HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 17 June 1982

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

PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 3 278 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling, 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 were presented by the Hon. J. D. Corcoran and Messrs Blacker, Lewis, and Russack.

Petitions received.

PETITION: EDUCATION

A petition signed by 218 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to increase the priorities given to all levels of education was presented by Mr Crafter.

Petition received.

PETITION: NORTHERN METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT

A petition signed by 740 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to review the public transport system in the northern metropolitan region was presented by Mr Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling for questions I indicate that questions for the honourable Minister of Agriculture will be taken by the honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr BANNON: Can the Premier say whether it is a fact that the Government is planning to hold a referendum on the Roxby Downs indenture Bill? I have been informed that the Government plans to hold such a referendum because of its reluctance to call a general election, because of its low standing in the public opinion polls, the rebuff it suffered in the Mitcham by-election, and the advice given to the Premier last week by Prime Minister Fraser that an early South Australian election would interfere with the Fraser Government's electoral time table.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The answer to all of those flights of imagination dressed up as questions is 'No'.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Premier inform the House of the number of jobs currently supported by the Roxby Downs project?

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: You people might find jobs down the drain funny, but we don't.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Todd will come to the question.

Mr ASHENDEN: There have been many reports on the potential employment impact of the Roxby Downs project, but there are many people already employed now at the Olympic Dam site, along with service support contractors. Now that the Labor Party, supported by the Democrats, has rejected the project, what are the implications for the existing workers associated with the project?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The implications for those people are quite serious, under the present circumstances. It is one of the reasons that we wish to have urgent discussions with the joint venturers, to see what can be done at present to preserve the jobs of those people at Roxby Downs. But, there are quite a number of people who depend on Roxby Downs at present. It has been estimated that there are something like 1 000 people employed directly and indirectly on the Roxby Downs project. The number of people working at Olympic Dam today is 207, and in Adelaide 60, which totals 267 direct employees and direct contractor employees. But what is forgotten is that hundreds more are employed by subcontractors to service the workers and their families at the mine site. I give some examples: daily air charter between Adelaide and Olympic Dam; daily heavy haulage between Adelaide and Olympic Dam; daily water transport to Woomera, to Olympic Dam; a bus service three days a week, Adelaide to Olympic Dam. The major contractors regularly supply transportable buildings. Three companies are in that business; other items include P.V.C. piping, generating plant maintenance, general construction services, telecommunications, catering services, heavy engineering, electronic equipment, analytical laboratory services, medical care, and road construction. I do not think that is an exhaustive list. Approximately 53 children travel to school in Andamooka each day, representing a significant proportion of total enrolment.

I think it is quite clear to honourable members that I am outlining to the House jobs that are filled now. It is not employment in the future; it is jobs now. The Labor Party has effectively voted to add up to 1 000 to the numbers of unemployed in this State. Many of these employees are trade union members, and they are asking what they have done; why they have been betrayed by their own Party; what has happened to that Party; and why that Party has voted to sack people who want and need the jobs with that project. They are in employment and this project keeps them in employment and keeps their families. They have every right to ask exactly what has happened to the Party which is supposed to represent their interests. Why does that Party stand in the way not only of their jobs now but of jobs in the future? These are the questions that those people will be asking the Labor Party from now on. Not only that, but they will see Labor's public indignation about the unemployment figures from time to time for what it is: a total and absolute sham. The Labor Party in this House has the opportunity to do something positive about unemployment, something that it has been complaining and worrying about, so it says, for so long. What it has done, effectively, is to vote to destroy 1 000 jobs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: All I can say is that the socialist left, led by the alternative Leader, who is quietly standing in the background, must be laughing its head off.

OPEN SPACE ACQUISITION PROGRAMME

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: What plans has the Minister of Environment and Planning to reactivate the open space acquisition programme run by the State Planning Authority (to use the verbiage of the Planning and Development Act), and, in particular, is he concerned at a statement by the authority on page 16 of its annual report for 1980-81? Under the heading 'Future Development and Management', the report states:

The four-year programme agreed to by the authority, whilst continuing as a basis for assessing future works priorities, has been superseded by the conservation, open space and recreation funding package from Treasury. Drastic cuts have been made in funds available for reserve development and no further land acquisition will be permitted except with the approval of Cabinet.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am very pleased that the honourable member raised this question, because it provides me with the opportunity to explain what the Government is doing in this area. The present Government is concerned (and has made public statements) about retention of native vegetation in South Australia. When we first came into office, we considered priorities in regard to the conservation of the parks and reserves under our responsibility. It was recognised that our first priority must be the management of those areas already under the parks and reserves management scheme. We as a Government have been very successful in improving management in those parks and reserves. In fact, last night I had the opportunity to attend the first conference for four years of all field staff in the National Parks and Wildlife Service, and I was able to talk to the staff and to hear their comments about the service. The improvement in management was referred to.

I refer now to open space. We had to make a decision in regard to our responsibilities in the management of open space and future acquisition. It was decided that management should be our first priority and that, instead of purchasing more open space and looking to more acquisition, we should protect vegetation, and particularly native vegetation, through the vegetation retention programme in country areas. That has been done. We have introduced a scheme, which has proved to be most successful and which other States have recognised and taken a great deal of interest in. Heritage agreements in this State have been recognised generally as being a vast improvement in the Government's responsibility in protecting native vegetation.

Regarding the metropolitan area, the Government, through the new planning legislation, appreciates its responsibility in acquiring open space for recreation purposes. I would hope that the honourable member opposite would know enough about the legislation, because it has been debated in this House and was passed successfully at the end of last year, to have an understanding of our responsibility under that legislation in regard to future open space. I know that the State Planning Authority has expressed some concern, and concern has been expressed to me. I have also had the opportunity to consult people in the authority about its responsibilities under the new legislation, and I believe that it now accepts that the Government is taking a proper role in regard to open space.

HERITAGE AGREEMENTS

Mr LEWIS: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say whether the Government under the Heritage Act will force landowners to sign heritage agreements covering areas on their properties? Some of my constituents have brought to my attention that certain groups are asking the Government to force landowners to sign heritage agreements with the Minister of Environment and Planning in relation to areas on their properties. I seek clarification of the Government's policy on this matter, as it seriously affects the way in which property owners plan their cropping programmes and future enterprises.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I thank the member for Mallee for his question. As I mentioned in reply to the last question, heritage agreements and the vegetation retention programme have indeed been very successful in South Australia. However, some concern has been expressed, and I, too, have been contacted by people who have the same concerns as those expressed by the member for Mallee. I want to clarify the situation, because heritage agreements were introduced on a voluntary basis. It was made quite clear at the time the Heritage Act was amended that that should be the case.

I emphasise that heritage agreements are voluntary; they are a voluntary scheme between the landowner and the Minister of Environment and Planning. There is no way possible that the Government would want to force any landowner to sign such an agreement covering land that he owns. The Government made that quite clear at the time when the Bill was debated in this House, and we have continued to press that point when the matter has been raised.

I want to clarify the situation because I know that people in the community, particularly in the rural community, are concerned about any force being placed on them to come to an agreement under the heritage agreement scheme. The scheme works on a voluntary basis, and the Government intends that it should remain that way.

PERMANENT HEADS

Mr TRAINER: In view of the fact that a significant number of Public Service permanent heads are considering early retirement in the near future, will the Premier give an undertaking that the Government will not appoint new permanent heads before the State election and, if not, why not? I have been informed that a number of permanent heads are likely to retire early. The factors given for early retirements are low Public Service morale under the Tonkin Government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: —and alterations to State Superannuation Fund pension commutation rates. At present up to 30 per cent of pensions can be converted to a lump sum, but this is to be reduced by from 17 per cent to 21 per cent in the near future, depending on age. According to the Public Service list, up to nine permanent heads have reached the age of 55 years, which entitles them to superannuation benefits. The Director-General of Further Education already has announced his intention to quit. If the Tonkin Government were to make appointments to a number of key public service positions just before an election, it would limit the ability of a newly-elected Government to impose its own priorities.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Members opposite are obviously labouring under a great strain, which is causing them to have quite remarkable flights of fantasy: they are nearly as bad as the flight of fantasy in which a former Premier indulged recently when he said that the next Tonkin Budget would cut expenditure by one-third. I do not know whether perhaps Mr Dunstan has been out of Government for so long that he has forgotten how things work, but I have heard that statement repeated, and I think it came from the other side of the House only yesterday. It is, of

course, quite an absurd proposition. It would just not be possible to undertake such a cut, nor, of course, is there any intention to do such a thing.

Mr Trainer: What's this got to do with the question?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It clearly demonstrates the sort of ridiculous fantasies in which the honourable member appears to be indulging. There are quite a number of permanent heads retiring, because of changes in the commutation rates which occur from time to time, as at the end of June. A considerable time must elapse before the next State election must be held, and I would remind the honourable member that, on my calculations, this could be anything up to eight or nine months. It would be totally and absolutely improper to leave those positions vacant for that length of time: that is almost as ridiculous as the suggestion made that there might be a 33 per cent cut in spending on the State Budget. I think the honourable member and his colleagues are living in cloud cuckoo land.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr GLAZBROOK: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs give the House some examples of the spin-off benefits generated by such projects as Roxby Downs and say what is the likelihood of disruption to other companies in the future? There have been claims and, indeed, counter claims about the benefits of projects such as Roxby Downs and, in particular, their impact on the economy of the State as a whole. Although Roxby Downs is only in its infancy, I have been informed that it was already making quite a significant input to the State's economy, but now that the Roxby Downs project has been placed in jeopardy by the defeat of the indenture Bill—

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

Mr GLAZBROOK: Sorry, Mr Speaker. I would appreciate it if the Minister could give some details of other ventures and companies which face disruption if the project does not go ahead.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am delighted to add further detail to what the Premier said in answering a question this afternoon. I would like to refer to three specific companies and describe the sort of impact that is a spin-off from a development like Roxby Downs. The first is based on a conversation I had this morning with the Managing Director of Rossair Pty Ltd, Mr Frank Calder, who said if the Roxby Downs indenture did not go ahead it would have a dramatic effect on his company. In the past 18 months resource development in this State has seen Rossair lift its fleet from one to seven aircraft, including a cost of between $400 000 and $500 000 per aircraft. The Roxby Downs project and the Moomba gas fields have been responsible for this growth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Even though Roxby Downs is in its infancy, Mr Calder says that the company uses at least 1½ aircraft full time, with all the back-up facilities that are needed. Rossair has significantly expanded its staff over the past 18 months, including another 11 pilots, five engineers and two booking clerks. It now has a total staff of 80 people in this State. Spin-off effects on other sections of the aviation industry are also considerable, as Rossair now needs more parts, more fuel and all the other material to operate an airline. Mr Calder specifically asked that we name his company and use his name in giving these facts, because he is absolutely irate at the rejection of the Roxby Downs indenture Bill and the significant impact it will now have on jobs here in Adelaide.

The next company, employing several hundred people in Adelaide, has a very significant presence already at Roxby Downs. It states that the whole future of its operations in South Australia is now placed in a very serious position because of the rejection of the indenture Bill. On the assumption that the project would proceed, this company has been gearing up to supply the needs of the major construction camp in about 12 months time. Like so many companies involved in major works, lead time and planning for involvement in major projects is long. By scheduling works associated with Roxby Downs, this company must now scramble to find alternative work beyond the end of July. That is how immediate it is: by the end of July that company needs to find alternative work. I would like the honourable member to listen to this last fact, because it is devastating. The management of the company, which is employing hundreds of people in Adelaide, predicts that the size of the company and its work force will contract by up to 50 per cent by the end of the year.

