HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 8 December 1982

The House met at 10 a.m. pursuant to proclamation issued by His Excellency the Governor (Sir Donald Dunstan).

The Clerk (Mr G.D. Mitchell) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

At 10.5 a.m., in compliance with summons, the House proceeded to the Legislative Council, where a Commission was read appointing the Honourable Leonard James King (Chief Justice) to be a Commissioner for the opening of Parliament.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The House being again in its own Chamber, at 10.10 a.m. His Honour Mr Justice King attended and produced a Commission from His Excellency the Governor appointing him to be a Commissioner to administer to members of the House of Assembly the Oath of Allegiance or the Affirmation in lieu thereof required by the Constitution Act. The Commission was read by the Clerk, who then produced writs for the election of 47 members for the House of Assembly.

The Oath of Allegiance required by law (or the Affirmation) was administered to and subscribed by all members.

The Commissioner retired.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I remind the House that it is now necessary to proceed to the election of a Speaker. I move:

That Mr T.M. McRae take the Chair of this House as Speaker.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition) seconded the motion.

Mr McRAE (Playford): In compliance with Standing Orders, and in accordance with the traditions of Parliament, I submit myself to the will of the House.

There being no other nomination, Mr McRae was declared elected.

Mr McRae was escorted to the dais by the mover and seconder of the motion.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae): I wish to acknowledge the honour that has been granted to me by honourable members. I accept this position with due humility. I indicate that there will be no particular departure from the general style that has been adopted by the last three Speakers. Fundamentally, I intend to play it straight down the line. In return, I seek the assistance and support of members to maintain the prestige of this House.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I offer my congratulations, Sir, on your accepting this onerous position with the due reluctance that has been traditional since the creation of this historic office. The rights that the House of Assembly lays claim to date back to the Parliamentary tradition of the United Kingdom and the House of Commons which, in turn, date back to as long ago as 1265 and the time of Simon de Montfort.

It is a noble office which has traditionally continued in this State under our Westminster system of government. It is a heavy responsibility to preside over the gathering of Parliament. While we have detailed Standing Orders and regular procedures, nonetheless the political process and the nature of debate is such that on occasions all the skills and qualities that the Speaker can muster are needed to ensure the orderly conduct and the advancement of Parliament in the overall interests of the State. In your case, Mr Speaker, you come to this position well qualified: you have already served in this House for some 12 years, and your legal background and training, your profession, well fit you to understand and interpret the Standing Orders of this House. I certainly assure you, Sir, of the confidence that members on this side have in your election as Speaker.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): It gives me pleasure, Sir, to support those words of congratulation to you on assuming this high office proposed by the Premier. In doing so, we on this side of the House recognise the right of the Government to nominate one from its ranks to fill this most important position in this Parliament. In terms of Parliamentary experience you are one of five members, I understand, who have served a minimum of 12 years in this place, and I am sure that having served with distinction over those 12 years will stand you indeed in good stead to discharge the duties of your high office, to the benefit and the interests of all members of this Parliament.

The position of Speaker, of course, is vital to the proper and effective functioning of this Parliament, and I would like to take this opportunity, while congratulating you, Sir, to place on record my view that the member for Light, as you indeed acknowledged, has served this Parliament with great distinction in this respect. I am sure that you will follow the fine example that he has set with great distinction in the discharge of your duties on behalf of this Parliament.

The SPEAKER: I wish to thank both the Premier and the honourable Leader of the Opposition for their very kind remarks.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to have the Speaker presented to him at 11 a.m. today.

[Sitting suspended from 10.34 to 10.50 a.m.]

The SPEAKER: It is now my intention to proceed to Government House to present myself as Speaker to His Excellency the Governor, and I invite members to accompany me.

At 10.50 a.m., accompanied by a deputation of members, the Speaker proceeded to Government House.

On the House reassembling at 11.30 a.m.:

The SPEAKER: Accompanied by a deputation of members, I proceeded to Government House for the purpose of presenting myself to His Excellency the Governor, and informed His Excellency that, in pursuance of the powers conferred on the House by section 34 of the Constitution Act, the House of Assembly had this day proceeded to the election of Speaker, and had done me the honour of election to that high office. In compliance with the other provisions of the same section, I presented myself to His Excellency as the Speaker, and in the name and on behalf of the House laid claim to our undoubted rights and privileges, and prayed that the most favourable construction might be put on all our proceedings. His Excellency has been pleased to reply

as follows:

To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the House of Assembly: I congratulate the members of the House of Assembly on their choice of the Speaker. I readily assure you of my confirmation of all constitutional rights and privileges of the House of Assembly.

[Sitting suspended from 11.33 a.m. to 2.15 p.m.]

SUMMONS TO COUNCIL CHAMBER

A summons was received from His Excellency the Governor desiring the attendance of the House in the Legislative Council Chamber, whither the Speaker and honourable members proceeded.

The House having returned to its own Chamber, the Speaker resumed the Chair at 2.52 p.m. and read prayers.

COMMISSION OF OATHS

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received from the Governor a Commission under the hand of His Excellency and the public seal of the State empowering me to administer the Oath of Allegiance or receive the Affirmation necessary to be taken by members of the House of Assembly.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA JUBILEE 150 BOARD BILL

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

RIVER MURRAY WATER BILL

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

GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY BILL

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

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

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That Mr M.J. Brown be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House during the present Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Under Standing Orders, I must ask the honourable member for Whyalla whether he would accept the position.

Mr M.J. BROWN: I humbly accept the nomination, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. I recognise the member for Flinders.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I move:

That Mr N.T. Peterson be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House during the present Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member for Semaphore accept the nomination?

Mr PETERSON: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: That being the situation, I must now advise that it is proper that a debate occur, and I ask whether members wish the debate to occur. If they do, I shall call upon the Premier, who moved the first motion, to debate the issue.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Mr Speaker, I do not believe that it is necessary to embark on a debate, as the respective merits of the candidates are known to all members.

Mr BLACKER: I would like to explain my position and the purpose of my nomination. At the commencement of the previous Parliament I was involved in the nomination of another candidate and, as such, I believe that we brought to South Australia one of its best Speakers. On this occasion I believe that this Parliament should be put in a position where it can vote for an office bearer, in this case the Chairman of Committees. In your own case, Mr Speaker, I fully supported your nomination, as I believed that it was an obvious choice, and I should have spoken on the occasion of your appointment to commend and congratulate you for just that.

Norm Peterson, the member for Semaphore, is well known to members of the Parliament. I think we would all agree that in this House he has displayed a sense of responsibility. Equally so, his electors have supported him with a massively increased vote. It is with pleasure that I nominate Norm Peterson, in the knowledge that I believe he can do a good job in the position of Chairman of Committees.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): In seconding the nomination for the member for Semaphore, I do so in the belief that independent members of Parliament should be given the opportunity of being elevated to various positions within the Parliament. I believe it would be most unfair and discriminatory if all members did not have the opportunity to be elected to the various positions. In the three years that the member for Semaphore has been a member of this House, he has clearly demonstrated that he is a clear and independent thinker. The Government has nothing to fear if the member for Semaphore is elected to this position, as he has said that he would support the Government.

The member for Semaphore has represented his electorate conscientiously and objectively. Kind and considerate, he has proved that he is of high integrity and sound principles. The honourable member is a fair-minded person, and one who has demonstrated a sensitivity towards public needs. In the past the electors of Semaphore have given this Parliament persons who have won the admiration of their fellow members of Parliament. Therefore, I believe it is only fitting that this House now recognise the excellent qualities of the member for Semaphore and support his nomination as Chairman of Committees.

The SPEAKER: Under Standing Orders, this is one of the most puzzling areas, so I will now ask whether any other members wish to speak. If not, I will declare that a ballot be required and that the bells will be rung. The opportunity is now open for any person to speak.

Mr PETERSON: Is it proper for a nominee to speak?

The SPEAKER: Yes, I recognise the honourable member for Semaphore.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I accept the nomination because, as was stated by the previous speaker, the opportunities for people in my position in this Parliament are extremely limited in regard to obtaining positions on committees, select committees, or any other position whatsoever in the Parliament. Basically, that is the reason why I accept the nomination. I believe that I can do the job, and would like the opportunity to do so because all other opportunities are so limited and so locked into the Party system that we are cut out altogether.

The SPEAKER: I see no other person seeking recognition. In those circumstances, under Standing Orders, there must be a ballot. I direct that the bells be rung.

While the ballot was being held:

Mr EVANS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: I will take the honourable member's point of order after the ballot-papers have been collected, and when I have asked a question that I want to ask.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the House to come to order. Before dealing with any other business, I ask whether any member who wanted to vote has not had the opportunity to vote. I assume that any member who wished to vote has voted.

Mr EVANS: I raise the point that on one other occasion when a vote like this was cast the two ballot-boxes were counted separately. Where there was a break away from what a Party may have wanted, it was obvious that there were one, two or more cases where that occurred. It is possible for a break away to occur from both sides to balance it out or from only one side. I believe that the ballot slips should be placed in one heap before they are counted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Fisher to resume his seat. I ask the House to come to order, if not out of respect for me at least out of respect for the people of South Australia.

Mr EVANS: Members may be wondering why I have raised this matter. I believe this is a secret vote. The only way in which a secret vote can be had is if all the ballot-papers are placed in one heap and then counted. It is possible for members to see, as votes are taken from each box and placed on the two heaps, whether they are taken from separate boxes. I know that occurred once previously; people were conscious of it, and it caused some conflict later.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has a reasonable point. I see no reason why all the ballot-papers cannot be tipped into one box. I direct that that be done and then I will request that the honourable Premier and the honourable Leader of the Opposition act as scrutineers. Will both gentlemen come forward to make sure that that procedure is carried out.

The CLERK: The voting shows that Mr Brown has received 24 votes and that Mr Peterson has received 23 votes.

The SPEAKER: As a result of the ballot, Mr M.J. Brown has been duly elected Chairman of Committees of the Whole House during the present Parliament.

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that, in accordance with the summons from His Excellency the Governor, the House this day attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament. I have obtained a copy, which I now lay on the table.

Ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS: INTEREST RATES

Petitions signed by 181 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge all politicians to unite nationally to do all within their power to reduce interest rates across the board were presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold and Mr Hamilton.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: GRANGE VINEYARD

Petitions signed by 9 775 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to list the Grange vineyard property in its entirety on the registrar of State heritage items were presented by the Hons. D.C. Brown, G.J. Crafter, and D.J. Hopgood.

Petitions received.

PETITION: EDUCATION

A petition signed by 2 026 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide extra funding for the South Australian College of Advanced Education so that existing programmes and staffing levels can be maintained and, if necessary, expanded was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: REMAND CENTRE

A petition signed by 30 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal to build a remand centre within the town of Hindmarsh was presented by Mr Baker.

Petition received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Robe Slipway Replacement,

Paralowie School Upgrading (Stage I),

Morgan Water Filtration Plant,

Royal Adelaide Hospital—20-Megavolt Linear Accelerator,
Engineering and Water Supply Department—Upgrading of Regional Headquarters at Crystal Brook;
Port Augusta North-West Primary School—Stage II.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: COMMONWEALTH WAGE FREEZE

The Hon. J. C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The Australian economy has been severely affected by the international recession, depressed commodity prices and domestic drought. South Australia has not been isolated from the resulting economic down-turn. Our manufacturing industries, in particular, have been hard hit, and recently a number of major South Australian companies announced a series of retrenchments. There is a realisation by the Commonwealth, State Governments, all political Parties, and groups representing employers and trade unions that existing economic policies are insufficient to correct Australia's plunge into massive unemployment. It has also now been acknowledged that the Federal Budget's economic forecasts last August were inaccurate and have been overtaken by events.

South Australia, among other States, called for a Premiers' Conference to discuss means of dealing with this deteriorating situation, and on 15 November the Commonwealth invited all States to a Premiers' Conference. The South Australian Government welcomed this conference because we believed that the States and the Commonwealth should work to achieve a consensus to tackle the real problems facing Australia. Unfortunately, the Commonwealth made no proposals for this conference other than that there should be a 12-month freeze on wage increases and that so-called savings would be devoted to public works or employment programmes.

During the three-week period leading up to the conference the Commonwealth: rejected all proposals to widen the agenda of the Premiers' Conference to consider other aspects of economic policy and determine strategies for countering the recession; rejected all proposals to widen the conference to include trade union and employer representatives in order that a consensus be reached in the wider community; and rejected appeals from South Australia on 25 November for an up-to-date economic assessment to ensure that States were able to consider the seriousness of the economic situation. The South Australian Government believed that Premiers must be given the facts if they were to contribute effectively to the development of an appropriate change of direction for Australia's economic policy at the meeting called for 7 December.

The Commonwealth Government rejected a further request on 1 December from the South Australian Government asking for clarification of the Commonwealth's position on its wage pause proposals, which had become confused and subject to speculation from the media that there was a split in the Federal Cabinet on the nature of the proposals and on the brief of the conference to deal with economic problems. South Australia, along with several other States, employers, and trade unions, was concerned that the Commonwealth did not appear to be genuine in attempting to develop widespread consensus and commitment to a national economic recovery programme. We believe that without such a consensus little could be achieved.

The Premiers of the three principal manufacturing States were left to undertake wide-ranging consultations with employers and trade unions, both within the States and at the national level. Following our initiatives and painstaking negotiations, a national consensus gradually emerged in the lead up to yesterday's Premiers' Conference. We believe it was significant that this consensus occurred even though the Commonwealth declined to participate in these initiatives. The absence of leadership by the Commonwealth was particularly disturbing, considering its primary role in determining Australia's economic priorities.

This House should recall that each day during the three weeks before the conference there emerged some form of doubt and confusion as to the Commonwealth's intentions. It became apparent that media speculation about divisions within the Commonwealth Cabinet were accurate. Faction fighting became apparent between those in Cabinet who believe the Commonwealth should take a hard line, making no concessions, and refusing to amend any part of its economic policy, and false legislation to freeze wages and abandon any attempt to develop a consensus on Australia's future. The other Cabinet faction was prepared to accept that a national commitment and consensus was necessary and that all parties, including the Commonwealth and the States, should be prepared to make some sacrifices, rather than allow the wage and salary earners to bear the full brunt of the Commonwealth's proposals. The Governments of South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria developed a comprehensive plan for economic recovery. However, we went to the conference prepared to listen to all proposals and, if necessary, make sacrifices in order to achieve consensus.

