Mr BANNON: I move:

Page 1—

Line 15—Leave out 'five' and insert 'four'.

After line 15—Insert the following paragraph:

'and

(c) by inserting in subsection (2) after paragraph (a) the following paragraph:

(ab) of whom one shall be the Artistic Director of the company *ex officio*.'

The effect of this amendment is quite simple. Instead of the two extra members being appointed by the Minister, one of them shall be appointed by the Minister the other shall be the Artistic Director of the company. It is an interesting situation, because this amendment was moved by the Minister when he was in Opposition, but it was not accepted by the Government at that time.

When this Bill was before the House previously, the present Minister of Arts as Opposition spokesman moved just such an amendment, to have the Artistic Director on the board of the company. It was moved in conjunction with, and was based on, the fact that an elected member of the company is currently a member of the board. Of course, that position will continue unaffected by the Bill.

The arguments that the Minister used then were that some sort of balance should apply. In that he could certainly draw some support from action that had been taken by the previous Government in relation to the Art Gallery Board, where the Director of the art gallery had been made a member of the board but on the express condition that at some stage an elected member of the staff of the gallery would also join the board. There had been a system of observers, and an amendment was to be made that the Act, and that was the basis of the appointment. It involved the concept, in other words, of the Director, the chief executive, to balance and to be a full member of the board in conjunction with an elected member of the staff.

At that time the Government of the day opposed the Artistic Director being included. The chief reason for that was that the theatre company was operating as a kind of *troika* operation with no real chief executive in the sense contemplated, for instance, for the art gallery and elsewhere. There was an Artistic Director, a Manager of the company and there was a Director of the Theatre-in-Education team (Magpie), and they worked as a threesome. They had different functions and it was felt by that group, and by the company (and I think this ought to be remembered because their view were considered to be quite important at the time) that to extract one of them and in effect confer a kind of *ex officio* managing director title on him would not be desirable. Those views were accepted as being reasonable, and that position has applied until today.

We would argue that with the expansion of the board the arguments that the Minister made then in Opposition become somewhat more relevant. Because an imbalance could be created if there were two Ministerial appointments and because the Artistic Director is now more clearly seen, in terms of the company, as someone who could appropriately be on the board, there seems every reason to make the amendment that was formerly proposed by the Minister when in Opposition. As I understand it, the present *troika* (and those three positions I mentioned still exist) are quite happy with that situation. It does overcome the other problem that, if the Minister is to make both these appointments (and he has indicated that one of the main reasons is to try to strengthen the business and administrative aspect of the company, as he has done in a number of other areas), we run the risk of the vital creative decision-making aspect of the company, its real purpose, being lost. By all means, let the Minister place on the board someone with those skills to strengthen it in the areas in which he believes it should be strengthened. However, I believe that there should be a balance, and an appropriate balance could be struck by putting the Artistic Director on the board.

I understand that the present Artistic Director, Mr Jim Sharman, has no strong views one way or the other. Obviously, he will attend board meetings, as will the Administrator, the General Manager, Miss Ballantyne, and the Theatre-in-Education Director, Mr Moore, as they have done in the past. But, this amendment would confer formal

board membership status on Mr Sharman. We would have the balance then between the Artistic Director and the member of the company. I think that we would ensure a better balance with the sort of interests that are represented on the board, and thus would get rid of the criticism that the Minister is trying to stack the board or unbalance it in terms of his own nominees.

The amendment has much to commend it. In fact, I am surprised, bearing in mind the Minister's attitude when in Opposition, that, when he at last as Minister had an opportunity to make this change, he did not make it. I am very surprised indeed. The Opposition believes the case he made then is relevant today in a sense that it was not before, and with the expansion of the board it provides an opportunity to give effect to it. I commend it to the Government.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Government opposes the amendment. In saying that, I think that some of the reasons that the Leader outlined for supporting it are relevant because, when considered carefully, they indicate that a quite undue status would be placed on the Artistic Director, *vis a vis*, the General Manager of the board, and that could be undesirable for the company.

True, the Hon. Murray Hill when in Opposition moved an amendment that would have had this effect. The Minister freely recognises that his experience in Government as a Minister administering this State Theatre Company has led him to that the conclusion that that is not an appropriate course of action to take. To place the Artistic Director and not the General Manager on the board, or, indeed, to place the General Manager and not the Artistic Director on the board, would give one an added status that could act adversely on the company as a whole. For example, if the Artistic Director was a member of the board making financial decisions about the company, those decisions might, with the added status which the Artistic Director had as a member of the board, enable the General Manager's financial advice to be overridden.