The third company I wish to relate to the House is a company that already has a presence at Roxby Downs and will be employing one extra person for every 10 people on site at Roxby Downs. This company states that the spin-off effects and the work created by supplies purchased by their company here in Adelaide and sent to Roxby Downs is very considerable and that this also will have a devastating effect on its operations at Roxby Downs.

It is quite obvious, from the statements made by companies such as these and by several other companies that have expressed their concern this morning, that this State will not proceed, cannot expand, and cannot continue to employ people at the present level if major development projects worth $1 500 000 000 are stopped in their tracks by a Labor Party that fails to understand or comprehend.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to please resume his seat. I should indicate to the House that I am concerned that a series of questions being asked and answers being given are perilously close to a reflection upon a vote in another place, and I ask all members, no matter on which side of the House they sit, to watch very carefully the Standing Orders and the method of their application in this place.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am trying to highlight what I describe as the spin-off effects in Adelaide from major resource development projects in this State, and I stress the fact that, unless the projects are allowed to proceed, they will have an enormous impact on employment and business confidence in this State. Responsibility for that lack of confidence and that loss of jobs must lie with the people who are responsible for stopping such projects.

TEACHER HOUSING

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Education give further consideration to Teacher Housing Authority rentals on tribal Aboriginal reserves and other remote areas with a view to effecting real reductions in rental rates and, if he will not, why not? Members will recall that on 4 March I asked the Premier about rentals on T.H.A. houses in remote areas of the State, and in his reply the Premier said:

> The matter is being considered by a Cabinet subcommittee, and will be considered by Cabinet soon. Regarding housing at Andamooka, the honourable member will be aware . . . that the present situation there and at certain Aboriginal settlements is currently under review by an interdepartmental committee because of the unusual situation which applies.

On 13 May, and presumably as a follow-up to that statement by the Premier, the Minister of Education indicated in the following terms:

Cabinet approval on 27 April is that teachers at schools covered by the Teachers Salaries Board—Locality Allowance Award be given subsidies against general residence rental scales approved from time to time by Cabinet with effect from 11 September 1981, as follows:

There then followed a table indicating that group 1 schools would attract a 60 per cent subsidy and group 2 schools a 50 per cent subsidy. The statement went on:

In addition, Yalata, Nepabunna and Oodnadatta in group 3, Marree from group 4 and Koonibba from group 5 have been approved to receive a 40 per cent subsidy.

The statement then went on to indicate that the matter had been referred to the Budget Review Committee for urgent consideration. Since that statement was made, I have been approached by a number of teachers who are residents of such houses and who are very concerned about the situation. They have pointed out that the Minister's statement referred to the general residence rental scales, not to policy rents, and policy rents are separately determined and not subject to those reductions of 60 per cent, 50 per cent, or 40 per cent. The teachers have pointed out to me that last year the policy rents increased by $8, a 40 per cent increase, and they indicate that they have heard strong rumours that there will be a similar increase this year.

They have told me that the statement of 13 May indicates an increased subsidy for a non-existing rent as far as they are concerned. They have said that the new policy would result, in some cases in those areas, in further rent increases on what they are at present paying, not a reduction, and that the 60 per cent and 50 per cent were therefore entirely out of context. In the light of the proposed reduction in the Education Department's vote to the Teacher Housing Authority, from $990 000 to $820 000, they are concerned that their rents will go up, not down.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Teacher housing rentals in the regional groups 1 and 2 refer specifically to houses in the Aboriginal areas, and I believe that the houses in group 3 are at Yalata and Nepabunna, and were all houses occupied by teachers in Aboriginal settlements.

These were all the subject of special negotiations between February and May of this year and in fact the original intended increase in rent placed those Aboriginal houses on a par with the subsidised rentals payable by all other teachers in South Australia. That arrangement was negated and a separate and much smaller increase was negotiated and advised to the departmental housing occupants in those areas.

The honourable member referred to the fact that teacher housing rents had been increased. I would once again remind the House that, in September 1979, rents for houses in the Teacher Housing Authority's care were to have been increased in accordance with rents for houses under the care of the South Australian Housing Trust. Those rents were not increased in 1979 and 1980 and were not in fact increased until September 1981; in other words, for two whole years, from September 1979 to September 1981, there was no increase in Teacher Housing Authority rentals of any kind.

Mr Lynn Arnold: You promised a reduction.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member keeps referring to this old red herring that the Government promised a reduction. Let me simply point out to the rather thick mentalities, or at least they are not very mathematically oriented—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You are being very kind to us.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If the honourable member accepts it as a compliment, he can accept it that way; it was not intended that way. Many students have no trouble at all in working out mathematics. If every other person in South Australian Housing Trust occupancy has had his rent increased and teachers have been saved $640 000 over two years, then, to my way of thinking, and to that of youngsters doing basic mathematics in schools, that represents a reduction by comparison with what other people have been paying. I think the majority who have studied those statistics would agree with that.

Apart from that, there is an understanding between the Education Department and those residents in the remote outback areas who are in Aboriginal settlements that any future rent increases under this Government would be further considered and that the houses in those areas would be subject once again to special consideration.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr MATHWIN: Is the Premier aware that the Leader of the Opposition has alleged that the Government wanted the Roxby Downs indenture Bill to be defeated, and can the Premier say whether or not this is the case?

Mr Abbott: How are you going to explain this one?

Mr MATHWIN: It is funny how the Opposition gets all upset when I start—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come to his explanation, or he will be sat down.

Mr MATHWIN: In today's *News*, the Leader of the Opposition is reported as saying:

In my view it is the result the Government has wanted all along.

Mr Bannon: Correct. That is very true.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am interested to hear the Leader confirm by his interjection that he made that statement. The statement is untrue, as many of the Leader's other statements on this and other similar matters have been. The journalists who were in Parliament House during the early hours of the morning would have been very much aware of the Government's desire to have the legislation approved. The Hon. Mr Foster in another place will also be aware that the Leader's statement is untrue, following discussions which he had with the Minister of Mines and Energy earlier this morning. The Government officers who assisted the Minister of Mines and Energy during the last long months of negotiations will also be aware that the Leader's statement is quite untrue. I understand also that the Leader has alleged today that the Government has attempted to stop the companies talking to the Opposition about the matter. That statement is also untrue and that is quite apparent if one turns to the evidence given to the select committee. Page 157 of the select committee's evidence refers to a request by the member for Mitcham. The relevant part of the transcript is as follows:

I have considered that there could be areas of information that my colleague, the member for Baudin, or I might like to pursue and in anticipation of your considering that to be not unreasonable I have spoken to the two principals you have just mentioned concerning our arranging with them at their convenience to go to Melbourne or some other venue that might be indicated concerning obtaining further information. Obviously, I am not attempting to commit the committee in any way. Would you have any objection to such a course?

On the following page of the evidence the Deputy Premier was quoted as follows:

From the committee's point of view, I do not have any objection. I do not think the proposal is counter to any Standing Orders of the Parliament. If people want to go off and get information I think that is sensible, but if it is anything that is going to be of concern to the committee, it must be on the record.

Honourable members will see from that evidence that what the Leader has suggested today about the Government's putting obstacles in the way of the Opposition is completely untrue.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: The Leader of the Opposition said Mr Morgan came and saw him.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition is also on record as saying that he had discussions with Mr Morgan, of Western Mining. For him to say that obstacles were put in the way of proper discussions with officers of Western Mining Company, the joint venturers, and the Opposition, is totally and completely false, as is his allegation today that the defeat of the Bill was exactly what the Government wanted. That is totally disgraceful, and certainly untrue.

SPORTS INSTITUTE BOARD

Mr SLATER: Does the Minister of Recreation and Sport believe that women and women's organisations are adequately represented on the Sports Institute Board?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: This matter has received some publicity in the last week. Indeed, I received a letter today from the Women's Sporting Committee of ACHPER, and a letter from the Leader of the Opposition, also referring to that letter. Let me put the whole matter in its context. The South Australian Institute of Sport, which has been described by its Director, Mr Nunan, as the best thing that has happened in sport in South Australia in 20 years—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Call him Mike, Mike!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I have to admit that Mr Nunan does coach North Adelaide, but that has no bearing on his appointment! However, this is a serious question and I am not trying to take away from that. One of the first accusations made was that there was too narrow a range of sports represented on the Sports Institute, in fact, that it was dominated by football and cricket. Then a series of names was given in the newspaper article. Mr Nunan and Mr Jarver were mentioned. I point out that they are officers of the Sports Institute, employees of that institute, and not members of its board. The board members are not there to represent their particular sport; they are there to do a specific job. They have all been selected because of a particular expertise. I will run through them: the Chairman, Mr Geoff Motley, a very popular appointment as Chairman, is there not necessarily because he was a very good footballer—

Mr Plunkett: He came from Port Adelaide.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: He came from Port Adelaide, and he did coach North Adelaide, but, in fact, he is there not only because of his sporting ability, but because of his administrative ability. He is a very successful business man and a very good administrator, and that is what the Sports Institute needs: good administration. Mrs Marjorie Nelson hardly needs any introduction to the sporting public of Australia, let alone South Australia. It is quite obvious that we are very fortunate to have her as a member of the Sports Institute.

She is on the board to do a particular job, because she has a very deep knowledge of athletics and the administration of athletics, having been recently Chairman of the Olympic Council in South Australia. The name Mr Howard Mutton comes readily to mind, and no-one in South Australia who follows sport could deny that man's qualifications to be on the board of the Sports Institute. Mr Mutton has a very deep involvement in sport through the Education Department and is well regarded in this State because of what he has done for sport in that department. He is also the coaching director of the South Australian Sheffield Shield team, so he is on the board for that reason also. Mr Denis Glencross is on the board not because he represents hockey (although he is highly regarded as a hockey coach in South Australia) but because he is probably our leading sports psychologist.

These people have not been appointed to the board because of the sports they represent but because of what they can bring to the institute. Mr Ken Cunningham probably knows more about sport in general, because of his employment, than do most people in South Australia. He has continual contact with members of all different sports, which is more than could be said for many members here. Mr Peter Bowen-Payne is a past manager of the Australian Olympic swimming team and is a lawyer. He is on the board to do a particular job. The board of the Sports Institute was selected to do a job, and not to represent individual sports. I believe, and the Government believes, that those people are the best for that job. No decision was taken to leave women off the institute. We endeavoured to get people who could do the job in a balanced representation.

Let me add that the members of the Sports Advisory Council are coming up for reappointment in the near future. The members' terms have expired and the House can be assured (and those organisations in the community that have complained can be assured) that there will be the usual strong representation of women on that council. The council has a job entirely different from the managing of the institute. Finally, I point out that this Government is the only Government to have appointed a woman to the board of the State Transport Authority and its predecessor, the M.T.T., in the history of that organisation.

ELECTORAL ACT

Mr BLACKER: Will the Minister of Education inform the House whether the Government will incorporate in the secondary school education curriculum the compulsory study of the operation of the State and Federal Electoral Acts, particularly those parts of the Acts which relate to the voting systems that apply in this State? In recent years, many of my constituents have expressed concern at the general lack of understanding in the community of the Electoral Acts. It has been suggested that, if all students who approach the age of being eligible to vote had a comprehensive understanding of the relevant Acts, community appreciation of the responsibility of voting would be better understood.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member's question is addressed to a subject which is at present optional in the South Australian State education system, and, in fact, the question of whether or not that topic might be incorporated into the school curriculum would be more appropriately answered by the Director-General of Education, who is statutorily responsible for curricula in South Australian State schools. I would be very pleased to address the honourable member's question to the Director-General of Education and bring back a personal report.

STRANGERS GALLERY

Mr HEMMINGS: Is the Chief Secretary aware that last night in the Strangers Gallery of the Legislative Council—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will please resume his seat. We are not in a position to accept questions relative to the activities of another Chamber in this Parliament. The honourable member can approach me with the question, but I cannot accept it in its present form.