The South Australian Government was concerned that there had been excessive reliance on proposals for a wage freeze. This one-sided emphasis neglected the fact that an essential element of economic recovery in Australia was an expansionary policy and the regeneration of investor and consumer confidence. The Commonwealth placed great stress on the need to increase the profitability of business but ignored the fundamental fact that business will not invest and employ more workers if it does not have an adequate market for its products.

At yesterday's conference the States, including Liberal Premiers, were confronted by the Commonwealth, which demanded concessions but offered none. The Commonwealth refused to entertain the notion that other complementary changes in policy might be necessary to achieve a wage pause. The Commonwealth, for instance, refused to consider a national approach to some form of price control or price surveillance, even though several States offered to transfer their constitutional powers over prices to the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth refused to consider any policies designed to reduce interest rates, refused to ease monetary policy and denied the States the right to increase borrowing powers for vital capital works programmes. Significantly for South Australia, the Commonwealth also refused to consider a 12-month pause in the reduction of tariff protection.

The Commonwealth was unable to provide estimates on the impact of its wage freeze proposals on the consumer price index, or the impact of its proposals on employment. There was also confusion resulting from contradictions to the proposals. The plan spoke of special regional unemployment problems that needed to be dealt with but proposed to allocate money to the States on a population basis rather than a needs basis. This contradiction, of course, would have particularly disadvantaged South Australia and Tasmania. The Commonwealth also refused to consider a return to centralised wage fixation following an agreed wages pause.

After seven years of single-minded concentration on reducing inflation, Australia has unfortunately remained at the top of the table in inflation. The Commonwealth has not been successful in the principal aim of its economic policy. I believe that there is now consensus support for a

change in this policy to include the generation of growth, employment and confidence in Australia.

Following protracted negotiations the Commonwealth agreed to provide $300 000 000 in potential savings from a 12-month wage pause in Commonwealth public sector salaries. This will be made available to the States and local authorities, as well as for the Commonwealth's own employment initiatives.

Some of these funds will be used for welfare housing, and the remainder on employment related activities. The Commonwealth will judge applications from all States on their employment creation merits for the allocation of these funds. A statement made this morning by the Leader of the Opposition, that South Australia's decision not to legislate for a 12-month wage freeze would mean that South Australia would be denied its share of the $300 000 000, was incorrect, ill informed and totally at variance with Federal Government announcements. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition will be pleased to know that not only has South Australia been invited to make submissions for Commonwealth funds but also that submissions were already being prepared this morning to ensure speedy implementation. It is quite clear that South Australia is further advanced than other State Governments. Again, I want to assure this House that the Acting Prime Minister (Mr Anthony), with the Federal Treasurer (Mr Howard), concurred that there would be no conditions attached to the allocation of these funds, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. The South Australian Government has proposed that funds be allocated on the basis of a State's share of unemployment, rather than on a per capita basis.

The Commonwealth reached agreement with some States that they would participate in legislative action to impose a freeze on public sector wages over 12 months. New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia indicated that they would not legislate for a public sector wage freeze but would be prepared to seek support for a voluntary six-month wage pause in the public sector.

The Commonwealth reached agreement with some States that they would support a 12-month wage freeze in the private sector, with the Commonwealth legislating to freeze Federal award wages over 12 months. New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia agreed to attempt to achieve a six-month wage pause in private sector wages under State awards. The Labor Premiers, in their wide-ranging consultations prior to the conference, had been very close to achieving national agreement for a six-month wage pause. The Commonwealth, in its obstructive approach, destroyed the chance of such an agreement being developed and implemented. As with all other States, South Australia was deeply concerned to try to reach such agreement at the conference.

South Australia is certainly not isolated in disagreeing with the unrealistic and unworkable approach by the Commonwealth. Indeed, employers as well as unions have indicated that it is essential that consensus be achieved in order to develop a workable programme. They agreed, in consultations with Labor Premiers, that it was better to develop a workable six-month agreement than a cosmetically attractive longer period agreement that would not be workable. The excessive Commonwealth dependence on legislative prescription is not practical, and it can only run into further difficulties, including the certainty of a legal challenge, even if it passes the Senate.

I was deeply disappointed with the outcome of the conference, because it failed to face up to the real problems facing Australia and abandoned the real chance for community consensus on a national prices and incomes policy. I am encouraged, however, that there are people within the Commonwealth Government with a more pragmatic and realistic approach to this question of the shortest path to economic recovery and the generation of confidence and jobs. I am sufficiently encouraged to be confident that, in the submissions that will be made to the Commonwealth about approaches that should be undertaken in South Australia by either the State Government or the Commonwealth to create jobs, those proposals will be judged on their merits.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COUNCIL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Government currently has a Bill in preparation which proposes the setting up of an Industrial Relations Advisory Council as a formal statutory body. The proposed council will be a tripartite advisory body formed to advise the Minister on the industrial relations issues of the day. It will also review proposed industrial legislation before it is presented to Parliament. The setting up of this advisory council will fulfil a promise of mine made in a speech to this House in December 1981. I made that promise as a result of the previous Government's failure to consult.

I have decided that, to be consistent with the principles that will be contained in the Bill, I should first seek the considered views of the various employer and employee groups before presenting the Bill to Parliament. To that end, I have called together those members of the existing Industrial Relations Advisory Council and will place before them the draft Bill to set up the council as a statutory body. Discussions on the draft Bill will be held with the council on 17 December, which should then enable me to submit an agreed upon document to the House in the next session of Parliament.

Once the advisory council has been set up on a statutory basis, I expect it to review immediately a number of the more pressing areas of concern. For example, one of the council's first jobs will be to consider the recommendations made in the Cawthorne Report and to review the specific legislative changes proposed by the Government as a consequence of that report.

Other significant industrial issues that the council will be required to look at will include such things as legislation to give the Industrial Commission powers over the question of shopping hours, a strengthening of the role of the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board, the setting up of statutory safety representative and safety committees, the introduction of detailed redundancy provisions providing for such things as early notification, and legislative changes to the Workers Compensation Act.

In all these areas of reform there is an obvious and pressing need for flexibility and consultation. The setting up of the Industrial Relations Advisory Council on a statutory basis will allow such proposed legislation to be tested by persons with specialist skills who will bring years of practical experience to the job. The Government recognises that if its reforms are to be effective they must find general acceptance within the industrial relations community.

The formal machinery of an Industrial Relations Advisory Council will allow the Government to gain the necessary consensus viewpoint and to refine its legislation before it is presented to Parliament. Indeed, this process of prior consultation on proposed legislation will become mandatory under the provisions of the proposed Bill. It should be pointed out that such an approach is not designed to fetter Parliament; nor will it seek to deny the due processes of this House. Rather, it is an attempt to ensure that new legislation is workable and fair to the various interested

parties. A valuable by-product of such a forum will be the opportunity it will provide for a frank exchange of views on contentious matters. With spiralling unemployment and no signs of immediate national economic recovery, the need to work out a joint approach has never been greater. A more detailed statement on this proposed new legislation will be made available when the Bill is presented to the House in the forthcoming session.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Public Service List, 1982.
II. State Clothing Corporation—Report, 1981-1982.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Superannuation Act, 1974-1981—Regulations—Prescribed Public Authorities.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. J.D. Wright)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Industrial Affairs and Employment, Department of—Report, 1981.
II. Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, 1975-1982—Regulations—Job Loading.
III. Workers Compensation Act, 1971-1982—Regulations—Worker's Rehabilitation Advisory Unit Notification Form.

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Historic Shipwrecks Act, 1981—General Regulations, 1982.
II. Planning, Director of—Report, 1981-82—
III. South Australian State Planning Authority—Report, 1981-82.
IV. Planning Appeal Board—Report, 1981-82.
V. Planning Act, 1982—Regulations—Development Control.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Lands, Department of—Report, 1981-82.
II. Lands—Pastoral Act, 1936-1980—Out of Hundreds (Oodnadatta)—Cemetery Reserve Resumed and Dedicated

Real Property Act, 1886-1982—Regulations—

III. Descriptions of Officers.
IV. Registration of Division Plans.
V. Registration of Division Plans (Amendment).
VI. Supply and Tender Board—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956-1978—Regulations—Fares.
II. Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1981—Regulations—Display of 'L' Sign.
III. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Road Traffic Board Powers of Dispensation.
IV. State Transport Authority—Report, 1982.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Marine and Harbors, Department of—Report, 1981-82.
II. Marine Act, 1936-1976—Regulations—Exemption for Trading Vessels.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

By Command—

I. Australian Forestry Council—Summary of Resolutions and Recommendations of the 19th Meeting, Sydney, 10 May 1982.

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia—Report for year ended 30 April 1982.
II. Education Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Classification Board Subcommittee.
III. Poultry Farmer Licensing Committee—Report, 1981-82.
IV. Fisheries Act, 1971-1980—Regulations—Rock Lobster Fishery Zones.
V. South Australian Meat Corporation—Report, 1981-82.

Sturt College of Advanced Education—

VI. Report, 1980.
VII. Report, 1981.
VIII. Flinders University of South Australia—Report and Legislation, 1981.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1981—Regulations—Residual Pesticide Levels in Food.
II. Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report, 1981-82.
III. Radiation Protection and Control Act, 1982—General Regulations, 1982.
IV. South Australian Health Commission—Report, 1980-81.
V. Charitable Funds, Commissioners of—Report, 1981-82

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Australian Mineral Development Laboratories—Report, 1982.
II. Stony Point (Liquids Project) Ratification Act, 1981—Regulations—Limestone Mining.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

By Command—

I. Statistical Return of Voting—Florey District By-election.

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Advisory Council for Inter-government Relations—Report for year ending 31 August 1981.
II. Builders Licensing Board of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report on, 1981-82.
III. Children's Court Advisory Committee—Report, 1981-82.
IV. Companies (Application of Laws) Act, 1982—Regulations—Exclusion from Operation.
V. Consumer Transactions Act, 1972-82—Regulations—Rust Prevention.
VI. Credit Union Stabilisation Board—Report, 1981-82.
VII. Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1977-1982—Regulations—Costs.
VIII. Department for Community Welfare—Report, 1981-82.
IX. Hairdressers' Registration Board of South Australia—Report, 1981-82.
X. Places of Public Entertainment Act, 1913-1972—Regulations—Cinematograph Operators.
XI. National Companies and Securities Commission—Report, 1981-82.

Trade Standards Act, 1979—Regulations—

XII. Precious Stones.
XIII. Puller Winch.
XIV. Trustee Act, 1936-1982—Regulations—Keeping of Records.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. River Murray Waters Act, 1935-1971—Regulations—Control of Unauthorised Persons.
II. Water Resources Act, 1976-1981—Regulations—Fees.
III. Waterworks Act, 1932-1981—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Racing Act, 1976-1981—Rules of Trotting—

I. Arrears
II. Deletion of Rule 511.
III. Greyhound Racing Control Board—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Alsatian Dogs Act, 1934-1980—Regulations—Revocation of Ban on Kangaroo Island.
II. Parks Community Centre Act, 1981—Regulations—Election of Staff Representative.
III. Institutes Association of South Australia—Report, 1981-82.

City of Adelaide—
IV. By-law No. 2—Vehicle Movement.
V. By-law No. 15—Obstructions to Streets.
VI. District Council of Cleve—By-law No. 31—Control of Vehicles on Foreshores.
VII. District Council of Kapunda—By-law No. 29—Kapunda Public Cemetery.
VIII. District Council of Murray Bridge—By-law No. 23—Cemeteries.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr BECKER (Hanson) brought up the annual report of the committee for the year 1981-82.

Mr BECKER: The report summarises the views of the fourth committee, which was appointed in October 1979 and has been a most effective committee. Much credit for this must go to the acceptance, by a bipartisan committee, of the need for Parliament to make recommendations to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the public sector.

The report gives the current status on 18 matters currently being investigated by the Public Accounts Committee, most of which illustrate the need for improved accountability through the Parliament to the community. I believe that these inquiries demonstrate that the work of the Public Accounts Committee must be continued and further extended if this Parliament is to effectively monitor the management of taxpayers' funds. Attempts made to suppress the effectiveness of previous committees must never again be contemplated. In *Hansard* on 7 October 1980, the then Premier (Hon. D. O. Tonkin, M.P.) was reported as follows:

The work of the Public Accounts Committee of this Parliament has been most significant to date in giving the Government a lead in areas where expenditure can be contained and, indeed, should be contained. Contrary to some attitudes, the policy of this Government is not to regard the Public Accounts Committee in an adversary light. Quite the contrary: we regard it as being one of the best allies that a Government can have. In my view, the only time that a government can be condemned for anything which is brought up in a Public Accounts Committee is if, in fact, the Government is told about various occurrences and takes no action to correct the matters which have been brought forward. So I think properly used, and used in a co-operative fashion, the Public Accounts Committee is of immense value to the Government, and this has already proved to be so in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, in the Hospitals Department and, I have no doubt, in other areas. That is the Parliamentary backup that we have for our policies.

I sincerely hope that the present Government will view the Public Accounts Committee in a similar light. I ask that the Premier move that the report be printed.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

WAGE PAUSE

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier indicate whether or not we are going to participate with all other States in a wage pause? I ask this question in view of the Premier's failure to give any commitment to a wage pause in the Ministerial statement that he has just made and because of the conflict which arose in the interpretation of statements that he made after yesterday's Premiers' Conference. This morning's *Advertiser* reports that the Premier gave an undertaking at yesterday's Premiers' Conference to initiate a wage pause in South Australia. The report quoted the Premier as saying:

We were prepared in the course of the conference to pick up the concept of a six-months pause on the basis all eight Governments would be involved in the exercise on a six-month pause.

What we've been told now is, 'Right, the Commonwealth's made its decision, this is it, we expect you to do something about a six-month pause.'

Well, I've noted their views and I'll go back and talk about it with employer and union groups in South Australia.

This morning's report also quoted the Premier as saying that he did not plan legislation similar to the Federal Government's proposed legislation for a six-month wage pause. The fact that the Premier last night refused to commit South Australia to a wage pause is confirmed by reports in today's Melbourne *Age* and the *Australian.* The *Age* report states:

Although the New South Wales and Victorian Governments undertook to support a six-month pause, the South Australian Premier, Mr Bannon, gave no commitment.

The *Australian* report states:

The outcome of the meeting was still confused last night—with South Australia's new Labor Premier, Mr Bannon, saying he had not given a final commitment to freeze public sector wages in his State.

I also draw the Premier's attention to the fact that the A.B.C. political correspondent in Canberra, Barry Cassidy, quoted him on television last night as having indicated to the conference that he had given no commitment to a wage pause. However, in today's *News,* the following reference is made to the Premier's position:

He denied reports in the *Advertiser* today that he would be the sole Premier not to try to enforce some form of wage freeze in the wake of the special Premiers' Conference in Canberra yesterday.