That certainly would not be in the best interests of the company. As the Leader recognised, the company has recently been beset with a series of problems. The Government believes that they are best resolved by a board comprising people who are capable of providing an objective assessment of the problems and solutions in light of advice provided by both the Artistic Director and the General Manager. The board has a large Budget to administer. The Government grant in 1981-82 is \$1 075 000. It is considered that persons of management experience on the board are the most appropriate to fill those two positions. So, the Minister freely admits that the view he held in Opposition has been altered by his experience in Government. For that reason, the Government opposes the amendment.

Mr BANNON: The arguments are very familiar. I have made those arguments myself in the past. Circumstances have changed somewhat, which is why we moved this amendment. But, if that is the Minister's view, (although I believe that the amendment is appropriate), if it was not his intention to accept this, he should have reduced the extra membership of the board by one and simply appointed one extra person. Obviously, the Minister is not prepared to do that, either. The Minister has recognised the common sense of what was being put at that time, and has become a convert to it. Well and good! That will probably influence him when he is in Opposition again in the not too distant future.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND RESEARCH ACT REPEAL BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 9 December. Page 2579.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill, in the words of the second reading explanation, effects a minor change to the title of the Chief Executive Officer of the Film Corporation from Director to Managing Director because Director is a term of art within the film industry, apparently there has been some confusion, particularly when dealing with people overseas, as to who the chief executive is. It seems to be a perfectly logical and very simple amendment, which the Opposition support.

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

[Sitting suspended from 5.10 to 11.30 p.m.]

PLANNING BILL

At 11.30 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to Amendments Nos 1, 2 and 3:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist upon these amendments.

As to Amendments Nos 4 and 5:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist upon these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 6:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 7:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist upon this amendment but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Clause 7, page 7, line 22—After 'is' insert '(a)'.
After line 23 insert paragraph as follows—

'or

(b) of a kind excluded from the provisions of this section by regulation'

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to these amendments.

As to Amendments Nos 13 and 14:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist upon its disagreement to this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 15:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist upon its disagreement to this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 16:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out proposed subsection (6b).

and the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 17:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to this amendment.

As to Amendments Nos 18, 19 and 20:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on these amendments.

As to Amendments Nos 21 to 29:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist upon its disagreement to these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 30:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment but make in lieu thereof the following amendments:

Clause 40, page 22—After line 29 insert 'and shall be in a form approved by resolution of both Houses of Parliament'.

Lines 30 to 46—Leave out subclauses (3), (4) and (5).

Page 23, lines 1 to 3—Leave out subclause (6).

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment Number 31:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 32:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist upon this amendment but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Clause 41, page 25, line 41—After 'may' insert ', subject to subsection (13),'

Page 26—After line 1 insert subclause as follows:

(13) Where a supplementary development plan introduces or affects principles of development control under which development is permitted or prohibited, the supplementary development plan shall not be referred to the Governor unless the plan has been referred to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and—

(a) The Committee has approved the plan; or

(b) The Committee has resolved not to approve the plan, copies of the plan have on or after the date of the resolution been laid before each House of Parliament, and neither House of Parliament has within six sitting days after the date of the copy of the plan being laid before the House, passed a resolution disallowing the plan.

(14) Where a supplementary development plan has been referred to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and at the expiration of 14 days from the day on which it was so referred the Committee has neither approved nor resolved not to approve the plan, it shall be conclusively presumed that the Committee has approved the plan.

(15) Before referring a supplementary development plan to which subsection (13) applies to the Governor, the Minister may amend the plan in order to give effect to proposals for amendment made by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, or by either House of Parliament.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 33:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

As to Amendment No. 34:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by inserting after subsection (2) the following subsection:

(3) This section shall expire at the expiration of two years from the commencement of this Act.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

Consequential Amendment:

That the following consequential amendment be made to the Bill:

Clause 43, page 26, after line 27, insert subclauses as follow:

(4) The Minister may make such other provision for publication of the development plan, and of authorised supplementary development plans, as he thinks fit.

(5) The Minister may from time to time consolidate and republish the development plan with amendments.

As to Amendments Nos 35 and 36:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 37:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist upon this amendment.

As to Amendments Nos 38 to 42:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 43:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by inserting at the commencement of proposed new subsection (1):

Except as provided by the regulations, and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 44:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment but make in lieu thereof the following amendment:

Clause 52, page 32, lines 3 to 5—Leave out all words in subclause (9) after 'concluded' in line 3.