ELECTORATE OFFICE

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: Will the Minister of Public Works inform the House whether there is any connection between the fact that it is now almost six weeks since the Mitcham by-election and four weeks since the declaration of the poll, (and my name is still not up on my electorate office), and the persistent rumours of an early election?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: I have received numerous complaints from my constituents that they cannot find the office. They have speculated on the possible reasons: the fact that I am a woman; that I represent the Australian Democrats; or that the Government hopes that I may vanish.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I was not aware that the honourable member's name was not painted on the electorate office window. I remember that the honourable member wrote to me about a week or two ago asking for the allocation of bookshelves to her electorate office, which request I approved. I give an undertaking that the painter will be there as soon as it is feasibly possible to do so. Immediately after Question Time today (I will not do it myself; knowing my painting skills it would be a disaster), I shall make sure that the job is done as quickly as possible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I can assure the honourable member that the fact that she happens to be an Australian Democrat, the fact that she happens to be a woman, or the fact that she might happen to be here until the next election (whether it be a by-election or a general election), has nothing whatsoever to do with her name not having been painted on the window. The job will be completed very quickly.

TUNA BOATS

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister of Marine have action taken to upgrade the facilities available to tuna boats unloading their tuna at the Streaky Bay jetty? I have been approached by persons who use that facility during the tuna season and who have complained about the delays and the difficulties in getting water down the jetty. The Minister might be aware that a large amount of the tuna processed at Port Lincoln is unloaded at Streaky Bay and is road transported down to Port Lincoln. If the Minister cared to visit one of the attractive tourist areas of South Australia during November, December or January, he would be able to see at first hand the large number of boats tied up waiting to unload. Therefore, I would be grateful if the Minister could give this matter his urgent consideration.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I take it from the last part of the honourable member's explanation that there is an invitation there somewhere, and I will be pleased to accept it; probably I could take the opportunity of looking at Venus Bay as well.

Mr Mathwin: Have a look at the oyster beds there, too.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The member for Glenelg reminds me that the oyster beds are worth seeing, too. However, I would be delighted to accept that invitation. I will also take it upon myself to get a report on the matter raised by the honourable member and let him have it as soon as possible.

FIREARMS

Mr HEMMINGS: Is the Chief Secretary aware that last night in a Chamber of this Parliament two police officers were present wearing exposed hand guns and, if so, is that a breach of an undertaking he gave my colleague the member for Stuart? Last night, during the Roxby Downs indenture debate, two police officers, namely, Constable No. 2829 and Senior Constable No. 1840, were in a Chamber of this Parliament wearing exposed Magnum hand guns. The Minister some time ago gave my colleague the member for Stuart an assurance that members of the Police Force would wear exposed hand guns only when the safety of the public was under threat. Whilst I was not in the particular Chamber at that time, I am assured that the people there were very orderly and that at no time was there any threat to the safety of members of Parliament or officers of the Parliament. It was put to me this morning by a member of the public, who is a constituent of mine, that the wearing of hand guns in this Parliament could be seen as a 'standover tactic by this Government'.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: The last comment of the honourable member defies response at all. In relation to the former part of his question, I would be pleased to indicate to the House the policy of the Police Department, a policy which this Government and I, as Chief Secretary, support. Police deployed in sensitive areas, such as Rundle Mall or sporting venues, processions, parades, etc., are not issued with the Smith and Wesson .357 revolver. If they are to be armed at all, in those circumstances they are issued with the .38 Browning automatic pistol, which is carried concealed. Only patrol personnel are issued with the Smith and Wesson, which is worn exposed. However, a patrol may be tasked to a sensitive area, and it follows that in those circumstances it is not possible to guarantee that patrolmen wearing exposed firearms would be sited in those sensitive areas.

I presume that the circumstances surrounding last night's incident arose because of the large number of people gathered at Parliament for what was—and is—the most significant issue to be placed before Parliament in this State for decades, resulting in the duty officer calling in extra support for the police who were rostered here, without those exposed firearms, I might add. I am sure the honourable member will appreciate that if we are to call in extra assistance at short notice, because of unforeseen circumstances, it is likely that this situation will prevail. Even the honourable member ought to be able to appreciate that from time to time that situation will arise, and unashamedly I support the Police Department in that situation. I will seek information to see whether my assumptions relative to the situation pertaining to last night are accurate.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Mr RANDALL: Has the Minister of Education seen the headline on page 3 of this afternoon's *News* entitled 'Morals rejected as special school topic'? Does this mean that morality is of no concern in the Education Department's system? The newspaper article from its title gives somewhat of an impression that needs to be answered. It states—

The SPEAKER: Order! I listened very closely to the question posed by the honourable member and, because he asked whether the Minister had seen a particular headline, the question was admissible. However, the manner in which the honourable member is now trying to identify his interest in the article is not an explanation of a question which is permissible under the Standing Orders.

Mr RANDALL: I thank you, Mr Speaker. The point that concerns me regarding the article is, first, the headline; and, secondly, the following statement:

> A Keeves Report call for introduction of a special State school subject on morals, values and beliefs has been rejected by the South Australian Education Department.

It is the second sentence which concerns me:

> It is one of several curriculum issues rejected by the department since it began assessing implementation of the education inquiry's recommendations, published in February.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I can understand the honourable member's concern and probably the concern of other members. The heading did give a misleading impression in so far as it suggested that the Education Department was reject-

ing any study of ethics and morals. In fact, I think that, if one had read a little further into the body of that report, one would have seen that it quoted a statement by the Director-General of Education, and I believe that this statement may have come from an assessment of either the Keeves Report or that other very important document in South Australian education, *Into the 80s*.

The Director-General has included that subject as part and parcel of the integrated courses of study for South Australian Government school students, but rather than have this as a separate and individual subject studied, say, in one or two lessons a week taught by an individual teacher, the Director-General has said that ethic and moral studies in South Australia should (I think the precise words were something like) 'permeate the whole educational fabric in South Australia' and that therefore this subject should be part of the curriculum of each and every teacher and would be part of every lesson, rather than there being just one lesson here and there on an *ad hoc* basis. In other words, it is a very important aspect of South Australia's educational system. I believe that the priorities given to it are appropriate, and they have been agreed to by the Institute of Teachers, the South Australian Association of State School Organisations, the South Australian Schools Parent Council, school councils, teachers, and all others who have been involved with the Education Department in putting together a policy for educational instruction into the 1980s.

BUS SIGNS

Mr ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Transport say how many illuminated electronic signs with both the destination and route number have been incorporated on State Transport Authority buses? There was a big media flurry when the Minister introduced the first bus with this sign some months ago. However, the signs seem to be conspicuous by their absence, and many pensioners and elderly citizens have asked whether the Government intends to continue with the idea, or is funding the problem.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, the Government does intend to continue with the idea. Funding is not the problem. The honourable member, when he read that press release a few months ago, may have noticed that it stated that destination signs would be only on new buses as they were incorporated into the fleet. The authority and the Government have decided that, as 70 or 80 buses a year are introduced into the fleet, it would be better to incorporate them in the new buses as they come on stream, so the first buses that the honourable member will see with destination signs will be in the new order of M.A.N. buses due for delivery this year.

I think there are 140 of those coming on stream, although not necessarily all in the next 12 months. The illustration that the honourable member saw in the newspaper with a destination sign contained therein was of one of the old buses that had the destination sign incorporated in it for testing purposes so that we could test the reliability of the signs. I assure the honourable member, the House and the public that this popular move will be instituted as promised, but it will be instituted on the new buses, as has always been the understanding.

LAKE ALBERT

Mr LEWIS: I direct a question to the Minister of Water Resources, and it is supplementary to the one I asked on Tuesday. In reply to that question, the Minister stated:

> I assure the honourable member that as soon as the necessary studies into the benefits of such a proposal—

the proposal was to construct a channel through the Narrung peninsula isthmus to provide a drainage point for Lake Albert—

> and an environmental impact assessment has been done on the effects that it would have on the Coorong, the proposal will be referred to the River Murray Commission for consideration as a River Murray Commission works.

Will the Minister say how long he expects that to take?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The part of the study which is taking the time is the water sampling at the entrance to Lake Albert at Meningie. The object is to determine the variation in changes in the water quality along the length of the lake, and this water sampling has to be done over a period in order to get an accurate picture so that the effects of the cutting of the opening or outlet from Meningie through to the Coorong can be determined. That work is proceeding as quickly as possible, but I cannot give the honourable member an accurate completion time. We will, however, certainly endeavour to have the work concluded as quickly as possible so that it can be referred to the River Murray Commission.

LAND TAX

Mr CRAFTER: Will the Premier, as Treasurer, reconsider his refusal to exempt from land tax small business operators whose principal place of residence is on the same land title as that of the business? It has been put to me by small business operators in this situation that they are penalised because they and their families happen to live at their place of business. Whilst the principal place of residence is exempt for almost all other South Australians, there appears to be a bias in the law against these small business operators.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, there is always a difficulty in such cases, and I know that the member for Norwood has been particularly concerned with one or two specific instances. It is a question that is always difficult: it is rather like the cut-off point that came about when this Government abolished succession duties. It abolished them as from a specific date (the end of December 1979) and, of course, there was a change-over period when people who had estates in respect of people who had died, for instance, on 30 December, felt that since the date was so close to the cut-off date they should be considered to have that law applied to them. Unfortunately, this cannot be done.

In many cases there are exceptional circumstances in respect of the concession which this Government has given on stamp duty on the purchase of a first home and, again, unfortunately, there will always be some people caught near the cut-off point. If we were to exempt every person who came into a particular category, it would have the effect of merely moving the cut-off point a little further down the line and inevitably other people would come close to that next cut-off point.

I have examined very carefully indeed the problem raised by the member for Norwood, and I have asked my Treasury officers to examine it further. There is some merit, I think, in saying that a business conducted on the property should be considered on its individual merits, depending exactly on how big the business is, how many people live on the property as a principal place of residence, how many of them move to employment outside, and a number of other factors of that nature. At present, I am afraid there is not much we can do to exempt from the land tax which is now payable everyone working from home, but certainly this is something that the Government will continue to keep in mind and examine.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Friday 18 June at 11 a.m.

COMPANIES (APPLICATION OF LAWS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Members will recall that, in accordance with South Australia's commitments under the co-operative companies and securities scheme, the Companies (Application of Laws) Act, 1982, was passed earlier this year. It is proposed that, together with similar Acts passed in the other States of Australia, it will come into operation on 1 July 1982. The Act applies the provisions of the Companies Act, 1981, of the Commonwealth as laws of South Australia, with variations agreed upon by the Ministerial Council for Companies and Securities to suit South Australian requirements. These variations are set out in schedule 1 to the Companies (Application of Laws) Act, 1982.

The purpose of this Bill is to allow trustee companies in this State to continue to act as liquidators. Each of the four South Australian trustee companies is empowered under its enabling legislation to act as liquidator. Registration as a liquidator under the Companies Act, 1981, of the Commonwealth is restricted to natural persons. The purpose of this amendment is to alter the application of the provisions of the Companies Act, 1981, of the Commonwealth in South Australia so that the South Australian trustee companies may continue to act as liquidators.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes the necessary amendment to schedule 1 of the principal Act. Schedule 1 sets out local variations to the Commonwealth provisions as they apply in South Australia. In this case an additional subsection will be inserted in section 417 of the Companies (South Australia) Code which will preserve the right of trustee companies to act as liquidators.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

CASINO BILL (1982)

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport): By leave, I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee on the Casino Bill, 1982, be extended until the first day of the next session and that the committee have leave to sit during the recess.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NORTH HAVEN DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): By leave I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee on the North Haven Development Act Amendment Bill be extended until the first day of the next session and that the committee have leave to sit during the recess.