In view of the fact that the major national newspapers and the A.B.C. confirmed the *Advertiser's* interpretation of the Premier's position following the conference, can he say whether he has changed his mind overnight and, if he has, will he give the House details of proposals he will be putting to his meeting later this afternoon with representatives of the Trades and Labor Council to implement a wage pause?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader is right when he says that there has been a conflict in interpretation in the media, and that is most unfortunate. The matter is complex. One of the reasons why this conflict has arisen is the failure of the press to distinguish between what we went to the conference prepared to do, what we were prepared to do in the course of the conference, and what finally emerged from the conference. Let me make it clear, as I would hope that in part the statement I have just placed before the House has made clear, that we left the conference without making commitments, and in that we were joined by our colleagues in the other two Labor States.

That is not to say that we believe the idea of a wage pause, at least for six months, should be rejected out of hand. I have made clear that from today I will be consulting with both trade union and employer groups on the implications of the decision made at the Premiers' Conference by some of the States and the Commonwealth and how it might apply to South Australia. When I said that there has been some conflict (and the Leader referred to conflict in interpretation), I make clear that at the conference itself we came very close indeed to reaching a consensus on a package of measures that would have included, in part, a six-month wage pause.

In fact, I have before me the notes on the proposition that was to be supported by all States and the Commonwealth. In that, reference is made to the six-month wage pause. Reference is made to the approach to the Federal Conciliation and Arbitration Commission by all States, supporting the view that there be no new wage round in the private sector until the conclusion of the proposed public sector wage pause. The effect of that was to be reviewed at the Premiers' Conference to be held in June. At the expiration of the pause, the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission was to exercise its statutory obligations when considering any application for a wage increase.

That was put to the conference and the Commonwealth Government refused to budge on the question of the 12-months pause. It rejected out of hand anything less than 12 months and, by so doing, made it unacceptable and unworkable. That is the position in which I stand. At the end of

that conference the Acting Prime Minister read a statement in which he announced what the Commonwealth was going to do, in effect, unilaterally and what some other State Governments were going to do. He said that he expected South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales to apply a six-month pause. I am back in South Australia discussing with South Australians whether or not that is going to be possible. I believe that is the only correct way to do it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections, as honourable members know.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suggest that, as some of the other States, and, indeed, perhaps the Commonwealth, are beginning to discover, this is not something that can be enforced by legislative prescription, even if the power to do so was there (and at the Commonwealth level there are severe doubts about that). It is something that can be achieved only by consultation and consensus within the community.

I reiterate that that consultation and consensus had been achieved. The A.C.T.U. supported the stand of the Labor Premiers. The major employer groups, while admittedly preferring a 12-month pause (they would prefer a 10-year pause if they could get one, and that is fair enough—that is their position) were perfectly prepared to accept, as an option, the six-month pause. The only group in the whole process not prepared to accept it was the Commonwealth Government and that is why agreement floundered.

The Leader's statement that legislation is proposed in all States but South Australia is not true. On the contrary, Victoria does not propose to legislate. New South Wales is examining its position. The Queensland Premier, very strong at the conference, has gone back to his State and said that he does not think he will legislate now and that he will try to enforce it for 12 months and consider it after six. At the end of the conference the Tasmanian Premier left saying that he was not sure whether he could get legislation through and that in any case it would create an 18-month pause in his State and he did not think that the people would wear it.

So, there is no degree of unanimity of approach. Certainly, we are not one off. I would suggest that South Australia's approach to achieve consensus and consultation in this matter will be the one that is proved right in six months time. I put those words on the record and ask the Leader of the Opposition to remind us of them in June next year.

INVESTMENT

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Premier outline to the House the latest information on the level of new investment in South Australian industry, in particular how new investment in this State compares with the national total? With your leave, Mr Speaker, I would like to explain to the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the first time that the honourable member has spoken in the House, and I ask that she be given a fair go.

Mrs APPLEBY: I have asked this question because during the recent election campaign some sweeping claims were made by the former Government on the investment levels in this State. Television commercials claimed that, under the Liberals, this State was receiving 20 per cent of all investment in Australia. In his policy speech the former Premier made the following claim:

> Since we were elected to Government, some $1 500 000 000 has been invested in the manufacturing industry in South Australia, almost one-fifth of the national total.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, I have figures on investment levels and for the erudition of the member for Eyre I will come to this House prepared with economic data on every occasion, as I think it is quite appropriate. Investment levels in South Australia are not encouraging. Only recently, the Bureau of Statistics has published figures on investment levels in this State and in Australia generally; these are the most accurate figures yet published on investment. Unfortunately, we have been bedevilled by statistics being issued from the Federal Government department that have proved constantly inaccurate. It is a pity that those statistics have been used at the political level to give an unreal view of investment in South Australia. I think it is vital that we look at the facts, because only by so doing can we decide what measures are appropriate to correct the situation.

In the 12 months to September 1979, this State's share of actual total investment was 6.7 per cent; in the two years to September 1981 it was 6.6 per cent; our share was up slightly to 6.8 per cent in the latest available period, the six months ending March 1982. That, of course, is well below our population share and, therefore, is not a performance of which we can be pleased.

Our share of manufacturing industry investment is probably the most alarming aspect of these figures. It is expected that this State will receive only 4.8 per cent of national investment in that sector for the 12 months to June 1983; that is on top of a steady decline since 1979. At present, we account for around 10 per cent of national manufacturing industry activity and employment. South Australia is one of the three major manufacturing States in Australia, and that level of investment (4.8 per cent of the national share) is extremely disturbing. The new A.B.S. information would also appear to suggest that, contrary to what has been said in the past, mining and resources investment in this State is low. Unlike the situation in other States, the A.B.S. provides no separate data in the mining investment category, partly for reasons of confidentiality, suggesting that one or two projects only are contributing to our level of investment. We will be analysing those figures further and will be discussing with industries ways in which investment can be regenerated in this State.

WAGE FREEZE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Premier agree that South Australia has been significantly disadvantaged by his failure to give a commitment to a 12-month wage pause? The Premier, despite a hastily cobbled together Ministerial statement (to use a phrase with which he is familiar), still has not made his position clear to the members of this House.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He is still refusing to make clear to this House and to the public whether he supports a six-month or a 12-month pause, or any pause at all. He has said that he has come back to South Australia to discuss the matter with the employer and trade union groups. The position of the employer groups has been perfectly clear for some time now. Mr Polites, in the Federal sphere, and the employer spokesman for the local group, as the Premier knows well, have made their positions clear, so he is really saying that he is coming back to talk to the unions. I have been told that, if the Premier had agreed to a 12-month wage pause at yesterday's Premiers' Conference, South Australia would have been at least $40 000 000 better off in grants and loans from the Federal Government. I understand that the Federal—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: —Government was prepared to make available grants to the States of between $200 000 000 and $300 000 000—

Mr Gregory: Bribe money.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: —to be used for construction projects. The honourable member interjects and suggests that it is bribery, but the Premier is desperately casting around seeking funds to enhance employment. I understand that that is the position made clear by the Commonwealth Government: it was prepared to make available between $200 000 000 and $300 000 000 additional money for construction projects. On a population basis this would have meant for South Australia at least $20 000 000 which the State Government would have been free to spend as it chose on construction projects.

However, because of the refusal of the Labor Governments to enter into a 12-month freeze, the Federal Government will now decide how and where that money will be spent. This means that South Australia is no longer automatically entitled to its share on a population basis. A report in this morning's *Sydney Morning Herald* states:

> Mr Howard made it clear that the Federal Government, not the States, will decide how the $300 000 000 will be spent on work related projects.

In addition to this potential loss of funds I understand that the attitude of the Labor Premiers and their refusal to agree has cost the States an additional $200 000 000 to $300 000 000 in borrowing approvals through Loan Council. Had the Premier and the other Labor Premiers agreed to the proposed pause, the Commonwealth would have convened a special meeting of Loan Council yesterday afternoon to approve new borrowing arrangements. On this point, the *Sydney Morning Herald* states:

> Because the Labor States refused to accept a 12-month wage pause, the Federal Government restricted its funding offer to $300 000 000 and did not proceed with its plan to offer all States additional Loan Council funds to boost their capital works programmes.

As it is, all we have is the hope (but not the guarantee) that the Federal Government will spend some funds in South Australia without the State Government's having any say in the type of project on which those funds are to be spent.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: First, the Commonwealth made no offer whatsoever in terms of extended Loan Council borrowings. The 21-point plan put forward at the beginning of the day at the conference contained no such reference, nor did the Commonwealth give any indication that that was contemplated. On the contrary, Treasurer Howard told the conference that the Federal Budget was now in a $4 000 000 000 deficit, as opposed to the billion dollar deficit that he thought it was going to be two months ago, and that there was no capacity in those areas.

They did, in point 13 of their 21 points, offer $300 000 000 to the States for employment related projects on a population basis. It subsequently emerged that it was not expected that the whole $300 000 000 would be allocated directly to the States, but that local government was to participate in some of it and that some would be reserved for specific projects of the Federal Government, so that amount would be reduced accordingly.

Finally, what has been decided is that the Commonwealth itself shall allocate those moneys, and I suggest that, far from being a disadvantage, this could be an advantage to us, because, under the population basis of such a distribution, we would not do as well as we would under a distribution related to need. That is a case that Tasmania and South Australia in particular are better able to argue in the absence of a Loans Council or Commonwealth-State types formula, and that is what we intend to do. As I have already indicated in this House, the measures that we are developing to take advantage of the Commonwealth moneys are well advanced. I had preliminary discussions with at least two Federal Ministers before leaving the conference, and Mr Howard himself assured me that there would be no discrimination whatsoever in the allocation of those funds.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Premier state the current unemployment position in South Australia and how it compares with that in other States? I ask this question as a result of claims made in the State in the past two months that have tended to cloud the position of the jobless in South Australia. For example, in his recent election speech the former Premier said:

> We have been moving against the national unemployment trend.

This claim would suggest falling unemployment in this State while the jobless total soars in the rest of Australia.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The fact is that the jobless total is rising, both in this State and in the rest of Australia, and it is nonsense to suggest otherwise. I believe that we should approach this economic data, these figures, with a sense of reality. We should recognise that our unemployment reached a post war record of 52 000 in October 1982. The release of those figures on 11 November perhaps had something to do with the timing of the State election. In the three years from October 1979, unemployment in South Australia increased by 8 000. We now have a jobless rate of 8.4 per cent. I think two sub-groupings of those figures are worth looking at. In the metropolitan area the level has now risen to 9.1 per cent. At present 24.1 per cent of persons aged 15 to 19 years are seeking work. So, it can be seen that the problem of youth unemployment in this State is very acute. The figure tends to move up and down slightly, but it has been as high as 30 per cent; it is well above the national average of less than 19 per cent. Again, as with the overall unemployment figures, only Tasmania is in a worse position than is South Australia. Let us address those figures realistically and attempt to initiate measures that will ensure economic revival and employment in this State.

WAGE PAUSE

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: If a wage pause is introduced in the other States and not in South Australia, does the Premier agree that the competitive position of South Australian industry will be jeopardised? South Australian employers are confused and concerned about the reluctance of the Premier to give a clear commitment to the implementation of a wage pause in South Australia—a reluctance, I might say, that the Premier has pursued today both in his statement and in answers to questions. The competitive position of South Australian industry across Australia will be jeopardised if South Australia does not implement a wage pause concurrently with the other States. The Premier would be aware that the viability of many South Australian companies with major markets in the Eastern States depends on their being able to maintain a competitive edge. In those circumstances, I seek an assurance from the Premier that he will take immediate action to clear up the confusion and concerns which South Australian employers are expressing because of his refusal to give a clear commitment to a wage pause.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have not yet heard from these confused employers. However, if in any case they are confused they certainly will not be as I hold productive

discussions with them over the next few days. I think they will understand the position completely. I point out that some 60 per cent of employees in this State are governed by Federal awards over which the State has no control. The remaining 40 per cent are under State awards which in many cases are related to national wage movements and national industry agreements. Therefore, South Australia will not be particularly disadvantaged in the way that the honourable member suggests if the scenario that he painted is in fact followed.

It is most unlikely that there will be anything different in the other States from the position which exists here. I assure the honourable member that he need have no worries on that score. In fact, wages in South Australia are lower than are those in other States. We have a comparative cost advantage, which has been a long-term historical thing; that is most unlikely to change in the current economic circumstances.

TOMATO GROWERS

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture, inform the House whether he is aware of the difficulties facing tomato growers in the western districts, particularly in the Henley Beach district? Climatic conditions over the last five or six weeks have produced a tomato glut on the Adelaide markets. First, a series of frosts and, secondly, a series of hot days have caused that glut. Growers estimate that the cost of producing a carton of tomatoes is about $5 to $6. Wholesale prices, as recently as last week, were as follows: 1-3/4 inch tomatoes $1.50 per carton, 2-inch tomatoes $4 per carton, 2-1/2 inch tomatoes $5 per carton, and 3-inch tomatoes $2 per carton. Therefore, the production cost is well above the sale price. In recent weeks tomato growers would have been better off receiving unemployment benefits.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question and welcome him to this place; it is good to see him here. I will certainly refer his question to my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, in another place. The Government is very concerned about the plight of those involved in the glasshouse industry, just as it is concerned with the plight of many people in agriculture today, a fact that is not often recognised by some members opposite. Indeed, so great is the Government's concern that over the last three years my Party has indicated on a number of occasions its concern for the glasshouse industry and the way in which it was faring. In fact, we proposed in this Chamber and in outside forums a number of things that should happen in relation to the glasshouse industry to take account of the serious problems facing it.

The problems occur in a number of areas, including the wholesale distribution mechanism; indeed, the Minister of Agriculture has commented about that matter in the press since 6 November. Another area of concern is the price reporting mechanism. In fact, I raised that matter in this place before the last election, both as the representative of the then shadow Minister of Agriculture and as the member for Salisbury, which district includes a number of people employed in the glasshouse industry.

The facts that the member for Henley Beach provided about the cost of production and the returns received by tomato growers are entirely correct, and highlight the very serious problem that has been facing glasshouse producers in this State in recent times. The Government is also concerned about the level of technical support available to those involved in the glasshouse industry. The three areas that I have mentioned will be receiving the Government's urgent attention. Already, there have been meetings between grower representatives and the Minister of Agriculture. I hope that in the not too distant future some positive announcements can be made, and that the member can then relay them to his constituents.