After line 5 insert subclause as follows:

(10) An application for leave to continue an appeal under this section must be made within seven days after the conclusion of the conference, and if an application is not made within that period, or if leave is not granted, the appeal shall be deemed to have been dismissed.

(11) An application for leave to continue an appeal under this section shall be dealt with by the Tribunal as expeditiously as possible.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendments Nos 45 to 48:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 49:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to this amendment.

As to Amendments Nos 50, 51 and 52:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on these amendments.

As to Amendments Nos 53 and 54:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on these amendments.

As to Amendment No. 55:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to this amendment.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

I want to take this opportunity to refer only briefly to a few of the matters raised in the conference. I want to refer first to matters relating to mining in this State. Referring first to amendments Numbers 1, 2 and 3, although these amendments have been deleted, I have given an undertaking in regard to them that I will discuss with my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You do that all the time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: We have an excellent relationship, between the two of us as Ministers, and between our departments. It is one we are very proud of. I will be discussing with the Minister of Mines and Energy whether existing procedures pertaining to environmental assessment of exploration activities are adequate, or whether improvements could be effected or should be needed.

Amendment No. 6 related to the City of Adelaide, but it was interesting to note when the amendments came out of the Upper House that the City of Adelaide was under two pieces of legislation, under the Act we are now debating, and under the City of Adelaide Development Control Act. That was a ridiculous situation. Although this amendment has been deleted, I have given an undertaking to the conference to introduce amending legislation in relation to the City of Adelaide Development Control Act to introduce environmental impact assessment requirements to the City of Adelaide. I have indicated that I will do that in the next session. I have also undertaken to discuss with the council the possibility of the introduction of third party appeals to the city, but I have given no commitment in that regard, because it would be necessary for me to have some discussions on the matter.

Acceptance of amendments Nos 13 and 14 means that the commission cannot be subject to Ministerial direction

when determining planning applications. Amendments Nos 15 and 16 relate to the membership of the Planning Commission. The acceptance of these amendments clarifies the drafting of clause 10. Amendment No. 17 relates to the subdelegation of powers by council. The acceptance of this amendment will ensure that a council may subdelegate powers delegated to it by the commissioner only to a committee of the council, rather than to a committee responsible to the council, which could include non-elected members.

Amendment No. 21 relates to membership of the advisory committee, and acceptance of this amendment will have the effect of ensuring that at least one member of the advisory committee must be a woman, and at least one member must be a man. Amendments Nos 22 to 29 relate to the appeals tribunal and its commissioners. The effect of the acceptance of these amendments is to maintain the status and the constitution of the present Planning Appeal Board and its commissioners. Amendment No. 30 relates to the development plan, and acceptance of this amendment has the effect that the consolidation development plan is to be in a form approved by resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

Amendment No. 31 relates to supplementary development plans. Acceptance of this amendment will have the effect of empowering the Minister to take action after three months rather than six months where a council has not proceeded with the preparation of a supplementary development plan at the request of the Minister.

Amendment No. 32 relates to approval of supplementary development plans, and acceptance of this amendment will have the effect of enabling the Subordinate Legislation Committee to report on plans that relate to development permitted or prohibited. Amendment No. 34 relates to interim development control, and the effect of this amendment will be to incorporate in the Bill an additional clause which will enable the Governor to bring supplementary development plans into effect for a limited time immediately upon public exhibition, rather than, as is usual, the plans taking effect after the completion of further public consultation procedures. As this concept is a somewhat novel one, the power will remain on the Statute Book for two years only, following which any further extension will require Parliamentary sanction.

Amendment No. 43 relates to third party appeals, and acceptance of this amendment will have the effect of bestowing third party appeal rights in respect of all applications for planning consent except where otherwise prescribed by regulation. Amendment No. 44 also relates to third party appeals, and acceptance of this amendment will have the effect of bestowing on third parties the right to a formal appeal hearing following a conference, except where leave is not granted by the tribunal.

Amendments Nos 45 to 49 are concerned with advertisements. Acceptance of these amendments will have the effect of enabling the removal of advertisement hoardings as well as advertisements in certain circumstances and reduce the period in which no planning authorisation is required for certain types of advertisements from three years to one year. Finally, amendment No. 55 related to a drafting amendment only.

I believe that the conference has been very successful, with a very large number of amendments before the conference. I believe that we have been able to compromise in a number of cases. The new planning legislation will mean that for the first time in South Australia there will be an integrated environment and planning management system. This augurs well for planning procedures in South Australia. The administrative process will be streamlined and approv-

als dealt with more rapidly. That is what we are attempting to achieve and it will result in time and cost savings.