Motion carried.

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): 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

It expands and makes more flexible the provisions of the Building Societies Act, 1975-1981, under which two or more building societies may amalgamate. At present section 21 of the principal Act provides that two more building societies may be amalgamated either upon application or at the direction of the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Section 22 prescribes the procedures for amalgamation by application. Briefly, each society involved must first be authorised by special resolution to apply to the Registrar of Building Societies. A joint application is then made and certain procedural requirements must be complied with, relating mainly to notification of members.

Pursuant to section 23 the Minister may, where a society is insolvent or in danger of becoming insolvent and another society agrees by special resolution to amalagamate with the first society, direct that the two societies amalgamate. Again, certain procedures must be complied with. Where section 22 or 23 has been complied with, the Registrar must, pursuant to new section 23a, register the society formed by the amalgamation, and its rules, and cancel the registration of the societies which have amalgamated. Pursuant to section 23a, the society resulting from the amalgamation has the combined assets and liabilities of the amalgamating societies.

Section 12 of the principal Act regulates the registration of new building societies. A major requirement is that of subsection (3), which provides:

(3) A society shall not be registered under this Act unless it has a share capital of not less than two million dollars of which not less than one million dollars is available on terms that:

(a) do not require repayment thereof before the expiration of ten years after the day on which it is received by the society; and

(b) require any repayment thereof to be made only with the consent of the Registrar.

By dint of section 23a (2), no societies may amalgamate, either voluntarily or by direction of the Minister, unless the resulting society would comply with section 12 (3). There is a strong argument that even without section 23a (2) any society resulting from an amalgamation under sections 22 or 23 would still have to comply with section 12 (3), as it would be a new society, and section 12 (3) refers unconditionally to new societies.

Two existing building societies have indicated that they wish to amalgamate pursuant to section 22 of the principal Act. They have discovered, however, that there are two obstacles to this proposal. The first, and more serious, is that the society which would result from the amalgamation cannot comply with the requirement as to capital base prescribed by section 12 (3). Both societies existed when the Act came into operation in 1975 and as such were exempted pursuant to section 4 (2) of the Act from the requirement to comply with section 12 (3). Even by amalgamation the societies cannot gain this required capital basis. The second obstacle is that the only method of amalgamation under the Act is the formation of a new, separate legal entity and the extinction of the amalgamating societies. These societies would rather be able to have one merely take over the other's assets and liabilities and so retain that first society's identity with the public.

The Government considers that, generally, the requirements of section 12 (3) should be retained as a benchmark with which new societies should comply and to which amalgamating societies should aspire. It considers, however, that there should be flexibility to allow amalgamations of existing societies where the resulting society would have a viable capital base, notwithstanding that it falls short of that prescribed in section 12 (3), and the amalgamation is in the public interest.

Accordingly, this Bill reproduces in Division V of Part III those provisions of Division II that should apply to a new society formed by amalgamation, including the requirement as to capital base, but confers power on the Registrar to exempt the new society from the capital base requirement if he is satisfied that there is good reason in the public interest for doing so. The Registrar is given this power as it is consistent with his role under the Act of maintaining close contact with societies and being the officer in the first instance responsible for scrutinising the industry. The Registrar is in the best position to assess a society's viability and the public effects of a proposed amalgamation. In practice, he would only make such a decision after consulting with the Building Societies Advisory Committee and Treasury officers so that all relevant factors are considered.

The Bill also adds a new type of amalgamation, namely, where one society transfers all its assets and liabilities to an existing society, rather than the two societies forming a third, new society. This will add to the range of options available to building societies to the benefit of the industry generally, by allowing the amalgamated society to retain its identity and association with the public, if it prefers to do so. The opportunity has also been taken to correct a drafting omission by inserting in section 3 the heading to Division V of Part VII.

The Building Societies Advisory Committee, which is established under the Act to advise and make recommendations to the Minister on the operations of building societies and comprises three representatives of building societies, the Registrar of Building Societies, a nominee of the Treasurer and a nominee of the Minister of Housing, supports this Bill as being in the best interests of the industry.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 inserts new definitions in the principal Act. The purpose of these new definitions is to widen the concept of 'amalgamation'. At present 'amalgamation' denotes the merger of two or more societies to form a totally new society which assumes all the rights and liabilities of the amalgamating societies. Under the proposed new definition a further concept of amalgamation is put forward under which one or more societies merge with another society without however affecting the corporate identity of that other society. Thus in this latter case no new society is formed by the amalgamation. Definitions of 'continuing society' and 'merging society' are also inserted in the principal Act. These definitions are consequential upon the expanded concept of amalgamation.

Clause 4 repeals sections 22, 23 and 23a of the principal Act and inserts new sections in their place. New section 22a deals with the manner in which an application for amalgamation is to be made. It provides that a society proposing to join in an application for amalgamation must send out certain information which is relevant to the application to its members. Where objection is made by 10 per cent or more of the members of the society to the proposed amalgamation the motion for the special resolution authorising the society to join in the application is not to be placed before a general meeting of the society. Subsection (6) authorises the Registrar to grant exemptions from the requirements of section 22 in appropriate cases. Before granting exemption he may give notice of the application for exemption and hear any interested persons on the question of whether the exemption should be granted. Section 23 deals with the case of a society which is insolvent or in danger of becoming insolvent. In such a case the Minister may direct an amalgamation.

The other society with which the insolvent or financially insecure society is to be amalgamated must have agreed by special resolution to accept the amalgamation. The provisions for giving notice to members of the proposal to pass such a special resolution and for the Registrar to grant exemptions correspond with similar provisions in the previous section. New section 23a provides for the amalgamation of societies where application has been duly made, or where the Minister directs such an amalgamation, and, under the terms of the amalgamation, a new society is to be formed. The section provides for the issue of a certificate of incorporation for the society to be formed by the amalgamation and for the transfer of the assets and liabilities of the amalgamating societies to the new society. New section 23b provides for the case where the amalgamation is to take effect by means of the merger of a society or societies with an existing society without affecting the corporate identity of that society. It provides for the transfer of assets and liabilities to the continuing society.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

FURTHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 June. Page 4710.)

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I was addressing the House yesterday on this matter when I raised the issue of the problem that could have been presented by the nefarious University of Boston, and I do not mean any such organisation of the same name that might exist in the United States. I realise, from advice that the Minister has given since then, that there may still have been difficulties with that organisation, even within the constraints of the legislation before it is proposed to be amended. That is probably a commentary on the type of amendment that might have been necessary, rather than a proposition that the section of the Bill should be totally removed.

I said yesterday that a number of organisations had made comments to me, but the very first approach that I had on this matter was from my colleague, the member for Norwood, who was particularly concerned about the provisions of the Bill before the House, because we had been approached by one organisation, namely, the South Australian Music and Audio Centre, which had expressed its very grave concern. That organisation advised the member for Norwood, and he consequently advised me, that it feared the Bill would have a bad effect on the whole industry, believing that there was a danger that the reputation of many private institutions of further education would be in danger. That organisation further made the point with my colleague that it was very annoyed at the lack of dialogue to which it had been privy on this matter. Its officers held the contention that other legislation does not cover the consumer aspect of all the consumers who may be requiring further education services from these private purveyors of further education.

The South Australian Music and Audio Centre indicated that the legislation, as presently before the House, plans for a compensatory effect, rather than a preventive effect. In other words, it seeks to fix up mistakes and problems after they have occurred, rather than preventing them from occurring in the first place. That is a very powerful complaint about the Bill that we have before us.

It was as a result of that approach from my colleague, instigated by the South Australian Music and Audio Centre, that I have made some further inquiries of other organisations. Perhaps, before I comment in greater detail on some of the contentions, I might summarise some of the attitudes that I received. The Pam Arnold Model Centre indicated that it was not happy about the Bill before the House. That centre felt that the one aspect about which it was satisfied with the amendment was that regarding the requirement that it no longer had to advise about fees. But, beyond that, it felt that the whole value of the system was being reduced by the Bill presently before the House.

The Pride Business College felt that there would be no supervisory control of teaching institutions, and that this could lead to a decrease of professionalism in this State. The Hales Business College feared that there could be a bad effect on industry, and forewarned that we might see the widespread use of unregistered teachers in unlicensed places. Of course, one of the duties of the Minister of Education is to be responsible for the well-being of consumers of educational services. In that capacity, the Minister takes on the responsibility to look after those interests, on behalf of all those consumers.

The present Bill, in certain respects, however, abnegates certain of those responsibilities and expects the consumer of those educational services in question to entirely defend his or her own rights. The Hotel and Liquor Trades Training School also made the point that it was upset that it had not been consulted before any decisions were made on the Bill, and its introduction to the House. That school considered that it was an unfair criticism to make of institutions that were licensed that they were using it as an advertisement to gain clients when, in fact, the legislation requires it to do so. So, on the one hand, it was doing what it was required to do by law and, on the other hand, it was being criticised for so doing.

In fairness, I must make the point that a couple of organisations were indeed supportive of the legislation presently before the House. In somewhat of a different way, Stone's Commercial College felt that it would not suffer adversely through the passage of this legislation. The Japanese Arts and Language Centre indicated that it was, indeed, annoyed at what it called 'over regulation' from outside. I refer, for example to price control and the requirement to notify Government of all price changes. That is a summary of some of the positions put to me by private purveyors of further education services. I think one can see that there is a preponderance in that small sample of those opposed to the legislation, rather than those in support of it.

We must touch, of course, upon the question of whether or not price control and the requirement to inform Government of price control should be considered a reasonable area of Government regulation. I only have to remind the House that it was in the session of Parliament between 1975 and 1977 when the former member for Ross Smith, Mr Jack Jennings, asked a question about the operations of certain secretarial colleges, I believe, which advertised all sorts of grand promises for clients of their institutions, indicating that for a fee they would be given almost certain employment. His concern was that there was no evidence at all that they could guarantee the employment, and, further, that when it was all added up, the actual fees charged were excessive.

The point could be made that it is up to the consumer to make those sorts of decisions. The problem is that in an area like that, where there are many young people who are worried at their prospects of obtaining employment, not to say desperate about that, they will clutch at straws. If they find that someone comes along and offers them a very sweet inducement saying, 'Well, look, if you take our course you are certain of employment' (and I believe the advertising at that college mentioned by the former member for Ross Smith did contain a great deal of certainty) they may be prepared to say, 'Oh, well, the fees' being very expensive as they are and being way beyond my own financial means may be worth the sacrifice,' so that they will pay fees that would have been higher than what would be justified.

Other areas, of course, suffer from certain elements of the market place price-setting mechanisms that may not be entirely conducive to proper educational procedures. It is true that private speed reading courses that were available in this State in the late 1960s and early 1970s charged very high fees indeed. I understand that fees for similar courses today are nowhere near as high as they were then, because it was a captive market in those early days. Those early providers of such educational services were very few in number, offering a limited number of places and, literally, they were determining that the high student element could be met by asking a high price. Then, when the student demand declined, the price declined.

That is straightforward supply and demand economics, which is highly appropriate in many other instances. The question remains as to whether it is highly appropriate in the educational sphere. The danger of that sort of philosophy is that one might extend it even to Government further education courses and say, 'Well, there is a grave shortage of positions for this one area and a lot of student demand: therefore, we will ration out the positions by means of fee setting. We will set high fees and increase our revenue.'

At a time of economic restraint it would be a great temptation to do that. Indeed, that occurs in other parts of the world, where even Government colleges set differential fee structures for their further education facilities. I put to the House that that is not a reasonable way of determining returns from students. Indeed, in the Government further education arena, it has been the practice that that should not happen in regard to a large number of the courses offered. For streams 1 to 5, there is an effective proscription against the raising of fees for those courses. That is an inherent statement that supply and demand economics should not apply to the provision of those educational services. Even stream 6, to which fees apply, is not determined on that basis but is determined quite across the board on a fee per hour basis. That is quite a reasonable approach, even if we might quibble with the amount charged per hour. However, that is not the ambit of this Bill.