WAGE FREEZE

Mr EVANS: Does the Premier agree with the views expressed by the South Australian Institute of Teachers about the effects of a wage pause? The latest issue of the *Teachers' Journal* contains a report of the first meeting between representatives of the institute and the Premier since he took office. In part, that report states:

> SAIT will firmly press the Premier to reject a wage freeze either on its own or as part of an economic package to reduce inflation and unemployment as a strategy that will not work and is inherently unfair.

I also refer to a report in the *Advertiser* on 6 December in which the institute President, Ms Ebert, rejected a wage pause on the grounds that it would increase unemployment. It is well known that before the election the A.L.P. accepted the views of the institute on most issues, and I therefore seek an indication from the Premier whether he is also in agreement with the institute on this matter.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The short answer is 'No'—I do not agree with the views of SAIT. SAIT makes some valid points, and those points have been part of the national debate on this issue. However, I do not agree with the institute in all respects, and I would like to correct the impression that before the election we on this side of the House agreed with SAIT on all issues. We certainly agree with a number of the concerns expressed by SAIT, but obviously we disagree with a number of others. I believe the views of SAIT in this matter illustrate the need to try to find a practical and consensus approach to this whole question. Where there is such a wide divergence of views in certain sections of the community, we need the sort of discussions I have been proposing.

SCHOOL ASSISTANTS

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Education tell the House what teacher aide and school assistant hours will be reinstated to schools in the District of Unley following the announcement that the Labor Government will reinstate the 4 per cent hours cut by the previous Liberal Government? During the period of the former Tonkin Government, the hours of South Australian school assistants were reduced not only by a process of rationalisation but also by a process of deliberate and Draconian cuts that were instituted by the former Government.

In three years we saw the quality of education in this State reduced deliberately by the former Government. As a consequence, school assistants at schools not only in Unley but also throughout the State were required to reduce their hours, and this reduced deliberately and directly the quality of education being provided to our children and therefore the future investment of education within the State of South Australia. I believe it is important that the Minister consider this matter in reinstating hours to those schools. The record of the former Government leaves something to be desired in relation to—

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I rise on a point of order. I suggest very strongly that the member for Unley is commenting in his explanation of the question, and I believe that that is out of order under Standing Orders.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There will be more time for questions if honourable members allow me to speak. I believe that the honourable member might have been commenting, but I gave considerable latitude to the member for Torrens when he asked a question. I take into account the fact that this is the honourable member's first question in this House. In those circumstances, I will ask the honourable member for Unley to proceed with his question.

Mr MAYES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In looking at the question of school assistants hours, I believe we must recognise that over the past three years there have been cuts directly affecting the quality of education and that the former Government's position and policies in regard to this matter have had a major impact, something that I believe many members opposite preferred to forget in the lead-up to the last election.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I welcome the new member for Unley to this place: he will be a very able successor to Gil Langley, who served the District of Unley so well for many years. Members will already know that the Government has reinstated the 4 per cent cut-back in school assistants hours that were taken away by the previous Government in 1981. Members will also be aware that that action has caused some considerable relief in the education community as they realise a number of things flowing from that decision.

The first matter is that they get more school hours back in their schools, and those hours for school assistants therefore play their part in the education of the children of this State, and that seems to be an important issue that was very often forgotten by the former Government. The second point is that it represents a bench-mark on behalf of the Government as to how importantly it views education and, indeed, the Government thinks that what matters in education is what happens at the classroom level, and school assistants play a very important part in that.

The restoration of the 4 per cent cut-back that took place in 1981 was done immediately we came into power, and schools are already starting to receive some information in that regard. I might say that we took the opportunity not only of restoring the 4 per cent cut-back; we also took the opportunity of rationalising the discrepancy between junior primary allocation of hours and primary school allocation of hours. Up until that point, the junior primary allocation had been somewhat less than was the primary school allocation; we took that as being quite unreasonable and we agreed to make the junior primary allocation the same as that for the primary schools. Thus, for that particular sector the increase is somewhat more than 4 per cent.

The effect of giving back the 4 per cent is worth some 4 265 hours of time per week in our education system. When I add to that the adjustment as a result of the 231 teachers with whom we have not dispensed at the end of this school year, who were proposed to be dispensed with under the former Budget, one can see that this is a fairly significant commitment. It is a significant commitment, because we believe that school assistants do play a part in the education of our children. May I say that we also intend to honour another commitment made before the election, a commitment which the previous Minister would have some ground for honouring himself, because it came out of a report which his own Government commissioned and about which he was so ecstatic on so many occasions, namely, that there should be a review into the role that school assistants play in the education process; we think that that review should take place. May I say to members that we do not see that review taking place to be a disguised means of taking back the very 4 per cent that we have given. We do not see that resulting in a reduction in the global allocation of school assistants hours across the State.

As to the specific point about the schools within the Unley electorate, the honourable member will appreciate that, with more than 700 schools within the Education Department, the matter is still being sorted out in the department, and I would like to take that part of the question on notice and report back to him by means of this House in due course.

ELECTRICITY CONCESSIONS

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare amend forthwith the direction given to the Department for Community Welfare to discriminate against ex-servicemen and women in relation to the receipt of benefits? I have been approached by many people asking for information in relation to those entitled to a reduction in electricity charges.

Members interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: If the junior Minister on the front bench would be quiet for a minute, it would give me an opportunity to explain my question. I have been told that a direction was given that anyone holding a pensioner concession card would be entitled to receive these benefits. Many ex-service personnel do hold this concession card. I understand that last night, on the Jeff Medwell talk-back show, the Minister said that ex-service personnel were not entitled to these benefits. It is reported that the Minister gave as one of the reasons that they receive cheap loans of $25 000 at 8 per cent. The honourable Minister would know that some low income earners can borrow $35 000 at a rate much lower than that, namely, about 3 per cent.

In the programme the Minister gave another reason and said that ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen were entitled to Repatriation Hospital services. The Minister would know that that is exactly the same regarding pensioners: if ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen have not qualified for a card they are also able to qualify on the same basis as pensioners for services within Government hospitals. The Minister then went on to say that there were too many of them. I suggest that that is purely discrimination against ex-service personnel.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I am pleased that the honourable member has raised this issue, as it gives me an opportunity to clarify some misconceptions abroad in the community about these very important concessions. The Government has acted very swiftly to implement this election promise. Indeed, it is probably the largest and most complex concession ever granted to those in need in our community. It involves the payment of this concession to a section of our community numbering in excess of 100 000 households. The Government has determined that that section of the community is most in need.

The Government readily accepts that in this area there is no precise information and that it must constantly review the implementation of this concession. The honourable member raised the problem of one group in the community that believes it is disadvantaged by the criteria that we have established. I have received representations from a number of other groups in the community that also feel that they are disadvantaged. The Government has established an interdepartmental committee to oversee the implementation of this concession administratively and in its effect. That committee will report from time to time to the Government, and it will then consider whether changes to the criteria need to be made.

I spoke to the ex-servicemen's association spokesman about this matter yesterday and asked him to contact the Chairman of that committee and place before the committee examples of need amongst the category of persons he represents. I have also done this with the other groups that have contacted me. If there are glaring examples of discrim-

ination, that must be attended to. However, I point out that the Opposition is very generous in Opposition, but was much less generous in Government.

The proposal put to the electors of this State prior to the last election indicated that some 70 000 South Australians would benefit under it. I understand that a spokesman for the Opposition told the Returned Services League that ex-service pensioners would receive this concession under the former Government's proposals. I point out to the House that there are some 27 000 service pensioners in this State holding pensioner health benefit cards.

The former Government also promised this concession to T.P.I. pensioners and war widows. There are 8 000 of those pensioners in this State. When one adds up those concessions for those categories of persons, one realises that there are very few of that 70 000 who would receive that concession. I suggest that it was never the intention of the former Government to provide this concession to service pensioners. The Labor Party's policy statements prior to the election specifically stated that the two categories for the provision of concessions amongst service pensioners were T.P.I. and war widows. The Labor Party has honoured its promise to the letter.

The Government has extended it far beyond that proposed by the previous Government, to include needy unemployed, sickness beneficiaries, special beneficiaries, supporting mothers and those people who do not own their homes. I point out to the House that it was obviously the intention of the previous Government to restrict this concession to only those persons who owned their own homes. If ever there was an inequitable distribution of a vital concession to those in need in our community, it was that proposal. That is made clear from a statement by the Premier reported in the *Advertiser* of 21 October this year, when the Premier said that the criteria that would be applied would be the same as that applying to the payment of remissions to pensioners for water and sewerage rates.

When one looks at the figure of 70 000 that the Premier quoted, one will see that that is the number of persons who are receiving that concession currently. I suggest to the honourable member that he might consider the morality of his own Party in the matter and the promises it made and be honest with those people who, I would suggest, are being confused by statements such as that which he and other members of his Party have made. The Government considers this concession to be a vital one. It is very much needed in the community and is very much appreciated by those people (in excess of 100 000 households) who will receive it. Many more people than that will reap the benefit of that concession. I would not like to see groups of needy people being enticed to argue amongst each other in order to receive this important benefit.

GOVERNMENT FINANCES

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Treasurer inform the House as to when he will make his promised statement on Government finances? On 16 November the Treasurer announced a Budget review and has subsequently promised that he will announce the results of that review to the House. In seeking an indication from the Treasurer on when he will make that announcement, I refer to point 10 of His Excellency's Speech earlier today and remind the Premier of a number of statements on Government finances that he has made in recent weeks.

In the *Advertiser* of 4 November (two days before the election) he was reported as saying, 'We estimate that revenue collection will match the extra expenditure we propose.' As reported in the *News* of 17 November the Treasurer said, 'We are certainly going to face some financial dilemmas.' In the *Advertiser* of 7 December the Treasurer, referring to the former Government, is reported to have stated:

> They have left their successors with the worst budgetary situation in 50 years.

That is a situation which is not borne out by the facts in the very frank and open statement by the Leader of the Opposition on 6 December. In answering my question, will the Treasurer explain some more of his more recent statements which conflict with his acknowledgement before the election in the *Advertiser* of 4 November, that the tight situation in regard to State finances would not cause difficulty to the Labor Party in implementing its election promises and that in making those promises the Labor Party has available to it extensive information on the Budget Estimates and State finances? In that article on 4 November, following a question relative to Mr Cain, 'Could that happen to you?', Mr Bannon stated:

> We have the Auditor-General's Reports, the programme performance budgeting information, and the Premier's own speeches on the economy as a defence for being a full book on the financial aspects of the State.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will certainly be making that statement in the current sitting, that is, before Christmas. I cannot say exactly when, because the information is still in the state of preparation. One would appreciate that it is a big task. In fact, the deterioration in finances that has been evident in economic circumstances has made that task more difficult. I want to be able to give a full and factual statement to the House. It will certainly be within the next few days. I comment in terms of pre-election statements in contrast to the situation in which we find ourselves.

It was certainly the boast of the previous Government that it provided much more financial information than had ever been provided previously. During the course of the election campaign a number of promises were made by the then Government that involved the expenditure of extra revenue which could be costed and which gave strength to a belief that the finance was available to fulfil those promises. A number of factors like that had to be taken into account in costing our programme. It is worth noting that, despite the very difficult financial position, which I will be detailing, we have moved to honour our promises and we will continue to do so.

SUBSTANDARD HOUSING

The SPEAKER: Before calling the member for Peake, I indicate that by mistake I called two Opposition members in succession. I will now proceed to call two Government back-benchers in succession.

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Housing please advise what action the Government is taking to improve substandard housing in South Australia and to control rent charges for such housing? Eight weeks ago I had reason on behalf of a constituent to approach one of the bigger metropolitan councils in my electorate concerning substandard housing, but found that the council had no power to act on such housing. This had been abolished by the previous Liberal Government when this power had been taken away from the Housing Trust.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It is rather fitting that the member for Peake should ask this particular question, because in this House in the previous Parliament he made very many speeches about shark landlords and the excessive rents being charged for substandard housing. I am pleased to advise my colleague that one of my first acts on assuming office was to transfer responsibility for the administration of the Housing Improvement Act from local government

to the Housing Trust. Before July 1981, the Housing Trust administered the provisions of the Housing Improvement Act, which provided for the improvement of substandard housing and the control of rents charged for such housing. However, in July 1981 this responsibility was transferred by the previous Government to local government authorities. Unfortunately, local government has been unable to use the Act and, since this decision was taken in 1981, no houses have been declared substandard.

At this point, I remind the House that when the previous Government made that decision it did not inform either the Local Government Association or the South Australian Housing Trust. There have been some very unkind comments going around that the reason why the previous Minister took the power away from the South Australian Housing Trust was that he wanted to appease his friends, the landlords. Perhaps that is unkind, but that is the story that is going around. There is also the story going around that one of the reasons why the power was transferred from the South Australian Housing Trust to the Local Government Association was that in the past the previous Minister had had a Housing Improvement Act placed on his own property. Again, that is unkind, but there must be some truth because it is going around the town. I can assure you that, when I passed the powers back to the Housing Trust, the Local Government Association, the South Australian Housing Trust, the Housing Industry Association and the Real Estate Institute told me that they were very pleased about it.

Coming back to rent control, this Government believes that the effective administration of the Housing Improvement Act is essential to ensure that the standard of South Australian housing is improved and that the rents charged are commensurate with the conditions of the houses themselves. That is just not happening now. Before I transferred responsibility to the Housing Trust, there were substandard houses in Thebarton and Hindmarsh, and the rents being charged were $80 a week.

That was only since the power was transferred to the Local Government Association. The trust's role also protects home buyers, who must be advised if any house they are thinking of buying has been declared substandard under the Act. That is another problem. There are many people at the very moment who have bought houses and have found that they are substandard, and they have no protection whatsoever. The purpose of the Act is to encourage a reasonable standard of housing and a fair rent structure. The trust will administer the Act in a spirit of co-operation with owners and tenants.

WATER STORAGES

Mr TRAINER: Mr Speaker, I extend my congratulations to you. I am sure you will make an excellent Speaker. You were an excellent choice and I am sure that, had the necessity arisen, you would have had my vote. Will the Minister of Water Resources advise the House of the current water position in South Australia in respect to the Murray River, in view of the drought conditions existing in the eastern and south-eastern parts of Australia?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Murray River situation is serious but certainly not as disastrous as some sections of the media may suggest. Yesterday, there was a meeting of the Murray River Commission in Canberra, which reviewed the status of water resources in the Murray River system. As at 1 June 1982 the Murray River Commission storages were 58 per cent full. At its meeting yesterday, the commission reviewed the storages which, as at 1 December 1982, stood at 37 per cent of full storage. This is below expectation by 300 000 megalitres, which is largely as a result of lower predicted intakes into the stream from the Darling River, and it also reflects the continuing severity of the drought in the south-east region of Australia. Yesterday, the commission agreed that the short-fall would have to be shared amongst the three States over a 22-month period from August 1982 to May 1984.