The legislation provides for the consolidation of existing development plans and regulations into one overall plan for the State of South Australia. This will eliminate the complication and confusion which presently arises from the requirement for separate exhibitions when development plans and related planning regulations both need amending. Regulations in future will deal only with administration procedures and definitions. The most important feature of the legislation that has come out of conference today is the streamlining of procedures for obtaining approvals.

It is not my intention to take up any more time but I believe that the legislation that we have is excellent legislation and that it will do a great deal to bring about a balance between environmental requirements and the desire of this Government to see more development, with less red tape. I thank all of those who took part in the conference and particularly the officers of my department, who have spent a considerable amount of time working on this legislation. I would commend them for that work.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: My objection in speaking in this debate is to make one observation and just highlight three matters that arose from the conference. First, I agree with the Minister that it was an extremely well-run conference. The Minister was in a conciliatory mood. The people from the other place, irrespective of Party, attempted to be as constructive as they possibly could. Despite the complexity of the issues before us, the amendments, the whole thing was carried through with a great deal of patience and good humour.

I draw to the Committee's attention three matters that have been referred to briefly by the Minister. First, the fact that third party rights of appeal are written into the legislation now as a result of the conference is a big improvement on the document originally laid before us, and I believe we will not in any way regret that this has happened. Secondly, the fact that interim development control has been written in, albeit on a two-year sunset basis, is a big advantage. I believe that, when the time comes, this Parliament will be asked to prolong that interim development basis, probably for an indefinite period, because we will have seen the way in which it works and we will have seen how successful it is. It will be part of our planning mechanism and something we will not want to give away.

Finally, I draw the Committee's attention to the way we have provided for the development plan and the way certain aspects will be amended. This really represents for this Parliament a new form of Parliamentary procedure. It is one that I believe will not have to be activated very often but it will be there and it is one with which we have to come to grips. To some people, it will be an unusual mode of operation, but nonetheless I believe it is one that will be effective.

There was a spirit of conciliation at the conference and we believe that, as a result of that, we have assisted in producing a Bill that will assist planning generally, to the people of this State.

Mr RANDALL: It is not my intention at this late hour to speak at great length, but I was one who participated in the conference and one who was involved for considerable hours with the Minister, and my colleague the member for Rocky River, and other members from this House, and we endeavoured to grapple through the various issues of the 55 amendments. I want to put on record my compliments to the Minister for the way the conference was handled and compliments also to the members opposite and to members of another place, who, although they had different view points, knew where to stop. The thing that struck me most was when the legislation was going through this House. I

come from a local government background and knowing full well the importance of such legislation review to local government. When one sees it proceed through this House with something like 55 amendments, one wonders whether the legislation will survive.

That was the fear that was beginning to permeate the community. I know that in local government circles there was interest in the way the legislation was going, because a lot of consultation had taken place and a lot of preparation and hard work had been done by the Minister's office and the community at large. When one watched the legislation go through both Houses and see the beginning of what could have been a gradual erosion of the legislation, I was glad to finally see the end of the day and see that we still had a reasonable piece of legislation in this House, although there are some things that worry us, as we have a policy on various issues. We will watch with interest to see how the matter proceeds.

I would like to place on record one small concern that I have. When we were debating the issue of providing one woman and one man on a committee, I wondered who the other members were. I think it is a token gesture to begin to put this thing into legislation. I believe that, if a woman or a man is appointed to a committee, it is because of expertise and ability to do the job, not because the person is male or female. To begin to write this sort of thing into legislation, I think, is wrong. Although I accept it as a compromise, I believe that, if this is the way the Labor Party is going to move, the community itself must begin to ask some questions on this form of tokenism. I accept that it was a compromise situation. As a committee we have accepted it.

I was also interested to hear that we did not need to have a representative of the Trades and Labor Council on this planning advisory committee. It was illogical to see the token gesture of putting the trade unionists on. A person sits on an advisory committee because of expertise that the person has. I do not wish to go much further, except to say that, as the Minister has quite rightly outlined tonight, we have in South Australia this new legislation and when the legislation is proclaimed and put into action, I believe, the local government will benefit. I believe the environmental groups will benefit. I believe that developers will benefit, and, as the Minister has already indicated, the fear and trepidation that the Adelaide city council has will be relieved, because it will not be under two forms of legislation control. The form of planning legislation that is before the House will be watched with interest when negotiations are undertaken with the council and when they develop this plan. When these amendments are implemented and as the third party appeal proposition is put into operation, we will watch with interest to see how they work. I endorse the recommendations of the conference.