It is not unreasonable that the Government should take an interest in the prices that are charged for these other courses. Indeed, there is a very great danger to the expansion of such educational services. I recall that speed reading courses in this State were provided by a few private purveyors early in the 1970s and very high fees were charged. Then, certain Government instrumentalities commenced to provide similar educational services (I believe it was the Department of Further Education, but I stand corrected on that), and the private purveyors were critical because they believed that they were being under-cut and that their profits were being eroded. Their profits, however, were excessively high in that sector of the educational market. In fact, the Department of Further Education merely charged the standard fee, on a pro rata basis, which it charged for all of its other courses, and the private purveyors of similar types of education did not criticise in those cases. Thus, the absence of price control could lead to a limitation of the capacity of Government education facilities to provide an increased range of curriculum offerings.

I accept that there may be no real danger to the credibility of large private further education facilities one way or the other, whether or not this Bill is passed. Because they have been in the industry for such a long time, their names have

become effectively household words. Everyone recognises the stature that they have built up and knows that participation means participation in a course which has credibility and which is designed upon appropriate bases. That does not apply to new further education providers: they must establish themselves in the market place against competition from others, and that is difficult enough when they are trying to provide services for fees, to attract students, and to ensure that their costs do not exceed the income they receive, without also having to fight a needless credibility battle.

This Bill provides the opportunity for an organisation to say, 'Well, we believe that we have educational services to offer and we believe that they will stand the test of examination. We are prepared for them to be so examined.' Surely, if an organisation is prepared to do that and to answer the requirements of an outside body, an outside person such as the Minister, it should be entitled to the consequent credibility. I do not mean that that should result in public advertising suggesting that those organisations are supported by the Minister. That is not what Part V states: it merely states that those conditions set out in clause 36 have been adhered to.

I whimsically referred yesterday to the good housekeeping seal of approval, and in a sense that is what this becomes. It is not meant to be a commendation or a promotion. Once having established that an outside authority has reviewed the educational criteria, the fees charged, the instructors involved, and the place of instruction, it is entirely reasonable and logical that that private provider of further education be on its own. It is then expected to fight it out within the market place.

I do not know that we have been given substantive evidence about the need for this deregulation. I would have thought that one of the criteria that should be considered in any exercise in deregulation is what abuse of the system has taken place. I have already referred to possible advertising abuse, but what other abuse is alleged to have taken place by licensed providers, or, indeed, by non-licensed providers? I accept the point that there are more non-licensed providers than there are licensed providers, but I come back again to whether that is a justification for doing away with a section of the Act. Maybe it is a suggestion that the section of the Act should be reviewed and extended, rather than limited in its coverage.

We do not want to get to the Barnum and Bailey circus-type situation, where a fringe element of non-government further education service providers seeks to take advantage of people's desire to increase their knowledge, or of the desperation of people to increase their qualifications for one reason or another. That would not advance either the further education sphere or the name of education itself. This Parliament has looked at ways of controlling other non-government education purveyors. We have voted in this House on two occasions on legislation for an independent schools registration board. We debated the way in which that should be done, and I believe we all agreed that there was a need for such a board. We all agreed there was value in that happening, because dangers could arise. Indeed, since its operation, it is to be noted that that board has taken on its duties responsibly and is closely examining all applications for registration. It has already deemed some schools not suitable, and others were deemed to be suitable on a temporary basis.

It has been put to me by a small non-government school that that is overregulation and shows excessive zeal by the Government. It was stated that this matter has nothing to do with the Government, which should not be involved in that area, and that surely, if a group of parents want their children to be educated in a certain way at a certain school, that is for them to determine. We made a considered judgment in that regard and, despite our differences about the mechanisms of the board, all members agreed that such a board should exist.

We maintained that it was not overregulation, but that, indeed, quite necessary regulation. I am putting to members of the House that exactly the same situation applies here; that Part V of the principal Act is not overregulation, but it is indeed quite common sense, quite sensible legislation. If it fails for certain reasons then those failures should be analysed in particular, rather than eliminating the section in general. It is the only matter contained in the Bill and it is for that reason that the Opposition has to indicate that it intends to oppose the Bill.

I reiterate the two points I made yesterday about the other areas that it is perceived will still be open to consumers of these further education services. One was the mention of the Industrial and Commercial Training Commissions Act, but that relates only to education for employment purposes; it does not relate to any other educational services that may be provided. That is a very important area in volume of student time, in the number of courses, and simply in the fabric of education. Therefore, those areas remain uncovered by the provision.

The other point that was made, of course, is that the Consumer Transactions Act provides protection for consumers. I repeat the point that I made yesterday: on the one hand, there may well be instances where a consumer is not all that interested in seeing the end of a fraud, and I refer to the example of the University of Boston; even if the University of Boston, as it stood, was not covered by this Act, an institution of its type would still not have seen a consumer necessarily making a complaint, because they may have sought to take advantage of that situation.

The other point is that if there is a fringe purveyor of private further education that is taking advantage of its consumers, then, under our legislation, as I understand it—and I am only a bush lawyer—that would require each one of the consumers to make complaint against the provider and, hopefully, ultimately, publicity that might attach to the first or succeeding complaints would so damage the public esteem of the organisation that it might cease to continue its practices. However, it could well happen that that might not be the case, and that therefore all the individual consumers would be required to take action to protect their own interests in the absence of class action legislation.

Of course, that does not take account of those providers of such services who may seek to be mobile, who may seek to move from community to community, taking advantage of particular residents in one community at a certain time, but who then, feeling their credibility might be in danger, move on to another area. In that regard the Consumer Transactions Act offers no protection at all. I hope that, when the Minister closes the second reading debate on this matter, he will indicate to us where protection will still be available, first, to the consumer of further education services from these private purveyors, and, secondly, to the community at large which will feel an impact from the operations of such institutions where, in fact, the Consumer Transactions Act does not provide coverage, or where in fact the Industrial and Commercial Training Commissions Act does not provide coverage. If there is not a third alternative or more alternatives, then indeed the Bill before the House falls on that yardstick alone.

This appears to be an exercise in deregulation for the sake of deregulation; the Opposition cannot believe that that is a praiseworthy aim. It is not that we are opposed to deregulation where that is worth while, but the fact that it does not stand the examination that all exercises of

deregulation should be subjected to. The Opposition opposes the Bill.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMPANIES (APPLICATION OF LAWS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 4739.)

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): The Opposition supports this measure. It is not a matter of any controversy. It simply allows the four trustee companies which operate within this State, and which have done so for many years, to continue to act as liquidators. That matter would have been brought to a halt, had there not been this enabling legislation because of the effect of Commonwealth legislation in this same area. As we move towards uniform company laws throughout this country, undoubtedly we will find a number of anomalies such as this that need to be attended to by the respective State Parliaments so that services that have been provided in the past may continue to be provided. That, of course, enables the Parliament to assess and review these from time to time to compare the services from State to State.

However, it is desirable that we have uniform company laws and the lack of those in our legal system in the past has been an inhibiting factor, not just for the work of governments in ensuring fair play in the market place, but also it is of importance to the modern structure of corporations in this country that they not be hindered by differing laws from State to State. Hopefully, the benefits of that can be passed on to consumers and to the community at large. With those few remarks, I indicate that the Opposition supports this measure.

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

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 4739.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This is the Building Societies Act Amendment Bill, a copy of the second reading explanation of which was handed to me about five minutes ago, and the printed copy of the Bill is the one that was presented yesterday or the day before yesterday to the Legislative Council. I am given to understand that no amendments took place in the Legislative Council and I will operate on that basis, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The Opposition supports this measure. In speaking to it, I would like to say that one of the major problems we have at the moment in South Australia is this question of housing and construction. It is at the root of our economic problems and the severely depressed state of the industry, brought about by a combination of economic circumstances and Government policies, has deepened recession, increased unemployment and, of course, has created enormous social problems as well. Housing is one of the vital issues of the moment and any measure aimed at improving the stability of those institutions which support the housing industry, any measure which attempts to pump more money into housing and construction at this time, is to be supported as long as it is in the public interest.

I understand that this Bill has been necessitated by the fact that two small building societies propose to amalgamate: the Druids Permanent and the Australian Natives Association. Under the current provisions of the Building Societies Act, that amalgamation cannot take place because, if those two societies amalgamate, they become a new society, and the new society must meet the provisions under section 12 (3) of the Building Societies Act, whereby they must have a share capital of not less than $2 000 000, of which not less than $1 000 000 is not repayable within 10 years.

It is this provision which the new amalgamated society would be unable to meet. As at June 1981, the share capital of the two societies respectively was below the amount required under the Act. As a result, that amalgamation proposal could not take place without that amendment. I suggest, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the provision in the Act was passed for good reason. Building societies and their stability are very important. They are semi-banking organisations. People deposit their money with them as a means of investment and not simply in order to gain housing loans. Therefore, their viability and stability is very important as financial institutions. It is also important because the obligations they enter into are long term; they lend to people building homes and repaying those home loans over a long period of time. Again, the dissolution or collapse of a building society would have a grave fall-out among those persons who have loans with them.

Obviously, in framing the Bill as it stands, recognition was made of the fact that a building society must have considerable financial viability. Of course, that meant that many of the existing building societies did not comply with the sort of size and financial requirements that the Act would see as being proper. However, because those societies were already in existence (and presumably, in the case of a number of them, had been in existence for many years), the Act allowed them to continue in operation. It was only when changes were made, either by amalgamation to form a new society or any other changes, that they ceased to qualify under the Act.

Now we have the position I have just outlined and, if it is to go ahead, then the Act must be amended. I guess Parliament must address itself to two situations: one, whether the existing provisions of the Act are such that they must be sustained whatever the consequences to those smaller societies; two, whether it is desirable in the public interest for those smaller societies to amalgamate under these new circumstances, or whether some other arrangements should not be made for them. Other arrangements could include a special provision simply providing for the amalgamation of these two societies, thus leaving the general principle in the Bill unaffected.

Now the Government has decided, as shown in this measure, to take the course of changing the policy, as it were, in the Bill, making the Act much more flexible in its application; in other words, it is seeking not just to provide for these two small societies and their amalgamation but for any future situation of that kind. Of course, there are protections provided by the Act. The Minister has some considerable control of building societies and the Registrar can make them comply with a number of conditions. So, it is not as though removing this restriction as it exists in the Act opens up the whole field. There are some reserve powers, as it were, which could be called on if undesirable amalgamations or changes were taking place, but I would suggest we must approach this measure with caution. It is a pity that it is being rushed through in a space of a few short days. However, the Opposition is not inclined to oppose it.

One of the strongest reasons why we do not oppose it is that we are told that the Building Society Advisory Committee, which comprises members or representatives of building societies as well as the Registrar and a nominee of the Treasurer and the Minister of Housing, supports this Bill as being in the best interests of the industry. Obviously,

decisions of that body must carry considerable weight. I am not suggesting that its decision should be binding on the Parliament; those decisions must be subject to examination, but I would suggest that, in the short time we have been afforded, the imprimatur of that committee and the general support, as I understand it, in the building society movement is such that we should not attempt to oppose or amend the provision.

Let me conclude by referring to the general housing situation and pointing out why there is a further overlying factor, the reason with which I commenced, namely, the current state of the building industry in South Australia. We should be very careful to ensure the total viability of any financial institution involved in this field at the moment. Over the past two or three years we have had an experience of a massive turn-down in house building and, in fact, dwelling commencements to the extent that there is a shortage in private housing; there is a record Housing Trust waiting list of unprecedented proportions, and, of course, a major crisis in the general housing field. For instance, there has been a reduction in new dwelling commencements quarter to quarter until last December. Of course, the new dwellings include not only houses but flats and others as well.