As far as South Australia is concerned, this means that we will receive 3 415 000 megalitres instead of 3 515 000 megalitres during that two-year period. The question still remains as to whether South Australia will reduce its planned flow from the Murray by 100 000 megalitres. This is being investigated by the department and is particularly complex. The quantity of water is not a problem and the available water is sufficient to meet our needs. There is no need to contemplate water restrictions irrespective of any final strategy adopted. I point out that the main purpose of the investigation is to optimise water quality having regard to the hydraulic constraints of the Murray River system.

The Management and Planning Committee of the Murray River Commission will meet again on 13 and 14 December to further consider a number of factors in addition to the system as far as the Murray River is concerned. I emphasise again that, while the Murray River resources situation has deteriorated somewhat, there is certainly no reason for current alarm.

PARTY FUNDS

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Will the Deputy Premier state whether the Australian Labor Party received $40 000 from the South Australian Bookmakers League before the last State Election and, if it did, was that donation received after the Deputy Premier, or his colleague, gave an undertaking in writing to the executive of the league that, if elected to Government, his Party would introduce legislation to reduce bookmakers turnover tax, thereby enhancing the personal income of those bookmakers at the expense of the Public Revenue Account?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I direct the honourable member to contact the Party secretary who controls the funds of the political Party.

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Unless the member for Davenport stops interjecting, action will be taken.

EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

Mr GREGORY: Is the Minister of Labour aware of employment agencies operating in this State who charge a fee to persons seeking employment? If so, will the Minister state what action he intends to take so that this exploitation of persons seeking work ceases?

I understand that an organisation called 'Job Seekers', with a telephone number of 224 0866 and which has an office at 312 Pulteney Street, Adelaide, is advising people that, if they pay a fee of $50, the organisation will then seek work for those people. People are told that, if they do not like the job that is first found for them, the firm will continue to seek employment for them for 90 days. The organisation seeks employment for these people by employing young people, by directing them to read through the *Advertiser's* situations vacant columns, and then telephoning employers who are listed in the Yellow Pages. I have been told by one of those young persons that she became embarrassed and ceased to work for the organisation because she felt that the organisation was unable to provide employment for the applicants and that it was taking the $50 under false pretenses. She also said that the conditions of her employ-

ment left much to be desired in that she was not allowed a reasonable lunch break and that her wages were paid in such a way that she often wondered whether or not she would get paid.

The SPEAKER: Order! Time has expired. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I think the first thing to mention in this regard is that in 1978 the Government of that day, which was a Labor Government, attempted to and did introduce into this House legislation to prevent the very thing about which the honourable member is complaining. The first requirement was that a fee-charging employment agency would be required to be in possession of an annual licence renewable at the discretion of the authority (a licence is automatically renewed under the current Act on the payment of the fee).

Mr EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that, once the hour has expired after 3.15 p.m. (you said, Mr Speaker, that time had expired), that would be the end of Question Time. I am aware that on opening day it may be different, but you stated before the Minister of Labour rose to his feet that time had expired. However, after you stated that time had expired, Mr Speaker, you asked the Minister of Labour to rise and give an answer. I seek your ruling on whether or not time had expired.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has answered his own question. No, time had not expired because it is opening day.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. The second part of the proposal was that the agencies would only be able to charge fees on a scale approved by the Minister. Agencies can currently arrange their own scale of fees and South Australia is the only State in which this applies. In addition to that, the Bill proposed to phase out over a period of 12 months the practice of employment agencies charging fees to applicants so that all fees would be born by the prospective employer. Currently, agencies cannot charge the employee more than the employer. A deposit is repayable on demand if jobs are not found.

There was, in that Bill, an attempt to repeal clause 2 *(a)*, which provided exemption from the provisions of the Act to employment agencies which found employment for nurses and medical officers only. I agreed to that provision after much consultation. There was controversy about this matter at that time and the Bill was defeated at the second reading stage in the Legislative Council because no agreement could be reached about the abolition of fees for employees, on approving scales of fees by the Minister, or on the removal of exemption for nurses in the home nursing situation. At that time the major employment agencies and I had numerous meetings, even though the Government had full support. I notice that the former Minister of Industrial Affairs is nodding his head, so he was aware of what was happening at that time.

However, for some reason beyond my control or understanding the Legislative Council decided to throw the Bill out, even though there was a great deal of unanimity throughout the State between the major agencies about the matter. I well remember considering the problem involving nurses. If that Bill had passed the honourable member would not now be asking his question. There was no attempt by the previous Government to reintroduce that legislation in any form. I give an assurance to the House, and to the member who raised this matter, that it is my intention to have this Bill redrafted after further consultations with the people affected by it. I hope that I will be able to reintroduce this Bill in due course and that, when that happens, the Legislative Council will show more sense than it did when the Bill was introduced on a previous occasion.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CAWTHORNE REPORT

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Yesterday, someone leaked a copy of the Report on the Requirements for Legislative Change to meet current and likely future developments in Industrial Relations, more commonly known as the Cawthorne Report, to the *Advertiser* and the A.B.C. News. I state categorically that I was not the source of the leaked copy. As members of this House know, I have consistently refused to release the report, as it was prepared from the very beginning as a confidential report. To my knowledge, three other people had copies of the report. Those with copies were: Mr Cawthorne, the new Minister of Labour, Hon. J.D. Wright, and the new shadow Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader, Mr Goldsworthy. The Deputy Premier mysteriously found a copy on his desk in the week after the election, and I understand that he has arranged for copies of the report to be printed. I gave the shadow Minister of Labour a copy of the report last week on the basis that he kept it confidential. He gave me that undertaking.

Now that this report has been made public it can be seen that the recommendations are the same as the conclusions of the discussion paper which was released publicly in February this year. About one-third of the recommendations of the final report were released when I introduced legislation in September of this year.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. It is quite clear that the honourable member is starting to debate the matter, and he well knows it. He will be ruled out of order if he continues in that vein.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I will attempt to not debate the issue. I wish to clarify a number of points and, therefore, I will clearly outline what the situation is so that I can clarify some of those points. It was also my intention to release the remaining recommendations of the report when further legislation was introduced next year. The release of the report has shown that it contains nothing that embarrasses the former Liberal Government. It also reveals the extent to which the report was written as a personal report, which is the reason why it was not made public. The story which appeared in the *Advertiser* this morning is inaccurate. It claims that the legislation I introduced into Parliament 'attacked' and 'was seen as undoing the system of closed shops'. In fact, the legislation did not significantly alter the position of closed shops. The only change was that, if a person applying for work at a closed shop did not wish to join a trade union, he could register more easily as a conscientious objector.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Hence the headline in the *Advertiser;* the comments in the first paragraph and the subsequent reference to closed shops are wrong. The position concerning closed shops was clearly spelt out in Parliament when the legislation was debated in October this year. The *Hansard* record of 12 October 1982 shows that the closed shop concept was being retained. The *Hansard* report states, in part:

> The Minister [of Industrial Affairs] is absolutely correct because the previous speaker argued for five or 10 minutes that we are trying to remove the closed shop situation. This legislation protects the closed shop.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Government business to be considered as required and to have precedence over other business, except questions, before the Address in Reply is adopted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition is not particularly happy about the motion. When the Liberal Party was in Government a similar resolution was moved because we had some pressing legislation which we believed would not wait. However, I did the then Leader of the Opposition the courtesy of discussing the matter with him. He was rather reticent about agreeing in the first instance, but he agreed to the suspension after I had convinced him of the urgency of some of the matters which the then Government wanted to put before the House, but only then on the clear understanding that it would relate to matters that were urgent and that could not await the normal courtesies of the House and the completion of the Address in Reply debate.

The Opposition is now in precisely the same situation, but no-one has done the Opposition the courtesy of explaining why this resolution has been moved, for how long it will be, for what measures, and whether the Address in Reply will simply be left swinging. It would be grossly discourteous to His Excellency the Governor to indefinitely adjourn the Address in Reply debate. Only matters of urgent import should ever take precedence over that debate. The Opposition has not been extended that courtesy, and so it is certainly not prepared to give carte blanche approval to this resolution unless some undertakings are given by the Premier. I strongly suggest that, if he expects co-operation, he should do us the courtesy of consultation, about which he has been making a big song and dance in other areas since his election as Premier.

To further make this point, I also point out that it was only on the grapevine that I heard that this House was sitting. I do not believe that there was any contact by the Premier or his Deputy to me, the Leader of the Opposition, or the Liberal Party Whip.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: When the previous Government made a decision about when the House would sit the first thing I did was to get on the phone and personally extend to the Leader or the Deputy Leader of the Opposition the courtesy of being informed about the arrangements. On this occasion I would certainly ask for a clear undertaking from the Premier that he does not intend simply to push the Address in Reply into the background, as though it is a debate of no consequence. I know that it is a debate that comes under criticism from time to time, because some members of this House (I would hope a minority) believe that it is not an important debate. I, and other members of the Opposition, believe that it is, because it is one of the few opportunities when members, particularly new members, have an unfettered chance to bring to the attention of Parliament and the public matters of importance to them and to the people who elected them. If the Premier is not prepared to give an undertaking that the procedure will be used only for Bills that cannot wait, the Opposition will oppose it.

The SPEAKER: We are in a difficult situation here, because I ruled that there can be no further speakers. So, unless somehow, by a wink and a nod, the parties can sort themselves out, I will have to put the question. I am forced to put the question that the motion be agreed to. There being no dissentient voice and there being present an absolute majority of the whole of the number of members of the House, the motion for suspension is agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the introduction forthwith of nine Bills and two motions without notice.

In so doing, and in view of remarks made earlier in these proceedings, I say that it is certainly the Government's wish to observe the courtesies and consultation with the Opposition. I regret that, apparently, sufficient consultation has not occurred on this occasion. I regret that this has occurred. I suggest that, in part, that can be attributed to the problems of transition from Opposition to Government and the fact that the new Government has had to grapple with a number of pressing matters.

I point out that the Leader of the Opposition himself demanded the early recall of Parliament. On that occasion I contacted him and told him that that was certainly the Government's intention and that it was also our intention to introduce only legislation that it was necessary to implement before the new year, in particular, some of the financial measures. It is obvious that the ongoing process of consultation needs to be sharpened up. I regret that, apparently, the Opposition did not receive sufficient notice about these matters. We will make sure that that situation is corrected. Of course, if the Opposition felt that it was not being properly consulted, it would have helped had it contacted the Government. It is easy enough to make a telephone call, and my telephone will always be open to the Leader of the Opposition. Need I say more, or does the Opposition want me to get down on my knees?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In fact, I place an assurance on record that proper consultation will take place. A number of Bills for introduction today are listed on a sheet of paper that has been circulated amongst members. Some of them are not of an urgency that requires them to supersede the Address in Reply debate. It is not our intention to supersede that, and the Address in Reply debate will take place in full. An election at this time of the year is not the normal pattern that we have been used to, not so much during the last decade but in the time of the Playford Government, with an orderly pattern whereby Parliament assembled, debated the Address in Reply, and handed down a Budget.

I hope that there will be some forbearance, bearing in mind the time of year at which the change of Government has taken place. I refer back to 1979 when, admittedly, there were some hiccups in the transition. At that time, the Opposition felt that it had not been consulted sufficiently, but that was sorted out. I invite the Opposition to sort it out in the same manner now. I assure members opposite that there will be no problems in this area.

All the measures listed on the Notice Paper should be resolved immediately; most of them should not cause controversy and can be dealt with expeditiously by the House. I give the Opposition that assurance without in any way circumscribing its right to debate. I hope that the Government will receive the Opposition's co-operation; in fact, the Opposition has called upon the Government to implement a number of those measures. I would have thought that the Opposition would welcome this suspension and the implementation of these measures before Christmas. If that is not the Opposition's intention let it say so and have it firmly placed on the record.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: What about the Racing Act?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will respond to that interjection to resolve the matter. The Racing Act refers to an amendment in relation to the Bay Sheffield.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: You cannot be serious!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. I showed a great deal of patience previously because a difficult situation arose, but I will not tolerate squealing and interjection across the corridors. That is just not on. That will stop, and an orderly debate will ensue.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The interjection from the former Minister of Tourism indicates the low priority that was placed on that area. If members opposite consider that this measure is not urgent and should not be debated this year (and I believe that the matter should be considered this year), let them say so. This is not a major amendment that requires great and lengthy consideration. Members opposite will either support it or they will not, and we can get it through. The Address in Reply debate will be conducted in the normal way.

I am moving the suspension in order that those Bills and the two motions listed can be dealt with expeditiously before Christmas. As soon as the Assembly has dealt with those Bills (and I hope that it would not take long), and while they are being considered in the Upper House, the Assembly can commence the Address in Reply debate, which will continue in sequence when we resume again in the new year.

It is a pity that we have had to deal with these matters in this fairly formal manner of debate. Let me stress again that it is not our desire to conduct the business of the House in a way that does not involve the Opposition. We have been in Opposition and we know the problems involved, and I hope that we can be sensitive to them. I am sorry that this matter has arisen today, but I ask that the Opposition on this occasion supports the motion.

Motion carried.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pay-roll Tax Act, 1971-1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is designed to give immediate relief to companies paying pay-roll tax, in advance of the implementation of the Government's commitment to substantially alter the Pay-roll Tax Act. Changes to the pay-roll tax exemption level are normally brought down in the Budget and apply from 1 July, that is, the beginning of the financial year. However, the Government is aware that increased wage and salaries costs have both added to the pay-roll tax commitments of many small businesses and made others liable for pay-roll tax for the first time. The Government is also concerned that South Australia's exemption level is lower than that of Victoria, which is normally regarded by businesses in this State as their main competitor.

The measures proposed increase the maximum exemption level to $139 992 per annum from 1 January 1983, and will provide relief to those employers who through the impact of increased wage levels in the second half of 1982 could have become liable for pay-roll tax during the balance of the 1982-83 financial year. The effect of the change will be that the level at which wages are exempt from tax will increase from $124 992 to $139 992 per annum. For pay-rolls higher than $139 992, the amount deducted from the wages paid will decrease by $2 for every $3 that the wages exceed $139 992 and the deduction will reduce to a flat $37 800 when the taxable wages are $293 280 and above.