Motion carried.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION BILL

At 11.32 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to Amendment No. 1:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by inserting after the contents thereof subclause as follows:

(3) In this section—

(a) 'sex' and 'marital status' have the meanings attributed to those expressions by the Sex Discrimination Act, 1975;

(b) 'race' has the meaning attributed to that expression by the Racial Discrimination Act, 1976;

and

(c) 'physical impairment' has the meaning attributed to that expression by the Handicapped Persons Equal Opportunity Act, 1981.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 2:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by inserting after the contents thereof subclause as follows:

(3) In determining the courses to be conducted by the College the Council shall have regard to the needs of the community as assessed and determined by the Minister.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 3:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out all words after the words 'subclause (3)' first occurring.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 4:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on this amendment.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

I commend the recommendations to the Committee.

Amendment No. 1 involves an insertion in the discrimination clause that was previously considered when the bill was before the House of Assembly and which has subsequently been accepted by the Committee, with one provision. The Committee felt that a number of considerations of discrimination were already quite adequately covered in the legislation that had already been enacted, with the exception of the matters of religion and political belief. However, the Committee felt that, since there may be some ambiguity as to the intentions of the current legislation, for the purposes of this Act we would insert additional qualifications relating matters of discrimination quite directly to the legislation already enacted in this provision; 'sex' and 'marital status' now have the meanings attributed to those expressions in the Sex Discrimination Act, 1975. 'Race' has the meaning attributed to that expression by the Racial Discrimination Act, 1976, and 'physical impairment' has the meaning attributed to that expression by the Handicapped Persons Equal Opportunity Act, 1981.

There is also the proviso contained in the recommendations that there is positive discrimination permitted in cases where the college recommending, and the Minister approving, should make special provisions for any student or class of students where it was felt that there was a necessity to discriminate in favour of those students to their educational advantage, to overcome any other disadvantages that they might suffer.

In regard to amendment No. 2, during the debate it was said that this was allegedly a very severe provision, which gave the Minister powers that members of the Opposition felt were extreme. For my part, I felt that the provision that the council should only collaborate with the Minister meant that the potential impact of the Bill was being grossly exaggerated. However, in light of the fact that the Executive committee itself had put forward an alternative, a compromise, and that this compromise was moved by members of the Opposition in the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council, we ultimately decided to accept that compromise in recognition of the fact that not only did it compromise on the question of the Minister's being able to exercise some prerogatives in the matter of teacher training but also in light of the fact that the various colleges of advanced education are now diversifying their courses of instructors, the Minister should also have some rights of recommendation in the whole matter of admission of students to courses and their rights to continue in courses.

I did feel during the conference that this clause was still inadequate: it did not give the Minister the right of intercession in a number of cases that have cropped up during the past two years and where Ministerial intervention has proved to be necessary. However, it was almost impossible to speculate with any degree of accuracy as to the wide range of possibilities that might crop up for which the Minister might need to intervene.

Therefore, it was decided to accept this compromise position, with the proviso that the present problem of proliferation of courses at Department of Further Education level and College of Advanced Education level, with the possibility of there being some competition for courses, the Minister should be allowed some scope for at least negotiating with both the Department of Further Education and the College of Advanced Education on the question of courses, and particularly in relation to the established needs of the community as assessed and determined by the Minister. That subsequent compromise was agreed upon.

In regard to the third amendment, this was far and away the most contentious of the matters and it was debated for several hours, to the extent that ultimately it was decided that for the time being this Bill would remain silent on the question of compulsory student unionism and the collection of fees. The various points of view expressed around the table and in the two Houses were considered at great length by both the Minister and members of the Conference. In addition, a number of different communications addressed to the Minister and to members were also considered. I believe that the main consideration that ultimately caused the Conference to decide upon its present course of action was that the clause, as contained in the bill when it emerged from the House of Assembly, was such as to make the question of voluntary student unionism a difficult one to implement.

This fact has been considered by both the Western Australian and Victorian Governments and a number of obstacles that would be almost insurmountable should the Bill have been put into operation from 1 January were brought to my attention. For that reason, I decided to accept the silent nature of the Bill on this matter and also to give notice to the House that during the ensuing year the matter of voluntary student unionism would be pursued, particularly by the Government and possibly by the newly appointed council of the College of Advanced Education. I endorse the recommendations of the Conference and recommend them to the House for adoption.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I, like the Minister, commend the recommendations of the Conference. I believe that they show the constructive decisions of all members of that conference throughout the day and I wish to give my thanks not only to my colleagues on this side of the House but also to Government members in both this place and another place. After lengthy, exhaustive debate that involved a lot of serious consideration of the issues involved and a great many possible alterations and amendments that were considered exhaustively, we have come up with a series of recommendations that deserve the support of this place and of another place. I pay particular credit to my colleagues in another place, the Hon. Anne Levy and the Hon. Barbara Wiese whom I did not mention previously.