From 1980 to 1981, on a March to March, June to June, and September to September basis, there has been quite a considerable reduction. There was a slight increase in new dwelling construction in the December quarter. In December 1980, 2 150 new dwellings were commenced. I am not talking about approvals: I am talking about actual buildings that have been started, which is a more tangible indicator, if you like. There was a decrease from 2 150 to 2 180 in 1981. That is, there was an increase of 30, which is very slight, but certainly, in the light of the experience of down-turn in the preceding three quarters, it may provide some slight encouragement.

However, there must be considerable concern about the position with house commencements. This was referred to recently in a letter to the *Advertiser* written by Mr Alan Hickinbotham, who we all know is a house builder and developer. He drew attention to the fact that, while the new dwelling commencments have shown some slight improvement (and these would include private flats and private rental accommodation), house commencements have been considerably down quarter to quarter through 1980-81. In December 1980 there were 1 730 houses commended and in December 1981 there were 1 490 commenced. That is a sharp reduction and, if we set that sharp reduction against the overall slight increase of 30, we can see how the housing market is changing.

Approvals, as I have said, are not such a reliable indicator but if we compare the three months to April 1982, the latest figure, we see that there were 2 205 approvals, compared with the equivalent quarter a year earlier of 1 872 so, again, we have an increase, mainly in the flats or other dwellings area, which are up by more than 200. In relation to housing finance, the position is very grave indeed. In March 1981, $47 300 000 of housing finance was provided for owner occupation. That covers all sources. In March 1982, $48 500 000 was provided. That is an increase of $1 200 000 but, in real terms, in an industry where inflation has probably been running at about 15 per cent, we see that it is a substantial reduction in the value of new housing finance.

There was a big increase from February 1982 to March 1982 of the order of $10 000 000 but, again, we must caution that, while that may be an encouraging indicator, there is no sign of substance in this at the moment. Permanent building society finance figures (and this relates directly to those institutions covered by this Bill) have shown an extraordinary and alarming reduction in loans approved. In March 1981, loans to the value of $14 900 000 were approved. In March 1982 loans to the value of $9 300 000 were approved. In April 1981 the value was $15 400 000, and in March 1982 it was $9 200 000, a very substantial reduction.

It is also alarming to see that there was an increase from March to April 1981 and a drop from March to April 1982. Again, translating those figures into real terms, we see the gravity of the situation. Building institutions, particularly smaller ones, are under considerable pressure in the current financial climate. They are hit by the interest rate policy of the present Federal Government. They have got little assistance from the State Government but, if this Bill will aid them in some way in a very difficult circumstance, we do not oppose it.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I am pleased to have the support of the Opposition for this measure. It is interesting that, during the greater part of his speech, the Leader had none of his members either behind or beside him to participate in his interest in the housing situation. Nevertheless, he made the point that the Government at times needs to act and sometimes needs to act promptly (and I make that point in response to the query about the alleged rush to get this Bill through) to ensure that the security of societies is protected in the interests of those who hold deposits with those societies. That, of course, is the purpose of this Bill, which apparently has received the support of both Houses without there being any proposed amendment.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That whereas the Parliament of South Australia by Joint Resolution of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly adopted on 26 and 27 September 1972, appointed 12 members of the Parliament as delegates to take part in the deliberations of a convention to review the nature and contents and operation of Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia and to propose any necessary revision or amendment thereof and whereas the convention has not concluded its business now it is hereby resolved:

(1) That all previous appointments (so far as they remain valid) of delegates to the convention shall be revoked;

(2) That for the purposes of the convention the following 12 members of the Parliament of South Australia shall be appointed as delegates to take part in the deliberations of the convention:

The Hons D. O. Tonkin and B. C. Eastick; Messrs S. G. Evans, J. Mathwin, J. C. Bannon, T. M. McRae, G. Crafter, and P. D. Blacker, the Hons K. T. Griffin, M. B. Cameron, C. J. Sumner and F. T. Blevins.

(3) That each appointed delegate shall continue as a delegate of the Parliament of South Australia until the House of which he is a member otherwise determines, notwithstanding a dissolution or a prorogation of the Parliament;

(4) That the Premier for the time being, as an appointed delegate (or in his absence an appointed delegate nominated by the Premier), shall be the Leader of the South Australian delegation;

(5) That where, because of illness or other case, a delegate is unable to attend a meeting of the convention, the Leader may appoint a substitute delegate;

(6) That the Leader of the delegation from time to time make a report to the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council on matters arising out of the convention, such report to be laid on the table of each House;

(7) That the Attorney-General provide such secretarial and other assistance for the delegation as it may require;
(8) That the Premier inform the Governments of the Commonwealth and the other States of this resolution,

and that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to speak on this. The re-formation of this delegation was done extremely hurriedly and without much notice at all and the Premier has not, as I understand, given us any indication of why he wanted it done so quickly. Is there to be a meeting, has a date been fixed, and why is it necessary to do it at this stage in such a hurry?

Before I sit down, I would like to make just one other point in relation to a position which has been reserved for an Independent (I think is the term we have loosely used) member of the House of Assembly. That is, of course, a person who is not a member of either the Labor Party or the Liberal Party. We are now confronted with three persons in that category: Mr Blacker, the member for Flinders, who is a member and the Parliamentary Leader of his Party; the member for Semaphore; and, of course, the member for Mitcham, who is also Parliamentary Leader of and representative of a Party. That immediately poses a difficult problem and the Premier did consult briefly with me about it. He asked me whether I had any suggestions. I gave him a brief off-the-cuff opinion on the sorts of things that might be taken into account. He did not come back to me before moving this motion.

I would just like to put on record that the previous representative of a minor Party from this place was the former member for Mitcham. The Party which he represented and which the present member for Mitcham represents is represented in both this Chamber and the Legislative Council and it is also represented in the national Parliament, in the Senate, although not in the House of Representatives, and perhaps more importantly, it commands a considerable vote in the South Australian electorate. In other words, there is an Australian Democrat Senator from South Australia, and an Australian Democrat representative in the Legislative Council and in the House of Assembly, and the Australian Democrat Party commands a vote of between 10 per cent and 15 per cent in the electorate at large. In terms of Parties, it would represent the third Party in this State. I would have thought that it would have strong claims to fill that representation.

The member for Mitcham is not here to say whether she has such claims, but I hope that she has been approached. I hope that all three members have been approached and have had an opportunity to have the matter discussed with them. Perhaps they among themselves could have reached some agreement. If they have not, I would have been surprised. I would have thought it a gross discourtesy to any of those members if they have not been consulted. That is the second assurance I would ask.

Mr Mathwin: Your Leader never did that.

Mr BANNON: I do not care what my Leader did; I am the Leader of the Opposition at the moment, I would remind the member for Glenelg.

Members interjecting:

Mr BANNON: At the moment, indeed: I expect to be Premier shortly. I would just like to ask the member for Glenelg, and indeed the Premier, who will respond, whether he has consulted those members. If not, it is discourtesy. In the case of the former member for Mitcham, he knew the score. In the case of the new member for Mitcham, she probably did not. In regard to the member for Flinders, he may well have been consulted. It is certainly true that he does represent a Party and he is the senior member of those three members whose names I have mentioned in terms of service in this House, but I point out that his Party is not represented in either the Senate Chamber from South Australia or in the Legislative Council, nor does it command a vote of the size of the Australian Democrats' vote in the electorate. I just mention that if that is a criterion the Premier is using, the only one which the member could claim to have a higher claim ahead of the member for Mitcham is on the grounds of seniority. As to member for Semaphore—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I was overseas on a study tour and there was a ballot; that is how the member for Mitcham got on. You weren't in the place.

Mr BANNON: The Deputy Premier interjects. I do not understand the point he is making, because I would have thought that what I am saying is quite sensible. I am sorry, Mr Speaker, I will not answer the interjection. I have attempted to set out the situation quite fairly. I hope the member for Flinders at least understands that I am attempting to make a constructive contribution to this debate. I am not attempting to suggest he is an unworthy representative. In fact, I think he has a claim to be a representative and I have outlined why that may be. I am going on to outline the respective claims on various members.

Finally, I would suggest the member for Semaphore, but he is not a Party leader as such. He is an Independent member in this place and in that sense I would suggest that his claims are not of the same order as are those of the member for Flinders or of the member for Mitcham. The member for Mitcham does sit on this side of the House and does not take the Labor Party Whip and the member for Flinders does take the Liberal Party Whip. That is another consideration that may work either for him or against him. Having made this point, I would simply ask the Premier: were these people consulted, have those members given him any indication, and what were the criteria he used to make that particular decision.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition finds it almost impossible to resist the temptation to rubbish the member for Semaphore, in this case damning him by faint praise, and I do not think it is very satisfactory in a matter such as this.

Mr Bannon: This is really disgraceful. Can you stop politicking for two minutes?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: He seems to find it difficult to keep quiet. He seems to be under a certain amount of strain at the moment—I cannot think why! I think the honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition would perhaps not have seen some reports, but the question of the Constitutional Convention has been raised recently. Particularly, I think it is one of the matters to be discussed, if we reach it, on the agenda of the Premiers' Conference. In order to make sure that we were up to date to make any suggestion that we meet, it was considered necessary to bring the membership up to date. I think this motion does that very well.

As far as representation from the three Independent members of this House is concerned, we have considered that the appointment of the former member for Mitcham, Mr Millhouse (now his Honour Mr Justice Millhouse), as the representative, establishes a precedent whereby the senior member in Parliamentary service of that group is appointed to the committee. Using that criteria, the member for Flinders is senior in service in this House and, accordingly, has been nominated.

Motion carried.

REGISTRATION OF DEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 13 (clause 3)—Leave out 'and' and insert 'or'.

No. 2. Page 2, line 2 (clause 4)—After 'Council,' insert 'appointed by the Legislative Council,'.

No. 3. Page 2, line 3 (clause 4)—Leave out 'nominated' and insert 'appointed from the group led'.

No. 4. Page 2, line 4 (clause 4)—Leave out 'or his nominee'.

No. 5. Page 2, line 6 (clause 4)—Leave out 'nominated' and insert 'appointed from the group led'.

No. 6. Page 2, line 7 (clause 4)—Leave out 'or his nominee'.

No. 7. Page 2, line 41 (clause 5)—Leave out 'upon the nomination of' and insert 'from the group led by'.

No. 8. Page 2, lines 42 and 43 (clause 5)—Leave out 'upon the nomination of the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council' and insert 'from that group'.

No. 9. Page 2, lines 44 and 45 (clause 5)—Leave out 'upon the nomination of' and insert 'from the group led by'.

No. 10. Page 3, lines 1 and 2 (clause 5)—Leave out 'upon the nomination of the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council' and insert 'from that group'.

No. 11. Page 3, lines 11 and 12 (clause 8)—Leave out 'upon the nomination of the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council,'.

No. 12. Page 3, line 12 (clause 8)—After 'a member of the Committee' insert ', being a member who was appointed to the Committee from the group led by the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council,'.

No. 13. Page 3, line 20 (clause 9)—Leave out 'upon the nomination of' and insert 'from the group led by'.

No. 14. Page 4, lines 3 to 5 (clause 10)—Leave out ', but shall not commence any such review unless it has first consulted with the Minister responsible for the administration of this Act on the question of determination of priorities'.

No. 15. Page 4, line 31 (clause 12)—Leave out '(other than a Minister of the Crown)'.