There are advantages in identifying in advance the changes in exemption level that will be made in successive financial years, and in reviewing the current Budget situation the Government will consider the desirability of legislating to provide such specific exemptions operative from 1 July in each of the next three years. The maximum exemption level provided in this Bill raises the South Australian exemption to that of Victoria and to a higher level than that in New South Wales and Western Australia. The increase therefore restores the relativities with our adjacent States which this Government has sought. The increased level of exemption will provide additional concessions amounting to approximately $2 000 000 in a full year.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Bill. Clause 3 amends the definition of 'prescribed amount' in section 11a of the principal Act by replacing subparagraph (vii) of paragraph *(a)* with two new subparagraphs. The effect of this amendment is to increase the maximum monthly exemption from 1 January 1983 to an annual level of about $140 000.

Clause 4 amends section 13a of the principal Act by increasing the value of 'B' in the formula set out in subsection (2) *(a)*. Although this is expressed in new subparagraph (vii) of paragraph *(g)* of subsection (2) to apply for the whole financial year commencing on 1 July 1982, in fact it only affects the calculation in relation to wages paid in the second half of the year because of the definition of 'Y' by which 'B' is multiplied in the formula.

Clause 5 increases the minimum level of weekly wages above which an employer must apply for registration. Clause 6 makes amendments to section 18k of the principal Act in relation to group employers. These amendments correspond to the amendments made by clause 4.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It provides for the implementation of the Government's undertaking to increase the stamp duty concession on the purchase of a first home, and for a number of other amendments to:

give greater flexibility in the determination of the threshold rate for credit and rental duty,

foster the development of a secondary market in semi-government securities,

reduce the opportunities for tax avoidance in two areas,

improve the administration of the Act and correct certain anomalies.

The Government has undertaken to raise the exemption level from stamp duty for first home buyers from $30 000 to $40 000 and the Bill provides that this concession operate in respect of contracts entered into on or after 1 December 1982. The higher exemption level will mean that the max-

imum stamp duty benefit for eligible purchasers will be increased from $580 to $880.

The threshold interest rate above which loans become liable for stamp duty, has had to be raised on four occasions in recent years and further adjustments are likely as interest rates tend to fluctuate. It has been proposed previously that the Stamp Duties Act be amended to allow the threshold rate to be fixed by regulation. The Government should also have the power to set different rates for different classes of transaction as experience has shown that not all interest rates have moved uniformly. The adoption of different rates will ensure that those transactions which currently attract duty will continue to do so (e.g. bankcard) but other transactions including those undertaken by pastoral companies will continue to be free of duty.

The provisions relating to transfers of semi-government securities will provide an exemption from stamp duty on a more comprehensive range of securities issued by Government authorities throughout Australia, and will give effect to a decision of Loan Council designed to promote a secondary market in semi-government securities. As a precautionary measure against an unintentionally broad interpretation of this exemption provision has been made for particular bodies to be excluded from the exemption.

A tax avoidance scheme has become increasingly prevalent whereby the documentation surrounding transactions which are sales is drawn up and structured as a voluntary conveyance to take advantage of the lower duty assessable where a voluntary conveyance is drawn subject to a mortgage. The provisions in this Bill close the loophole by providing that the duty on conveyances is based on the value of the property, irrespective of whether the basis of the transfer is a sale or otherwise. A number of consequential amendments are necessary to implement the revised basis of assessment.

Historically an exemption from *ad valorem* conveyance duty has been given where a property has been partitioned as opposed to it being sold or gifted. The partitioning exemption from *ad valorem* duty is being increasingly considered for use as a device to avoid duty which would normally be paid upon sale or gift and it is therefore necessary to restrict the application of this provision. It is intended that the provision will continue to apply only to family groups and this will reduce the tax avoidance potential of this provision.

Measures are proposed in the Bill to allow payment of stamp duty on interstate cheques to be made by return. Current legislation provides that this must be done by adhesive stamps and under present business practices this places an unnecessary administrative load on banks. Situations arise where because of an error by the taxpayer mortgage documents are stamped incorrectly. The Bill permits a transfer of stamp duty between instruments executed by the same mortgagor.

Under current legislation transfers by the legal representative of a deceased person do not attract *ad valorem* duty if they are sales. Prior to the 1980 amendment to the Stamp Duties Act such transfers also had to be in accordance with a will or the laws of intestacy. This extension of the exemption was not foreseen and in its present form presents scope for tax avoidance. The tightening of the exemption will restore the pre-1980 position. The 1980 amendments which tax transfers involving trusts were intended to charge *ad valorem* duty on the maximum amount a potential beneficiary could receive in certain cases. This intention has not been fully realised and the amendment modifies the present subsection.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Under the clause, different provisions of the measure may be brought into operation at different times. Clause 3 amends section 31b of the principal Act which sets out definitions of terms used in the Part of the Act dealing with duty in respect of credit and rental business. Under the clause, 'prescribed rate' is now defined as being the rate for the time being fixed by regulation, or, where different rates are fixed by regulation for different classes of transaction, the rate for the time being fixed for the class of transactions to which the credit arrangement, discount transaction or loan belongs. The clause also empowers the making of regulations fixing a rate of not less than 9 per centum as the prescribed rate, or different rates of not less than 9 per centum as the prescribed rates for different classes of transaction. The effect of this amendment will be to authorise the fixing of different rates as the rates of interest that must be payable on different transactions before duty under the credit and rental business head of duty is payable on such transactions.

Clause 4 amends section 48a of the principal Act which provides for duty on cheques to be paid by banks on a return basis at the initial stage when the bank issues its printed cheque forms. Under the clause, this return system for payment of duty will be extended so that it applies to cheque forms issued outside South Australia where it is known that they will subsequently attract South Australian stamp duty. In addition, under the clause, a bank will be able to pay duty by a return where cheques are drawn outside South Australia but paid in South Australia.

Clause 5 substitutes for the present section 60a a new section providing a definition of the value of property conveyed for the purposes of the Part of the principal Act dealing with duty on conveyances. Under the clause the value of property conveyed or transferred is defined as being, in relation to a conveyance on sale of property, the unencumbered market value of the property at the date of the sale, or, in relation to a voluntary conveyance, the unencumbered market value of the property at the date of the conveyance. Subclause (2) provides that the Commissioner of Stamps may treat the consideration for a conveyance on sale as being the value of the property conveyed or transferred unless it appears to him that the consideration may be less than the value of the property. Under subclause (3), the Commissioner may cause a valuation to be made by a person appointed by him if he has been furnished with no evidence or unsatisfactory evidence of the value of property conveyed or transferred or comprising or forming part of the consideration for a conveyance. Subclause (4) provides that all or part of the cost of such a valuation may, if the Commissioner thinks it appropriate, be recovered from the person liable to pay duty. Under subclause (5), an encumbrance prescribed or of a kind prescribed by regulation may continue to be taken into account in determining the market value of property conveyed or transferred. Present section 60a which is repealed by this clause provides for conveyances in contemplation of a sale and was designed to prevent a stamp duty avoidance scheme that is now covered by section 71.

Clauses 6 to 11 (inclusive), clause 13 and paragraphs *(a), (b), (c), (d), (e)* and *(f)* of clause 17 all make amendments that are consequential upon the changes proposed by clause 5, that is, to relate the duty on a conveyance to the unencumbered value of the property conveyed instead of, as at present, the consideration for the sale in the case of conveyances on sale. Clause 12 amends section 71 of the principal Act which deals with duty on conveyances operating as voluntary dispositions *inter vivos*. The clause amends paragraph *(h)* of subsection (5) which exempts from *ad valorem* duty a transfer by a person in his capacity as the personal representative of a deceased person or the trustee of the estate of a deceased person. The clause narrows this exemption so that it only applies to such a transfer if it is made in pursuance of the provisions of the will of the

deceased person or the laws of intestacy. The clause also amends subsection (8) which provides that a transfer of a potential beneficial interest in property subject to a discretionary trust is to be subject to stamp duty as if it transferred the full beneficial interest that the transferor would have if the discretion under the trust were so exercised as to confer upon him the greatest benefit in relation to the property that could be conferred upon him under the trust. The clause amends this subsection so that it relates the stamp duty to the beneficial interest that the transferee (not the transferor) would have if the discretion were so exercised as to confer upon him the greatest benefit in relation to the property that could be conferred upon him under the trust.

Clause 13, in addition to making amendments consequential upon clause 5, narrows the scope of the provision so that only conveyances for the partition or division of property between members of a family group attract the lesser duty provided for by section 71b. Clause 14 increases the component of the price paid for the purchase of a first home upon which the concessional rate of duty under section 71c is based from $30 000 to $40 000 with effect in relation to contracts entered into on or after 1 December 1982.

Clause 15 amends section 80 by striking out the proviso to that section. The proviso presently has the effect of basing the duty on an encumbrance to secure periodical payments for an indefinite period not terminable with life, or during a life or lives, upon the value of the property. This is done by making reference to subsections (2) and (3) of section 66 which are struck out by clause 9. By striking out the proviso, duty on such an encumbrance will be fixed upon the same basis as other securities for the payment of unlimited amounts under present section 79 (2). This will be to the benefit of the taxpayer in the few cases affected by the provision.

Clause 16 inserts a new section 81c which will enable duty paid as a result of an error on the part of the taxpayer on one mortgage instead of a different mortgage to be transferred to the other mortgage. Under the new section this will only be possible where the same persons are parties to each of the mortgages, mortgagees that are related corporations in terms of the Companies (South Australia) Code being regarded as one and the same person. Paragraph *(g)* of clause 17 extends the present exemption for conveyances of securities issued by a South Australian statutory authority to any securities issued by a statutory body constituted under a law of the Commonwealth or of this State or any other State or Territory, not being a prescribed statutory body or a statutory body of a prescribed class.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Savings Bank of South Australia Act, 1929-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It has been introduced to facilitate the Savings Bank of South Australia's investments in the new merchant bank Credit Commercial de France Australia Ltd, in which the Savings Bank holds a 26 per cent equity. It brings into the Act matters that are now covered by an agreement between the bank and the former Treasurer.

At the time of the election in 1979, the Labor Government, led by the Hon. J. D. Corcoran, was considering a number of proposals for the establishment of a South Australian based merchant bank. These proposals were linked to plans to save the Bank of Adelaide from collapse and later from take-over. With the change of Government, support for these proposals ended. However, the demise of the Bank of Adelaide led to a widespread feeling in the Adelaide business community that it no longer had effective access to decision-making in the banking industry. This resulted in new representations to the previous Government for the establishment of a South Australian based merchant bank.

The early discussions contemplated an exclusively South Australian venture with, possibly, a substantial shareholding by an agency of the Government. An examination of this proposal indicated that the establishment of a full service merchant bank (that is to say, providing both money market and corporate services) would require a partnership with a large financial institution with merchant banking experience.

I would like to fully acknowledge the role played by the former Government, and in particular the former Minister of Industrial Affairs, in concluding the arrangement between the Savings Bank and Credit Commercial de France which this Government is pleased to take over and assist in putting into effect. I seek leave to have the explanation of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

At about this time Credit Commercial de France, a nationalised French bank, was looking for partners in an Australian operation. Credit Commercial de France is among the largest underwriters of Eurocurrency loans and, for example, acts for some of the Canadian Provinces. It has carried out business in Australia for some years and has raised multi-million dollar loans for firms such as Western Mining and B.H.P. and the State Electricity Commission of Victoria. Credit Commercial de France was faced with two problems:

(a) under Australia's foreign investment policy it was required that there be Australian partners who could provide 50 per cent equity; and

(b) the bank needed partners with the appropriate skills in merchant banking.

Credit Commercial de France finally established that a small Sydney-based merchant bank, Solomons and Coulter, was a likely prospect as a partner. Subsequently, the parties met with the then Premier in January 1982 and it was agreed that an approach be made to the Foreign Investment Review Board seeking approval of an Adelaide-based joint venture with the support of the South Australian Government.

By May 1982, it was clear that no proposal would be approved unless a State Government instrumentality held at least 25 per cent of the equity. In June of this year the former Government agreed to either the State Bank, the Savings Bank of South Australia or State Government Insurance Commission acting in a caretaker capacity by holding 20 per cent equity in Credit Commercial de France Australia Ltd., the proposed new merchant bank. The Savings Bank of South Australia greeted the proposal with some enthusiasm as it was seen as a much needed opportunity to diversify the Savings Bank's financial base. Subsequent negotiations led to an agreement with Credit Commercial de France and Solomons and Coulter for the following shareholding:

Credit Commercial de France	50 per cent
Savings Bank of South Australia	26 per cent
Solomons and Coulter	24 per cent

This was approved by the Federal Treasurer and an agreement was signed on 25 October 1982. The Savings Bank's agreement to participate was subject to appropriate amendments being effected to the Savings Bank of South Australia

Act. Draft legislation was prepared and approved for introduction in time for the signing of documents in October. However, the calling of the election prevented the introduction of the Bill. It was apparent that this could have thwarted the whole deal so an agreement by deed was entered into between the Savings Bank and the Treasurer to give effect to some of the matters covered in the Bill. These arrangements provide several benefits to the Savings Bank, both immediate and longer term. In the short term, the benefits include:

A greater ability to help small business borrowers, in that the Savings Bank will have a connection to whom it can refer a higher risk or more complex borrowing proposition.

A greater opportunity to become involved in major financing operations.

Greater fund-raising potential. The Savings Bank and Credit Commercial de France Australia Ltd. should be able to work together to raise funds for special purposes.

The association of the Savings Bank and its staff with a business such as Credit Commercial de France Australia Ltd. should protect and enhance its market image and reputation and improve its ability to generate general banking business. In this way the Savings Bank will be able to continue to contribute to the well-being of South Australia through the provision of a larger range of financial services and facilities.

An opportunity to enhance staff training. The parties have agreed that there may be exchanges of staff between Credit Commercial de France and the Savings Bank of South Australia and Credit Commercial de France Australia Ltd. which will help the Savings Bank to obtain further skills to enhance its banking role.

Longer-term potential benefits include:

The possibility of more effective use of the Savings Bank's computer system through the sale of time to Credit Commercial de France Australia Ltd.

The potential opportunity to use the connection with Credit Commercial de France to broaden involvement in international business.