The first amendment relates to the alterations to the discrimination clause, and I believe that the conference has fined up the amendment and improved it quite substantially compared to the amendment as it came from the Legislative Council. It is therefore a more relevant and useful insertion. Amendment No. 2, relating to clause 13 (2), deals with the passive collaboration of the Minister. We deliberated on this matter for some time and debated exactly what was meant by 'collaboration' and exactly what types of events

and instances might arise where a Minister might need to collaborate with the council of the college. In the final analysis, I believe that the addition to that clause with new clause 3 takes into account one area of consultation that should be noted. I believe that that amendment is very sound.

Amendment No. 3 relates to compulsory student unionism. Again, I am pleased that the conference chose to recommend that the Bill remain silent on this matter and that much further consideration should be given to the issues involved. It became clear to us, like the proverbial committee that was asked to design a horse that ends up with a camel, that we were floundering around for a considerable time debating all the issues involved. Of course, there were some major differences of philosophy on this issue, and those issues led the conference to consider that it was better that the Bill remain silent in regard to that matter at this stage and that further consideration be given to it in future. I commend the conference for having made that decision.

Once again, I thank the staff, including the Parliamentary Counsel, who assisted us throughout the day at very short notice. Not only did they provide us with opinions about the suggested wording but also they drafted a great number of possible amendments, many of which never finally hit the deck. However, they did that patiently and with good humour. I thank all the Parliamentary members who served at that conference. I refer in this respect to the member for Ascot Park on this side of the House, and on the Government side the Minister, who had a very long day, the member for Brighton, and the member for Mawson. I also thank the Legislative Council conference managers: the Hon. Mr Laidlaw, the Hon. Mr Hill, the Hon. Anne Levy, the Hon. Barbara Wiese, and the Hon. Lance Milne, who was very active in the debate throughout the day. I commend the recommendations to the Committee.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday 9 February 1982 at 2 p.m.

In doing so, I take this opportunity to wish everyone in this place and everyone associated with it the compliments of the season.

Mr Trainer: All members?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, all members. There may be occasions of confrontation, and I believe that that is what the member opposite may have in mind. We may tend to overlook on occasions that we are all South Australians and Australians, and, although we may believe that we approach the duties of this place and those associated with Parliament in a different way, underneath I believe that we all share common motives. At times such as this it is probably just as well to remember that. We are here for the welfare of the people of this State and those we seek to serve. So I certainly include all members of this place when I wish everyone associated with the Parliament the compliments of the season. If my memory serves me correctly, it is usual at the end of a session that we go into some detail in relation to the contribution made by the staff, the officers, and other people associated with this place. I should like very briefly to single out two people, because they are leaving the Parliament. The first, of course, is Miss Stengert, who has been here, as we heard yesterday, since 1953 and whose contribution to the workings of the Parliament would, I believe, be very difficult,

if not well nigh impossible, to match. As has been pointed out, Miss Stengert has personal attributes that are quite outstanding, and the contribution that she has made to the welfare of every member who has been in this place has been quite remarkable. Indeed, Miss Stengert is held in the highest esteem and affection not only by all members of Parliament who have been associated with her but also by all those people on the staff for whom she has been responsible. Again, on behalf of the Government, I say 'Thank you'. I know that all members in this place will wish Miss Stengert a healthy and contented retirement when she leaves the place at the end of this year.

I would also like to mention Marge Newman who, I understand, is leaving the catering staff at the end of the year. Marge has been here for 15 years, which means that she has been here for longer than most of us. We would like to take this opportunity of thanking Marge for the service that she has given to the Parliament. We wish her well as she joins her husband in retirement.

In moving this adjournment motion, I wish the compliments of the season to all members, the staff and officers, and to the persons who are associated with the smooth running of this House. I thank them for those services.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to join with the Deputy Premier in his sentiments. In the words of Churchill, we have differed and quarrelled in the past, but now one cause unites us all. In this instance, that cause is the festive season, and we will at last have some relief for a few weeks from the rigours of the Parliamentary session.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr BANNON: I thought that the Deputy Premier would appreciate a Churchillian quotation, and I notice that he did. As the Deputy Premier pointed out, this is not the end of the session: we must return in February and March to complete some business and perhaps deal with some long awaited legislation that we have been promised for some time. However, in the meantime, we can take a break and relax.