No. 16. Page 4, line 39 (clause 12)—Leave out '(other than a Minister of the Crown)'.

No. 17. Page 5, line 1 (clause 12)—Leave out 'a Minister of the Crown, or'.

No. 18. Page 5, lines 21 to 28 (clause 12)—Leave out subclauses (4) and (5).

No. 19. Page 5, lines 34 and 35 (clause 12)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 20. Page 5 (clause 12)—After line 37 insert new subclause as follows:

(6a) The Committee may allow a statutory authority that is being reviewed, and the Minister of the Crown who has the administration of the Act under which the statutory authority was established, access to any evidence taken by the Committee during the review.

No. 21. Page 5, line 44 (clause 12)—Leave out 'upon the nomination of' and insert 'from the group led by'.

No. 22. Page 6 (clause 14)—After line 44 insert new subclauses as follow:

(4a) The Committee may append to its report a draft Bill for the implementation of any of its recommendations.

(4b) In preparing any such draft Bill, the Committee may make use of the services of the Parliamentary Counsel.

No. 23. Page 7, line 12 (clause 16)—After 'The Governor may' insert ', upon the recommendation of the President of the Legislative Council after consultation with the Committee,'.

No. 24. Page 7, lines 15 and 16 (clause 16)—Leave out subclause (2) and insert subclause as follows:

(2) A person appointed under subsection (1) shall, upon that appointment, become an officer, or employee, as the case may require, of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (19)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Langley, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, and Slater, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Chapman, Goldsworthy, and Russack. Noes—Messrs Keneally, McRae, and O'Neill.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments are not consistent with the principles of the Bill.

LIBRARIES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 June. Page 4708.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill has just been passed to us. I have a copy of the second reading report and the Bill as prepared for members in another place. It has inserted in it what looks to be an amending clause (I do not quite know what its status is; it is just a piece of paper), and I am very concerned that we are being asked to consider what is, in fact, a complete rewrite of the Libraries Act in this way, without the Opposition's being given an opportunity, particularly in this place, to go through the measure in any detail. As I understand it, some amendments were moved in another place, but I do not know their fate, and it is not clear from the Bill we have before us. I request your advice, Mr Speaker, on how we may proceed with this debate. I do not know whether this should be considered as a point of order.

The SPEAKER: I accept the Leader's request as a point of order, in that it seeks quite pertinent clarification a technical aspect of the Bill. The Leader has the opportunity to proceed with debate or to seek leave to continue his remarks. If he concludes his remarks, I will then put the Bill.

Mr BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will continue my remarks for the moment. This fairly comprehensive Bill of some 14 pages repeals the existing Libraries and Institutes Act (which has been in operation since 1939 and amended between that time and 1979) and the Libraries (Subsidies) Act. Those Acts are the two major libraries Acts, and they cover the management of libraries and institutes and the provision of library subsidies in this State.

This Bill will replace those Acts. It is not just a consolidation of those Acts but a rewriting of major parts of libraries legislation, including an objectives clause and a number of other provisions. We are in the position of having to tackle the second reading debate without knowing what transpired in the Upper House and with no final copy of the Bill or the second reading explanation. We have no assistance in knowing what amendments were moved or their fate. We have no *Hansard* record to which to refer, because I am not aware that the *Hansard* pulls for the debate on this Bill in another place are yet available. This creates considerable problems in handling the matter.

For the moment, I will confine my remarks to making a few general remarks about libraries. Recently, there has been controversy in regard to the state of the libraries in South Australia, particularly services and the administration of the central State Library. I do not intend to debate that matter in detail, but I refer to the controversy that has surrounded the changes in borrowing hours, the introduction of the new computer system and other reorganisational matters to indi-

cate that libraries are an extremely important area of public administration and require proper and detailed consideration in this House. After all, the State Library and the network of public libraries and institute libraries (those that remain) are used by vast numbers of people.

In 1975 or 1976, a major report was commissioned by the previous Government under the chairmanship of Mr Jim Crawford. That committee took up a challenge which had been thrown out and which was revealed through the hapless Horton Report, which was commissioned at the Federal level. That report pointed out that, in terms of the provision of library services in our community, South Australia was very poorly off indeed and urgent action was needed. It was understood by those involved in the Horton Committee exercise that major Federal action would be taken on libraries as a consequence of the report. Unfortunately, that report has simply gathered dust in Canberra. It is a scandal and a tragedy that, despite many efforts by many groups in the community and despite the matter being raised in Federal Parliament by way of questions and motions on a number of occasions, still the report has not been properly considered and acted upon by the Federal Government.

It was in regard to that somewhat alarming situation that the Crawford Committee embarked on its deliberations. The members of that committee were drawn from a number of areas and included experts in libraries and local government. The committee came up with an extremely ambitious and exciting programme for library development in Australia. It was a staged programme and involved the active participation of both the State Government and local government. It also anticipated, but somewhat vaguely, that the Federal Government would be involved as a result of the Horton approach to local government. It not only proposed the extension of free public library services throughout the State in all communities and the replacement of the existing institute system which, in many areas, had become very run down and decrepit by modern, up-to-date and easily accessible library standards, but also it proposed major administrative and structural changes to the State Library. It considered the problem of archival collections in South Australia and, of course, this area has been a matter of great concern.

Part III of the Bill deals with public records and aspects of archives. We are still waiting for a firm commitment by the Government in regard to proper archival consideration, and the matter is becoming quite urgent. I have referred to the Crawford Report, because I understand that that is the basis on which this rewriting and consolidation of libraries legislation has been undertaken. The provisions in this Act are not an enactment of the various administrative and other arrangements outlined by the Crawford Committee.

Since that committee presented its report to the previous Government, considerable action has taken place, particularly in the extension of local libraries and public libraries. There has been a lot of school community library development. The main thrust of activity took place in 1978-79, and at the same time a parallel exercise was done of those things which affected the State Library and its services. New positions are being created, and a new administrative structure has gradually been formed, based on those recommendations, but not following them word for word, because, despite the thoroughness of the committee's investigations, nonetheless there were areas where it was believed that the committee's findings had not been conclusive. Either the committee had suggested some options or, when an attempt was made to put those recommendations into practical effect, a number of objections were raised to the recommendations or to the precise form in which the recommendations had been moved.

All of that means that the process has taken considerable time. Much consultation has been involved, and a number of major policy questions must be grappled with. Regarding the central public library, the role of the Libraries Board of South Australia was one of the most important questions. What role should that board have in relation to libraries development generally? What role should it have in terms of the State Library of South Australia? What should happen to its holdings of property and its holdings in trust, bequests, and so on? All these questions required considerable discussion. Now, of course, the Bill is before us. It is with some regret that the Bill has not been introduced and allowed to lie on the table to give members a proper chance to consider it.

Late last week the Hon. Miss Levy pointed out to me that what she thought was going to be a few amendments to the Libraries Act, what had been suggested as being the rewriting of some clauses, and so on, in fact had turned out to be a comprehensive, newly rewritten Libraries Act, and that we have been given very little time to consider and, more importantly, to consult. I think that that may well be true of some of those parties affected by the change. For instance, I ascertained from the bulletin that the Institutes Association puts out that, while its executive had been consulted on the nature and some of the provisions of the Bill, the association had been given to understand that the Bill would be laid on the table of Parliament.

I do not have the exact quote in front of me, but the association advised its members that there would be an opportunity for them to have a look at the exact provisions of the Bill and forward some comments and that there would be an opportunity for further input from those institutes. In fact, that has not been made possible at all. Members of the Institutes Association had been given to understand that they would have a period in which they could examine the Bill during its course of consideration by Parliament. In fact, due to the Government's pushing the Bill through so rapidly, that has been made impossible. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I want to raise in the House some matters which I believe to be important to the operation of a Parliamentary committee. I raise these matters for the sake of what one might call democracy. The Subordinate Legislation Committee faces some difficulties under the present Statutes, and I am sure that previous committees also faced the same problems. However, in this day and age, more and more complex regulations are being brought in, and there are more Acts of Parliament to which they are tied; thus, the more serious becomes the problem of the inability of Parliament to amend regulations. It becomes more difficult even for the Subordinate Legislation Committee to recommend amendments to Parliament.

In 1930, an opinion was given that, if one regulation of a group of regulations could stand on its own then it would be appropriate for either House to disallow that one regulation. I believe that that has never been tested. In 1941 a similar opinion was given by Crown Law; again, that has never been tested. Therefore, the present Subordinate Legislation Committee feels that it should not test that situation at this stage, as the Attorney-General has indicated that he

would like a review made of the present Standing Orders and the relevant Act to see whether changes can be made.

I want to highlight some of the real difficulties that the committee faces. Local government zoning laws become operative once they are gazetted. Once they become operative, in the case of developments, interested parties can make submissions for developments in the newly rezoned areas while the Subordinate Legislation Committee is still taking evidence to decide whether the zoning laws are in conformity with the Act, that they do not take away some rights that already exist in law, or whether particular regulations may be more appropriate than a change in the Act in lieu of being an administrative decision. Those are some of the powers and considerations facing the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

I refer to an example involving the Tea Tree Gully zoning regulations. However, I want to point out quite clearly that the Tea Tree Gully Council did not do anything which in the committee's opinion was unlawful. However, while we were taking evidence, plans were in the process of being submitted for commercial development projects on the newly zoned area which had been rezoned from residential 1 to commercial, even though the council itself gave evidence that it would do all in its power to stop such applications coming forward. Before the disallowance the council had received what one might call sketch plans—nothing more than that. I have been told that subsequently, either on the day of or just after the disallowance in the other place, more detailed plans were submitted, naming a company that might be interested in the development or part of the development.

I believe that the council did have a discretionary power, if it wanted to use it, to carry out a promise (and I put it at that) to try to stop people putting in submissions. The council had the power to say that the first submission was only sketch plans, and that it would not accept updated ones. I believe that the company named as being interested in the project had never been approached and was not interested. If that is the case, the developer was not honest in its submission.

Another area concerns existing rights, in which I think this Parliament must take a more keen interest in the future than it has done in the past. I refer to the Murray River flood plain regulations which were disallowed yesterday in another place upon the recommendation of the committee. Those regulations took away the right of individuals to build on a piece of land which was divided and which had a title or lease created for the purposes of a living unit, whether for part-time or full-time living; in other words, a holiday home or a permanent home for full-time living.

Each and every one of us is concerned about the flood plain of the Murray River. We do not want it polluted any more than is necessary, but if Parliament, local government, the State Planning Authority, or any of the bodies that had the power had given permission for the creation of a title for a person to use part of that land for a residence, any move to take away that right (and I am talking about the total right) surely means either payment of compensation or acquisition of property at the market value.

There could be a case of someone buying a piece of land at, say $15 000, and borrowing $12 000, hoping to build on that piece of land, the regulations coming in and taking away that right, and the piece of land becoming valueless. That person may even have a mortgage of $12 000 (or whatever it may be) on the land, still be paying it off, and own nothing. I do not believe that is acceptable, but the difficulty the committee faces is this: where the Subordinate Legislation Committee has a regulation to disallow, there is nothing to stop the Executive Council meeting the next day and reintroducing the same regulations as a holding process to save people exploiting the situation if that action does not conflict with any part of any other Act.

Unfortunately, the Planning and Development Act has a provision that there should be a public scrutiny period, if you like, a processing period, of two months (it takes approximately two months) before it can be reintroduced. Even though they may be the same regulations and they have been through that public scrutiny period, departmental regulations scrutiny, and so on, once they are reintroduced, even though they are the same set of regulations, they are considered to be a fresh set, and they must go back through the process. So, I hope people see the difficulty the Subordinate Legislation Committee has in that regard.