During the last election, it was made clear that my Party placed a high priority on the establishment of a merchant bank linked to one of the State's own financial institutions. Consequently, we support this proposal and fully acknowledge the role played by the former Government, in particular the former Minister of Industrial Affairs, in concluding the arrangement between the Savings Bank and Credit Commercial de France. Finally, the Bill provides for some other minor amendments which may be appropriately included at this time.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 5 which sets out definitions of expressions used in the principal Act. The clause revamps the present definition of 'general manager' in order to accord with the present practice of the bank. Clause 3 amends section 8 which deals with the removal of trustees of the bank. Under the present section, the office of a trustee becomes vacated if the trustee becomes a director of any other banking organisation in the State. The clause provides that the office will only be vacated if the trustee acts without the consent of the Governor.

Clause 4 amends section 32, which deals with the various securities in which the funds of the bank may be invested. The amendment widens the range of securities, by providing that the bank can invest in securities of a body corporate that is directly involved in the business of banking. Clause 5 inserts a new section 34a, which provides that the Treasurer may guarantee a liability of the bank. The terms and conditions of a guarantee shall be as determined by the Treasurer after consultation with the bank. A liability of the Treasurer arising by virtue of a guarantee given under this section is to be satisfied out of general revenue, which is to be appropriated to the necessary extent.

Clause 6 amends section 42 which sets out the general business of the bank. The bank is to be able to carry on the general business of banking (the provision presently provides that the bank is to function as a savings bank), and is to have additional powers to enter into contracts of guarantee and indemnity, and to grant letters of credit. Clause 7 provides a consequential amendment to section 43, which presently looks to limit the types of body corporate which may deposit with the bank. Clause 8 provides for the repeal of section 46.

Clause 9 amends section 65 which provides for the disposal of the surplus of the income of the bank over its expenditure. The clause amends this section so that the Treasurer may direct the bank that part of its surplus need not be brought into account when the finances of the Bank are being dealt with under the section.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish a corporation to be known as the 'South Australian Government Financing Authority'; to make provision relating to the financial powers and relations of the authority, semi-government authorities and the Treasurer; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

With three qualifications which I shall outline shortly, this Bill is identical to the one of the same title introduced by the previous Government towards the end of the last Parliament. That Bill had been passed by the House of Assembly and was in the Committee stage in the Legislative Council when Parliament was prorogued.

The purpose of the Bill is to create a central borrowing authority to be known as the 'South Australian Government Financing Authority'—'SAGFA' for short. The Labor Party supported this legislation when previously before the Parliament. It is reintroducing it at this early stage of the new Parliament and will be seeking its passage in the current sittings so that SAGFA might commence operations as soon as possible.

As explained in some detail by my predecessor when introducing the previous Bill, the central borrowing authority concept will enable semi-government borrowings to be made in a more flexible but, at the same time, highly co-ordinated manner.

Similar bodies have already been established in Queensland and Western Australia and are operating highly successfully. Other States are actively exploring similar ideas. The concept is keenly supported by lenders and financial intermediaries. It has been accepted by Loan Council which approved arrangements proposed by the previous Government in this State to facilitate the operation of central borrowing authorities. The Government believes that this measure will fit in well with its overall financial planning and will usefully complement other initiatives which we have in mind.

The financial powers of the authority are drawn in broad terms, and quite deliberately so. It is important that the

authority have flexibility to react speedily to developments in capital markets which have undergone rapid change in recent times and are likely to continue doing so.

As I have mentioned, this Bill differs from that introduced by the previous Government in three respects. First, there is a new and additional provision in subclause 16 (2). This provides that powers given to the Treasurer in subclause 16 (1) to direct individual semi-government authorities to borrow from, or lend to, SAGFA may only be exercised if so authorised by a regulation.

The reason for this addition is that the powers of direction in the original Bill were too sweeping. They would, for example, have enabled the Treasurer, in theory at least, to require the two Government banks to place very large amounts of funds with SAGFA without further reference to Parliament and against the wishes of the banks. This would clearly be inappropriate in terms of the proper degree of operational dependence of the banks. It was not surprising that concern was expressed by some statutory bodies and in the debate in Parliament. The previous Government had foreshadowed moving an amendment to the original Bill which would have removed these powers of direction altogether.

In our view, this would be going too far in the opposite direction. As the Hon. Mr DeGaris pointed out in debate in the Legislative Council, there are some authorities—especially those which rely directly on the Government for funding—in respect of which it may be perfectly appropriate for the Treasurer to give directions to ensure that public funds are being used to best advantage.

The Government has, therefore, adopted a middle course. Under the revised Bill, directions may be given, but only as authorised by a regulation. This will enable Parliament to have the final say, which is surely as it should be.

This procedure is flexible. It would, for example, enable a regulation to be made giving a qualified power of direction to the Treasurer in respect of a particular authority. The qualification could, for instance, be in terms of a money figure or in terms of a particular category of funds. In summary, this course will give flexibility, but within a framework of ultimate Parliamentary control.

The second change is to be found in subclause 18 (3), which is again new and additional. The basic purpose of subclause 18 as a whole is to enable the debt of individual authorities to be taken over by SAGFA and for that debt to be consolidated and rationalised in the process. It was pointed out in debate that, theoretically, this particular provision could be used to translate a grant into a loan and, if not offset in some way, this could have a substantial and unexpected detrimental effect on the finances of an authority. Of course, this would not be contemplated by my Government and I accept fully that it was not intended by the previous Government. However, to remove any concerns which there might be on the matter, the new subclause 18 (3) provides that the Treasurer can only take action under subclause 1 *(c)* if it is part of an overall arrangement which is not to the financial disadvantage of an authority. This will mean that the provision could be used as part of a scheme to rationalise or simplify the funding arrangement for an authority—so that, for example, the nature of any subsidies being provided by the Government are made clearer—but this could only be done as part of a package which left the authority no worse off in net terms.

The third change is again an additional provision, forming clause 21 in this Bill. It gives the Treasurer power to require individual authorities to provide relevant information to SAGFA to facilitate its work. While we have no reason to anticipate any particular problems in the absence of this provision, we believe it appropriate to make the formal position quite clear to guard against any possible hiccup.

The Government regards this Bill as a bipartisan measure. Of the three changes in the Bill, two have been carefully designed to meet specific concerns expressed by statutory bodies and in Parliament, while the third is of a formal nature. I would seek the co-operation of honourable members in dealing with the measure speedily.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the measure. Clause 4 sets out definitions of terms used in the measure. Attention is drawn to the definition of a semi-government authority under which the provisions of the measure will apply to a body corporate of the kind described in the definition only if the body is declared to be a semi-government authority by proclamation.

Clause 5 provides for the establishment of a 'South Australian Government Financing Authority'. This authority is to be a body corporate with the usual corporate capacities. Clause 6 provides that the authority is to be comprised of three or four members as the Governor determines. The Under-Treasurer is to be the Chairman of the authority and the remaining members are to be persons nominated by the Treasurer.

Clause 7 provides for the terms and conditions of office as a member of the authority. Clause 8 regulates the manner in which business is conducted at meetings of the authority. Clause 9 provides for the validity of acts of the authority and immunity of its members from personal liability. Clause 10 requires members of the authority to disclose any conflict of interest.

Clause 11 sets out the general powers and functions of the authority. The principal function of the authority will be to develop and implement borrowing and investment programmes for the benefit of the corporations that are declared to be semi-government authorities for the purposes of the measure. The authority may also engage in such other activities relating to the finances of the Government of the State or semi-government authorities as are contemplated by the other provisions of the measure or approved by the Treasurer. Under the clause, the authority is empowered to borrow moneys within or outside Australia. It may lend moneys to semi-government authorities. It may accept moneys on loan or deposit from the Treasurer or a semi-government authority and may invest moneys. The authority is empowered to issue, buy and sell and otherwise deal in or with securities. It may open and maintain accounts with banks and appoint underwriters, managers, trustees or agents. Finally, the authority may provide guarantees, deal with property, enter into any other arrangements or acquire or incur any other rights or liabilities. The exercise of any of these powers is to be subject to the approval of the Treasurer.

Clause 12 provides that the authority is to act in accordance with proper principles of financial management and with a view to avoiding a loss. Under the clause, any surplus of funds remaining after the authority has met its costs in any financial year must be paid into the general revenue or otherwise dealt with as the Treasurer may determine. Clause 13 provides that the authority is to be subject to the control and direction of the Treasurer.

Clause 14 provides that moneys provided by the Treasurer to the authority are to be regarded as having been provided upon such terms and conditions as the Treasurer may from time to time determine. Clause 15 provides that liabilities of the authority are guaranteed by the Treasurer.

Clause 16 empowers semi-government authorities to borrow from or lend to or deposit moneys with the authority. Under the clause, the Treasurer may direct that a semi-government authority borrow from the authority rather than from any other lender and may direct that any surplus funds of a semi-government authority are to be deposited with or

lent to the authority. However, such a direction may not be given except as authorised by regulations under the measure. The terms and conditions of a transaction under the clause are to be as determined by the Treasurer after consultation with the Minister responsible for the semi-government authority.

Clause 17 provides that the Treasurer may deposit with or lend to the authority any moneys under the control of the Treasurer. The Treasurer may determine the terms and conditions upon which such moneys are placed with the authority.

Clause 18 makes provision for the Treasurer to re-arrange existing financial relations of a semi-government authority. Under the clause, this may only take place after the Treasurer has consulted with the Minister responsible for the particular semi-government authority in question. Under the clause, the liabilities under any existing loan obtained by a semi-government authority from a private source may be taken over by the authority and a new debt-relationship created between the semi-government authority and the authority. Alternatively, where a semi-government authority has an existing debt-relationship with the Treasury, this may be converted into a debt-relationship between it and the central authority. Where a semi-government authority has received any grant from the Treasury for capital purposes, that funding may be consolidated with other funding by the central authority and an appropriate total financial relationship struck between the semi-government authority and the central authority.

Under the clause, the new financial relationship must not be to the disadvantage of the semi-government authority. In general terms, the clause is designed to enable existing borrowing arrangements of a semi-government authority to be put on the same footing as it is proposed will be instituted for the future through the agency of the authority. Attention is drawn to subclause (9), which is designed to enable such a re-arrangement to take place in relation to liabilities of the South Australian Meat Corporation, the former Monarto Development Commission and the former South Australian Development Corporation that have already been taken over by the Crown or Ministers of the Crown in their respective corporate capacities.

Clause 19 provides for delegation by the authority. Clause 20 provides for the staffing of the authority. Clause 21 requires a semi-government authority, if so required by the Treasurer, to furnish information to the central authority relating to the financial affairs of the semi-government authority.

Clause 22 authorises the Treasurer and the authority to charge fees for services provided under the measure. Clause 23 provides that the authority and instruments to which it is a party are not to be exempt from State taxes or duties except to the extent provided by proclamation. Clause 24 is an evidentiary provision.

Clause 25 provides for the accounts and auditing of the accounts of the authority. Clause 26 requires the authority to prepare an annual report and provides for the report and the audited statement of accounts of the authority to be tabled in Parliament. Clause 27 provides that proceedings for offences are to be disposed of summarily. Clause 28 empowers the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the measure.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA JUBILEE 150 BOARD BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish a corporation to be known as the 'South Australia Jubilee 150 Board'; to define its powers and functions; to protect the title and symbol officially adopted for celebrations marking the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the colony of South Australia; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is identical to one of the same title introduced by the previous Government in the last Parliament. That Bill did not proceed past the second reading speech, but if it had it would have received the support of the Labor Party. The purpose of this Bill is to incorporate the South Australia Jubilee 150 Board, a board already informally established to organise and involve as many people as possible in celebrations marking the State's 150th birthday in 1986.

The Government is re-introducing the Bill at this stage in order to enable the board to commence its full operations as a body corporate as quickly as is possible. As has been previously stated, Mr Kym Bonython has been appointed as Chairman of the board, and it is proposed that he will continue as Chairman of the incorporated board. In addition to formalising the structure of the board, it is necessary to protect the name 'Jubilee 150' and the use of the symbol for its celebration. The Bill is designed to ensure that there will not be any confusion between official and unofficial bodies and activities, and it is obvious that the name of the board and the symbol should be protected from being associated with undesirable activities. It is envisaged that the board will authorise some persons to use the symbol for a fee or other consideration, and will protect such persons from unauthorised competition.

The Government intends to maintain the same framework for the operation of the board as was previously proposed. It is pointed out that a sunset clause for the Bill to cease on 31 December 1987 is included; any outstanding assets and liabilities will then vest in the Minister.

This Bill clearly assists the board in organising and promoting programmes, functions and celebrations for the 1986 anniversary and its passage through this Parliament should be of interest to all South Australians. I commend the Bill to honourable members. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the measure. Clause 4 sets out definitions of terms used in the measure. Clause 5 provides for the establishment of a board to be known as the 'South Australia Jubilee 150 Board'. The board is to be a body corporate with the usual corporate capacities.

Clause 6 provides that the board is to consist of not more than 14 members appointed by the Governor. Under the clause, the Governor may appoint from amongst the members of the board a chairman and a deputy chairman. Clause 7 sets out the conditions of membership of the board. Clause 8 requires members of the board to disclose any conflict of interest.

Clause 9 regulates the procedure at meetings of the board. Clause 10 provides for the validity of acts of the board and protects its members from personal liability for certain acts or omissions. Clause 11 provides for the establishment of an executive committee of the board which is to be comprised of the chairman, the deputy chairman and such other persons as may be appointed by the board. Under the clause, the board may delegate any of its powers or functions to the executive committee.

Clause 12 sets out the functions and powers of the board. Under the clause, the principal functions of the board are to initiate and, where appropriate, conduct programmes, activities, functions and celebrations during the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the colony of South Australia; to encourage, promote, facilitate and co-ordinate activities to mark the occasion of the anniversary; to encourage participation in anniversary celebrations; and to create, foster and promote interest, both within the State and elsewhere, in the anniversary.

Clause 13 provides that the board is to be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister. Clause 14 provides for the appointment of staff for the board. Clause 15 provides that the board may make use of the services of officers of the Public Service. Clause 16 regulates the manner in which the board is to deal with its moneys and limits expenditure by the board to expenditure authorised by a budget approved by the Treasurer.

Clause 17 empowers the board to borrow and provides the usual guarantee by the Treasurer. Clause 18 provides for the keeping of accounts by the board and the auditing of such accounts. Clause 19 requires the board to prepare an annual report which is to contain the audited statement of accounts for the preceding financial year and be tabled before each House of Parliament.

Clause 20 vests the official title and the official symbol in the board. The official title is defined by clause 4 as the expression 'South Australia Jubilee 150'. The official symbol is a symbol the general design of which is set out in the schedule to the Bill and which is depicted in a specially prepared graphic standards manual.