I would like to join the Deputy Premier in his good wishes for the Christmas season and the new year to all of his colleagues, but more particularly to the staff, *Hansard*, and other people who serve the House. The Deputy Premier referred particularly to Miss Evelyn Stengert, who for the first time in some 30 years will not be with the Parliament next year. She will certainly leave a very great gap indeed. The warmth of the tributes that were paid to her the other day at a gathering of all members and staff of this Parliament indicated just how much she has contributed in all sorts of ways to the life and welfare of members of Parliament.

We know Miss Stengert mainly through her role of being in charge of the catering facilities, and she has rendered sterling service in that area. People perhaps do not realise the extent to which she has helped individual members with various requests and has acted as a kind of house matron to the House over a long period of time. In my own case I remember well an occasion when I had an important engagement to attend and had to change in the House before going to it, and discovered that I had a vital button missing from my garb. I had nowhere to turn but to Miss Stengert, who rallied immediately and not only found a button, but also sewed it on for me. That is the sort of thing that we have come to appreciate very much from Miss Stengert. She really will leave a big gap indeed. Members have already paid a tribute to her and will be assembling again in the new year to do so more formally.

Marge Newman has also been mentioned as someone who has served the House in a part-time capacity, but over

a long period of time. She, too, will be missed. I echo the Deputy Premier's remarks. We have had a pretty tough session, and there is more to come. At most times, even into the early hours of the morning (and fortunately over the past couple of months we have had a bit less of that than we had earlier in the year), we have managed to retain some kind of perspective and some sense of humour. I hope that that will continue, whatever the differences between both sides of the House. I wish all members a very merry Christmas and a successful new year.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I, too, would like to join with the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in extending to all members the compliments of the season. I would like to say a special thanks to all members of this House, as members of either the Opposition or the Government, for the co-operation that they have given to me when I have sought their assistance. I would like to thank the domestic staff, particularly Evelyn and Marge. The tributes to Evelyn are well shared by all, and we certainly wish both Evelyn and Marge a long and happy retirement. No doubt we will see them come back to this place from time to time, and I am sure that we will all be pleased to see them.

Unfortunately, the Premier is not with us during this last week, but we hope that his sickness is only temporary and that he is soon back and fit and well again. I would like to thank the Library staff, officers, Clerks and messengers of the House, who have been most helpful whenever their assistance has been sought. In particular, I would like to thank the members of *Hansard* staff for the part that they played in the conduct of the proceedings of this House. I say with pleasure that I hope all members have a happy and healthy Christmas.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I wish to place on record my best wishes to the members of this House under your care, Mr Speaker, and of course to the staff who have serviced us throughout this period. I rise on this occasion also to convey to the House my disappointment for the neglect that I have received on this side of the House throughout this recent session and I indicate to you, Mr Speaker, and to members, just how boring it is when one does not enjoy the activity that others do. In saying that, it is only fair that I extend gratitude to those few members opposite who have recognised the portfolio of agriculture and have allowed me the opportunity, on isolated occasions, to respond. Accordingly, I look forward during the next period, in 1982, to a little more involvement by the Opposition, so that I can indeed respond for that all-important industry that I represent.

However, it is now that stage of the year when good wishes are flying around the place freely. Indeed, although tonight has been long and hard, I have enjoyed the paternity that has been extended by members on both sides of the House. It would be tremendous if that attitude could be extended throughout the period, but I understand that politics do not allow it. In the meantime, to you, Mr Speaker, and all members, I wish the happiest of Christmases and indeed, a fruitful year in 1982.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): Once again we have come to the end of a year.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr PETERSON: Well, we all know that. One does not have to turn somersaults. We have come to the end of a fairly eventful year.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr PETERSON: May I finish? We have come to the end of a fairly eventful year. It has been—

An honourable member: An eventful year.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, and a year of ups and downs and some wins and losses for all on both sides of this House. It has been an interesting year politically and, I am sure, for the State, and for all in this House. However, there have been a few disappointments for one or two members of the House, but these things happen. I would like to add my thanks to the staff of this Parliament, be they *Hansard* or other staff. They are magnificent people. I have been here now for several years and I have never seen, in those two years, an occasion where I have had a harsh word from the staff, whether they be *Hansard* or other staff. They have been magnificent to me and I am sure to everyone else. I would like initially to thank those people for their attitude to me; I am sure they extend to all other members of Parliament. They have made my life a lot easier and have given me a shoulder to cry on every now and then, and have given me an area of solace when I have been looking for someone to bleat to.