In the few remaining moments I have, I wish to refer to another set of regulations before the committee at the moment which is so horrendous that it would be a dangerous precedent for this Parliament to allow them to pass. The Subordinate Legislation Committee, unfortunately, did not pick up the problem until yesterday. I cannot report on behalf of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, because the minutes were submitted today and the evidence given at that time has not yet been made available to the House, so I cannot refer to it. I will refer to the evidence. I ask members to look at the provisions of regulations that relate to existing land use in any area. The regulations give the council power, quite blatantly, over a period of years to phase out existing land use where that existing land use does not conform to the stated land use under the Act. In other words, Parliament, in 1967 (I think), gave the opportunity and the right to individuals who had an existing land use to use it or to sell it while that use continued, without a break in excess of six months but that has been taken away by those regulations. I hope that members will study them, look at them quite closely, and see that we have placed many people in a very difficult situation. I hope that members are conscious of that.

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

Mrs SOUTHCOTT (Mitcham): I wish to refer to the discussion that I have been told (and in fact I heard part of it) took place in the Chamber earlier this afternoon about representation at the Constitutional Convention. I would like to explain to the House that I had left this place to confer with the Speaker, at his request, and had then taken the opportunity to return to my office to ring my electorate office and to cancel the appointments that I had made for tomorrow, because this House will be sitting.

I would like to state that the first thing I had heard about any nomination of people for the Constitutional Convention was in my office, when I arrived and heard the Leader of the Opposition speaking. I had not been consulted by the Government on the matter, and I regard it as a matter of gross discourtesy that at least I was not aware it was happening. One thing that I am quite sure of and that I have learnt during three weeks in this place is that I am the last person to whom anyone tells anything. I am not referring to the officers of this House, but I cannot understand why at least I could not be given the common courtesy of being informed.

My predecessor in the seat of Mitcham was a representative, and, although the Government argues that it was on the basis of seniority, I do not accept that argument. If I had been consulted, I certainly would have claimed a place on that representation as a representative of the Australian Democrats, as it is the Party that has the largest percentage of votes, apart from the Government and the Opposition, and also on the basis of our representation both in this House and in the Legislative Council. I am not at this stage aware of what action I can take, but I will be seeking advice overnight to see whether there is anything I can do on this

matter. I want to make it quite clear that I was not consulted; I had no knowledge of it; if I had, I certainly would have claimed my place.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I wish to conclude the remarks which I began in the last part of the grievance debate yesterday when I was given the opportunity to participate. At that time I had drawn attention to the fact that the number of occasions on which I had had consultations with members of the community of Meningie and the surrounding areas about salinity problems in Lake Albert had been considerable. I also pointed out that they were all at my own instigation, and that in the first instance I had broached the subject with the Progress Association not long after the election in 1979. I pointed out to them that among other things that I saw as being problems they had in the immediate future was the increasing salinity of this shallow lake, which is a blind appendage to Lake Alexandrina: the only water that can enter it (other than drainage water from the surrounding hinterland) is through the Narrung Narrows. The Minister of Water Resources, when I approached him on this subject, assured me that he had been aware of it as long as 10 years ago, and had voiced his concern on it.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Your predecessor asked a question in the House about 10 years ago.

Mr LEWIS: My predecessor indeed was interested in the matter. However, it appears from the records left to me by him that there was no attempt by members of the Meningie community to have the Government do anything to ameliorate that, and that the initiative which he took was largely at his own instigation, in exactly the same way as I personally identified the problem and on my own initiative instigated inquiries. That is why I was shocked, Mr Speaker, when I saw the report in the *News* of 10 June, after having had, just prior to that, a mere phone call from the gentleman who is the Chairman of the Dairymen's Association in that locality (Mr Graham Camac), in which he pointed out that he and his supporters would be doing everything in their power to unseat me at the next election unless the Government did something to ameliorate the effects of increasing salinity.

The Government was already doing something, and I wish Mr Camac had considered the assurances given to him by the Minister and given to others by the Minister when, at my instigation, the Minister visited Meningie and spoke with the Progress Association on this problem. He, of course, alluded to the fact that he had done so in his answer to that question that I put to him in the Estimates Committee on 9 October 1980. I know that the community is now concerned as a result of the interest that have been stirred up by Mr Camac's comments, or comments attributed to him, at least, in the article by Craig Bildstien in the *News* of Thursday 10 June.

I should point out that this Government and this member are doing everything in their power, with the greatest possible haste, to determine exactly what can be the effects and benefits of cutting a channel through the isthmus, through the Vandenbrink property, at the southern end of the Narrung peninsula, west of Meningie, to enable Lake Albert to drain, to flush, and to get some fresh water. I know that the industries around that town depend, in no small measure, on the fact that viable irrigation is possible, and I also know that the rate of deterioration of productivity in their pastures is increasing at a rate that is exponential; that is to say, it is accelerating, and the problem is exacerbated by the fact that, using the irrigation equipment they have, they must pour on more water than is necessary to irrigate their crops, merely to leach the salt out of the soil.

By doing so, they increase the salinity problem in the lake by increasing the drainage back into it through the soil which itself was saline in the lower horizons in the first instance. These saline waters are more concentrated than are the waters in the lake, as they return to the lake from that subsurface drainage. In returning in that form, they further increase salinity, further increasing the problems that the growers have in using excessive amounts of water to leach the salt from the root zones of their plants.

The Minister, the Government and I know that. The former member knew that. I suspect that the residents of Meningie have known it for a long time. I think it is a great pity that their concern was not expressed alongside and in support of mine (and that of the previous member and of the Minister over the period of 10 years that this problem has been emerging) to ensure that it could have been properly addressed. I think that it was ill advised of that gentleman, Mr Graham Camac, ever to have approached the media and given the public of South Australia, per medium of the *News* of Thursday 10 June, the mistaken impression that nothing was being done or was contemplated.

I only hope that this kind of behaviour is not followed by anyone else. It is a very bad example, and it is the worst kind of representation that any constituent or organisation in a member's electorate can make to that member—to attempt to embarrass the member by threatening him publicly without first having consulted him as to the way in which it may be most sensible to seek a solution to the problem, and I use that word advisedly.

Subsequent to that article, to ensure that the public did get the best information available, the Minister undertook, after discussion with me, to make a statement, and he made the statement. It was published only in the City-State edition of the *News* of 15 June. The article was headlined '$4 000 000 plan to cut salt in lake', and in that article the Minister, the Hon. Peter Arnold, said that the Government was sympathetic to the problem. He had asked the Engineering and Water Supply Department to prepare a comprehensive report, and he also pointed out that I fully supported the concept of a drainage channel.

I made that point when I was speaking to the reporter, Craig Bildstien, subsequent to the article of 10 June. That work will proceed as quickly as possible, but we cannot cut a channel through the isthmus without first having information at our disposal to know what the cost benefits will be and what the environmental impact will be.

I sincerely believe that in both instances the inquiries and the research being conducted which predicates those inquiries will confirm that the channel will have great cost benefit in ensuring the survival of the irrigated agriculture around that town and in that locality, and that it will also enhance the environment of that 50-mile stretch of the Coorong which suffers from time to time as a result of stagnation of the waters that develops from conditions of low flow. It should also enhance the spawning of those estuarine fish, such as mulloway, which need to have salinity levels lower than the sea but higher than the normal fresh river water.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): This evening I wish to raise a matter pertaining to an answer that the Minister of Transport gave in this House regarding T.A.A. staff relocation. Members will recall that the Minister answered a Question on Notice from the shadow Minister of Tourism last week, and in reply the Minister indicated that T.A.A. had advised him that no employees would be retrenched as a result of the relocation of the finance department of that enterprise to Melbourne.

When my colleague raised the matter on the following day, stating that he had received information that staff in Adelaide had been advised that a number of people would be declared redundant, the Minister indicated that he would take the matter up with T.A.A. again. I raise the matter

now because a constituent of mine is affected by the proposal and is gravely concerned at the way T.A.A. has operated. He believes, and I believe on the basis of information that he has provided me with, that the Minister of Transport has been hoodwinked by T.A.A. He has been given a story that is quite contrary to what the staff were being told while the answer was being prepared.

I hope that, following the undertaking the Minister gave last week that he would take the matter up again with T.A.A., he will be able to get a more satisfactory action and response from that organisation. It is a pity that we have not already heard the result of the Minister's taking the matter up again. It often happens that Ministers give a response in succeeding days to a question, and my constituent is waiting eagerly for that answer from the Minister. I take the opportunity to call on the Minister to advise members, or those members who have expressed interest in the matter by correspondence, of the further information that he receives from T.A.A.

The proposition to relocate the finance office in Melbourne has highlighted a trend that we have seen far too much of in recent years. That is the trend that Adelaide is becoming a branch office State. Here we have a major airline deciding that we will be only a minor order branch office. As a result, employees in this State are faced with redundancy. There is all this talk about creating employment, which is important, yet here we have a situation where a number of people will be put out of work. The information I have from my constituent is that a significant number could be put out of work.

There was a meeting of the finance staff in the Adelaide office on 11 May, addressed by two officers from Melbourne, and among comments made by Mr Geraghty, the Personnel Services Manager, he indicated that the poor passenger loading of the airline was contributing to some of its financial difficulties, and he said:

> . . .but I can tell you as of yesterday we were carrying only the same number of passengers as we were in March 1980 and even allowing for the people we retrenched and 100-odd people who are on leave without pay we still have 250 more than what we had at that time. The possibility in the immediate future for more positions becoming available is extremely remote.

The reference to those positions becoming available was a reference to the positions that may be available for the staff made redundant by the finance move.

A number of issues are involved in that finance move that have concerned, I understand, a number of the employees there. First of all, they are advised that if they do not accept positions that are offered to them, be they in Melbourne or be they here on a lower pay scale, then redundancy provisions do not apply. It is very simple: all that has to happen is that an officer can be told he has to go to Melbourne and take a job there, when it is clearly known that he cannot do that because of family, domestic or economic commitments, or, alternatively, he can be offered a job here at a significantly lower rate of pay and again could not be in a position to accept it and his failure to accept it on grounds well beyond his own realistic control would then preclude him from receiving redundancy payments.

Another point that has concerned my constituent and, I am given to understand, many others is that the last-on first-off principle is not being applied, despite the fact that I understand that the union representing those employees made an approach to that effect in February of this year. All things taken into consideration, I believe there is a considerable feeling of cynicism amongst the staff of the finance section of the Adelaide office. They note that they have not received redundancy notices at this moment, and point to the fact that there are still two weeks of the financial year to go. They fear their services are being used for that last fortnight so that they can take account of extra staff loading and then they will be summarily dispatched.

The company indicated that it was going to negotiate and consult with all people in this matter and yet as recently as last week I have had contact, and others have had contacts, indicating that that has not taken place. They feel that they have been dealt with poorly by the company. I hope that the Minister will take seriously the matter raised by the member for Gilles last week, and that he will indeed take it up again with T.A.A. at the earliest possible opportunity, because the redundancies will take effect soon, almost certainly before this House will sit again in the fourth session of this Parliament—if indeed we get to a fourth session of this Parliament.

The Minister indicated that T.A.A. is not a State enterprise and it is not under the control of the State Minister of Transport. That is accepted, but he is the responsible Minister in this Chamber who can be charged with the request to investigate matters affecting people in this State as far as transport is concerned, and T.A.A. undoubtedly is a transport authority. That is why the initial question was directed to the Minister of Transport, and he therefore has some obligation to pursue the matter. On other occasions his colleagues have taken up issues with their Federal colleagues or with private enterprise and, again, private enterprise is not directly responsible to the Minister, and yet they have recognised their obligations to do that. I hope that in that context the Minister of Transport will pursue the interests of not only my constituents who work there—

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

Motion carried.

At 5.4 p.m. the House adjourned until Friday 18 June at 11 a.m.