Mr Trainer: Are you talking about the Minister of Health?

Mr PETERSON: The Minister of Health is a very nice person. I like the Minister of Health.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Whether she is a good Minister of Health or not, is a different question. As a person, the Minister of Health is a magnificent person.

An honourable member: And an excellent Minister of Health, too.

Mr PETERSON: I did not say that. On all the occasions that I have had to deal with her on matters of health, the Minister of Health has always been extremely helpful, and I respect her for that. I respect all Ministers for the help that they have given me. However, some are more helpful than others, although that is to be expected. However, they are the Government and we must respect them for being the Government, and they are the Ministers and we must respect them for that. I have approached them in each of their portfolios as the occasions have arisen.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Some problems have been solved and some have not. If we want to speak about seaweed, I am sure that I could be here for quite some time talking about seaweed and sand. I am sure that we do not want to speak about it. However, I do wish to thank all elected members of the House and all members of the staff—

An honourable member: And *Hansard*.

Mr PETERSON: I have referred to *Hansard* three times already. Does the honourable member want me to say it again? I thank the members of this place, whether they work here or are elected members, and wish them a merry Christmas. I have worked around Australia, and in this State particularly, among many groups of people. I have never met a group of people as nice (with my meaning of 'nice') as the staff of this place. To me that is important.

I respect the Ministers for the help they have given me, and the Opposition for the help I have received from some of its members.

The Hon. H. Allison: They helped to put you in and they will help to put you out.

Mr PETERSON: The Minister of Education has made a comment, but I will be here for some time yet. However, this is not the time of year to talk about those things. I thank the staff for their help, and I wish them and all elected members of the House, as individuals, the very best for the Christmas season. We tend to forget that we are in this very important season. How much time have I got left, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member would appreciate that certain Standing Orders refer to the inability of a member to proceed with repetitive comment.

Mr PETERSON: As always, I respect your ruling, Sir. I believe you do a remarkable job as Speaker—and perhaps that means that I will get a couple of questions a week from now on! I hope that the coming year will be a happy one for us all although, in this political life, one side will be right and one side will be wrong. I am getting a signal to wind up from the Minister of Agriculture, and that is most unusual, because he is one Minister in this House who really can drag out a reply to a question. I thank him for clearing the boxthorn off the beach at Semaphore. I wrote the Minister a nasty letter and he replied, but he did take the boxthorn off the beaches. Finally, I thank the people of Semaphore who elected me to this place, because my time here has been a magnificent experience. Once again, I extend my best wishes to everyone.

The SPEAKER: It is my pleasure to respond, on behalf of the staff, to the comments and felicitations directed towards them. I have news for the Deputy Premier. On reflection, Miss Stengert believes that Miss Bottomly was correct and that it was 1951 when she came here, and not 1953, as she claimed. By the time we come back for the recognition of her services, I am sure that we will have been able to extract from the records the precise date of arrival, departure, return, and final departure. I know that Miss Stengert was particularly appreciative of the recognition given to her yesterday, and she has asked me to pass on to the members the fact that the tangible recognition will go a long way towards assisting her in making her new flat exactly what she would want for herself for the future.

Indication has been given of the work undertaken by many staff members in many different directions. The Parliament House staff is a conglomerate. Those outside do not recognise the number of people who are in here and who are responsible for making the place tick. It is an interesting group of people with a diverse series of activities, and each and every one contributes, as has been indicated, and I know that the work they undertake is appreciated.

I would like to single out one person who has been missing from the Chamber for some time but who visited the House earlier this week, looking much heartier than he had been looking, very keen to throw away his stick, and quite determined to come back and take up where he left off. I refer to Bob Harrison, who has had a rough time, but fortunately, as a result of ray treatment, is showing a degree of improvement. I know that members have a great deal of sympathy for Bob Harrison and the difficulties he has had. As they have already indicated, season's greetings are extended to every member of the staff.

I now formally put the motion proposed by the Deputy Premier, which has been given due consideration by a number of members, not least of whom is the member for Semaphore, who clearly indicated the reason why the Minister of Agriculture fails to get a great number of questions.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 12.29 to 1.10 a.m.]

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

TEA TREE GULLY (GOLDEN GROVE) DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 6)

ADJOURNMENT

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

At 1.12 a.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 9 February 1982 at 2 p.m.