Clause 21 requires the consent in writing of the board before any use may be made of the official title or symbol for commercial or other organised purposes. Under clause 12, the board is empowered to make charges for the right to use the official title or the official symbol. Clause 21 provides that it is to be an offence to make unauthorised use of the official title or symbol and provides for compensation to the board for any such unauthorised use.

Clause 22 provides for the seizure and forfeiture of goods in relation to which unauthorised use has been made of the official title or symbol. Clause 23 provides that the other provisions of the measure are not to affect the use of an expression or symbol by a person who, before the commencement of the measure, was lawfully entitled to control the use of such expression or symbol.

Clause 24 provides for the service of documents. Clause 25 provides that a person convicted of an offence under the Act shall be liable in respect of a continuing offence to a daily penalty, both before and, where appropriate, after initial conviction. Clause 26 regulates proceedings for offences against the measure.

Clause 27 provides that the measure is to expire on the thirty-first day of December 1987 and provides for the vesting in the Crown of all property, rights and liabilities of the board existing at the time of expiry.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning Act, 1982. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This is a short Bill to amend the Planning Act. It is in substantially the same form as a Bill that was introduced by the previous Government but lapsed upon prorogation of Parliament. It deals with two comparatively minor matters.

The first amendment deals with a problem that has arisen because of the proclamation of the new Act in stages rather than as an integrated whole. Certain parts of the Act were brought into operation in May in order to enable administrative preparation to be made for the new planning system proposed by the new Act. However, references in the new Act to the date of its commencement need to be read as references to the date on which the new planning system was introduced rather than the date on which these ancillary provisions come into effect. Thus a new provision providing that a reference to the commencement of the new Act is to be construed as a reference to the date of the repeal of the Planning and Development Act (that is, the date on which the new Act supersedes the previous Act) is included in the Bill.

Section 40 of the principal Act provides for the compilation of the new development plan on the basis of certain existing plans and documents. This compilation is, as honourable members are aware, now complete. It is thought advisable now to remove the provision as it could conceivably lead to challenges to the validity of the development plan based upon discrepancies between the plan and the documents on which it is based.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the amendments are to be retrospective to the date on which parts of the new Planning Act were first brought into operation (that is, 20 May 1982). Clause 3 provides that a reference in the new Act to the date of its commencement shall be construed as a reference to the date of repeal of the Planning and Development Act (that is, 4 November 1982).

Clause 4 amends the transitional provisions in two respects. Under section 5 (2) *(f)* a recommendation for the making of planning regulations in respect of which notice had been given under the repealed Act not more than 12 months before the commencement of the new Act is treated as a supplementary development plan in respect of which submissions have been invited under the new Act. This period of 12 months is extended by the amendment to 18 months. Secondly, a new subsection (5) is inserted. This new subsection states that, notwithstanding the retrospective operation of the amending Act, nothing contained in that Act invalidates action taken under the principal Act before the ninth day of December 1982, and any declaration of interim development control made under section 43 before that date is specifically validated.

Clause 5 provides that the document approved by Parliament as the development plan is, subject to amendment under the new Act, to constitute the development plan.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dog Fence Act, 1946-1978. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The objectives of this Bill are:

1. To recognise the change in name of 'Stockowners Association of South Australia' to 'United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia Incorporated'. The organisation nominates two members for appointment to the Dog Fence Board.

2. To repeal section 8, which refers to retirement procedures applicable to the first members of the Dog Fence Board, constituted in 1946. The section no longer applies to board appointments, which are for a set term of four years.

3. To increase the frequency of inspection patrols by fence owners. Section 22 (1) *(b)* requires that the fence be inspected at 'proper intervals'. The proposed amendment is more specific in stating inspections must be made at 'intervals of not more than 14 days'.

4. To clarify the responsibilities of fence owners regarding the destruction of wild dogs in the vicinity of the dog fence. Section 22 (1) *(c)* states the owner of any part of the dog fence shall take all reasonable steps to destroy all wild dogs in the vicinity of the dog fence. The proposed amendment provides that the owner shall destroy dogs 'by shooting or trapping the dogs, or by laying poisoned baits for them'.

5. To increase the maximum amount of maintenance subsidy payable by the board from the present $45 per kilometre to $225 per kilometre. The proposed amendment is related to the amendment of section 25 (3), increasing the maximum rate from 20c per square kilometre to $1 per square kilometre. The rates collected when added to the Government subsidy represents the board's income, and some 85 per cent of these moneys is paid directly to fence owners as a maintenance subsidy.

6. Section 25 (2) empowers the board to declare a rate upon ratable land without reference to an approval by the Minister. Section 31 *(a)* provides for a Government subsidy equivalent to a rate of $1 for every dollar of the rates declared by the board for that financial year. The amendment to section 25 will serve to have the Minister approve the rate set by the board, and hence exert control of the funds to be provided by Government subsidy.

7. To increase the maximum rate the board may declare with the approval of the Minister from the present 20c per square kilometre to $1 per square kilometre.

Currently the board is declaring the maximum rate of 20 cents per square kilometre, returning approximately $45 000 per annum from landholders. This rate income attracts a dollar for dollar subsidy from Government, making the total approximately $90 000 per annum. Payments to fence owners currently paid is $35 per kilometre of fence owned absorbing approximately $77 000 of the total funds. The board has foreshadowed an increase in rates from 20 cents to 55 cents per square kilometre, returning approximately $132 750 from rates, a corresponding contribution from Government subsidy would produce an income of $265 500. On that basis, subsidy to fence owners would increase to approximately $100 per kilometre of fence owned.

8. To increase the minimum area ratable by a Local Dog Fence Board from 65 hectares to 100 hectares. Many areas between 65 hectares and 100 hectares are not used to depasture sheep. The rate paid by small landholders does not cover the cost of administration.

9. To increase the maximum rate a Local Dog Fence Board may declare from $1.50 to $3 per square kilometre. The amendment recognises the need for local boards to increase their incomes to maintain their fence in sound dog-proof conditions. Rates presently declared by Local Boards range from 60 cents per square kilometre to $1.50 per square kilometre.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 6 of the principal Act. The amendment made by paragraph *(a)* is necessary because of the change in name of the Stockowners Association of South Australia since the original enactment of the principal Act. Paragraph *(b)* removes a passage from section 6 (2) which had transitional importance at the commencement of the principal Act but is no longer relevant.

Clause 4 repeals section 8 of the principal Act. Once again this provision is transitional in its effect and is now of no relevance. Clause 5 amends section 22 of the principal Act. Paragraph *(a)* makes it clear that inspections of the dog fence must take place at least every 14 days. Paragraph *(b)* amends subsection (1) *(c)* so that it is clear what methods must be used to destroy dogs.

Clause 6 makes an amendment to section 24 (1) of the principal Act which will enable the Dog Fence Board to pay different amounts to different owners of sections of the fence to reflect differences in time and money that must be expended by each in the maintenance of the fence. Additional payments are required in cases of serious damage to the fence by fire or flood. The amendment also increases the maximum sum that may be paid to a realistic level.

Clause 7 amends section 25 of the principal Act. Paragraph *(a)* replaces subsection (2) so that the approval of the Minister will, in the future, be required before a rate is declared. Paragraph *(b)* increases the maximum amount of the rate that may be levied. Clause 8 makes amendments to section 26 of the principal Act which increases the minimum size of separate holdings for the purpose of the declaration of a special rate. The maximum rate per square kilometre is increased to $3. Clause 9 amends section 42 of the principal Act by increasing penalties prescribed by that section to more realistic levels.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mining Act, 1971-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I point out quite willingly that this Bill originated with the now Opposition a short while ago. I seek leave to have the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It deals with a problem relating to the payment of compensation in respect of mining operations conducted on exempt land. Section 9 of the principal Act provides that certain land shall be exempt from mining operations but that the exemption ceases if compensation is fixed by agreement or by decision of the Land and Valuation Court. Upon completion of the operations in respect of which compensation has been paid, the exemption revives. One of the categories of exempt land under section 9 is land in the vicinity of a dwellinghouse, factory or other buildings or structures specified in the section. These structures are in some cases situated on land that is adjacent to, but separate from, the exempt land on which it is proposed to carry out

the mining operations. It is obviously fair that, in such cases, the owners of these structures which give rise to the exemption should share in the compensation payable by the mining operator. The present amendments give effect to that principle.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 9 of the principal Act. Paragraph *(a)* replaces paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)* of subsection (3). New paragraph *(b)* of subsection (3) makes it clear that the Land and Valuation Court must assess compensation if asked to do so by a mining operator. Paragraph *(b)* of the clause inserts new subsections (3b) and (3c). Subsection (3b) defines the persons entitled to compensation. New subsection (3c) makes it quite clear that an agreement or determination under subsection (3) and conditions attached to that agreement or determination will operate for the benefit of successors in title to the land and to the mining tenement.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Racing Act, 1976-1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to amend the Racing Act to enable bookmakers to operate at the Bay Sheffield Carnival conducted by the South Australian Athletic League as part of the Proclamation Day celebrations. It is envisaged that this initiative will generate further support for the carnival which is one of South Australia's major sporting events, including, as it does, the second richest foot race held in Australia. South Australian foot racing will benefit financially under the proposal as it is intended that 1.4 per cent of the total amount bet on foot races at the carnival will be paid to the South Australian Athletic League. This payment will be on the same basis as the other payments based on betting turnover presently paid by the Betting Control Board to South Australian horse racing, trotting, greyhound racing and coursing clubs.

The operations of bookmakers under this proposal will be strictly controlled by the Betting Control Board and its betting supervisors. It is intended that each permit authorising a bookmaker to operate at the Bay Sheffield Carnival will contain conditions limiting the races on which he might accept bets to professional foot races and preventing cross-code betting. The representations that have been made to successive Governments urging that this initiative be taken would indicate that it has wide public support. In bringing this measure forward at this early stage of the session, the Government anticipates its being in force in time to be of benefit to this year's Bay Sheffield. The Government will, of course, proceed with its other proposals for the assistance of the racing industry at the earliest possible opportunity. I commend the Bill to honourable members and seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 85 of the principal Act which sets out definitions of terms used in Part IV in relation to betting with bookmakers. The clause inserts new definitions relating to foot races, that is, races between persons on foot. Under the clause, the term 'race', as used in Part IV, will include a foot race that forms part of the foot race meeting known as the 'Bay Sheffield Carnival' conducted by the South Australian Athletic League Incorporated. This will mean, in particular, that the Betting Control Board will be able to issue permits under section 112 authorising licensed bookmakers to accept bets on foot races that form part of the Bay Sheffield Carnival. The present provision under section 114 for payment by bookmakers to the Betting Control Board of a percentage of bets made with them and for payment by the Betting Control Board to racing clubs of 1.4 per cent of those bets will also apply in relation to betting on foot races at the Bay Sheffield Carnival in the same way as it presently applies in relation to other races. Clause 3 makes a consequential amendment to section 112 reflecting the fact that, as in the case of coursing events, there will not be totalisator betting on foot races.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF MEADOWS

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the boundaries of the District Council of Meadows with particular reference to the rural and urban characteristics of the area and adjoining council boundaries.

The select committee should examine any benefits or disadvantages that might flow from boundaries which are redrawn on rural and urban characteristics and whether certain portions of the District Council area of Meadows should be severed and annexed to adjoining councils. In carrying out the examination, the select committee should take into account any operational, financial, staffing and management issues it considers appropriate as well as community of interest in its determination of the question.

The select committee should examine the likely costs and benefits of annexation and severance, including whether the residual urban area should remain as a municipal council or be annexed to an adjoining municipal council or councils. The select committee should also consider the impact of the proposal on adjacent council areas, and also any consequential adjustments to boundaries that may be required. If the select committee considers that there is a need to adjust the boundaries of the District Council of Meadows, with the inclusion of, or adjustment to, the areas of adjoining councils, it shall prepare a joint address to His Excellency the Governor, pursuant to section 23 of the Local Government Act, 1934-1982, identifying the areas to be severed and any required changes to the areas of adjoining councils by uniting, or by severance or annexation, any consequent adjustment of liabilities and assets, the disposition of staff affected by any change and all other matters pursuant to the Local Government Act, 1934-1982.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The action taken by the Government through the Minister is an enabling motion which permits evidence to be obtained from the persons involved and, because it is advantageous to have the select committee meeting during the time before the House meets after the Christmas break, the Opposition is prepared to accept the motion without further debate at this juncture. I say 'further debate at this juncture' because it is apparent that, when the committee reports back to the House, if there are any questions which are unresolved or any arguments which need to be put forward during the noting of that

report, that action can be taken. I believe that, after the evidence is available in printed form, that is a much better time for that to be undertaken. Therefore, I support the motion.

Motion carried.

The House appointed a select committee consisting of the Hons W.E. Chapman, B.C. Eastick and T.H. Hemmings, and Messrs Ferguson and Mayes; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on Tuesday 22 March 1983.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT COUNCILS OF BALAKLAVA, OWEN AND PORT WAKEFIELD

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the uniting of the District Councils of Balaklava, Owen and Port Wakefield. The select committee should examine any benefits or disadvantages that might flow from the uniting of the three areas. In carrying out this examination the select committee should take into account any operational, financial, staffing and management issues it considers appropriate as well as community of interest in its determination of the question. The select committee should consider the impact of the proposal on adjacent council areas and also any consequential adjustments to boundaries that may be required. If the select committee considers that the unification of the three councils, with any other inclusion of, or adjustment to, the areas of adjoining councils, it shall prepare a Joint Address to His Excellency the Governor pursuant to section 23 of the Local Government Act, 1934-1982, identifying the areas to be united and any required changes to the areas of any adjoining district councils by uniting, or, by severance or annexation, any consequent adjustment of liabilities and assets, the disposition of staff affected by any change and all other matters pursuant to the Local Government Act, 1934-1982.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports the motion. This is a somewhat different situation to that to which I referred a few moments ago, because a considerable amount of evidence has been taken by members in another place. If the honourable Minister can assure Opposition members who will sit on that Committee that, if there is a need to recall witnesses, and those witnesses are recalled, so that the current committee is in a position to better understand any evidence that has already been led, at this juncture I can see no difficulty. However, if the Minister, or his colleagues who have been discussing this matter with him, is of the opinion that the evidence will necessarily be taken as gospel without the right of further inquiry, there would be a major upheaval. I take it from the nodding of the Minister's head that he is not tired and that he is in fact agreeing to the proposition that I have proposed. On that basis, I support the motion.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Rather than the member for Light's taking the nodding of my head as being an assurance, I would like to have it clearly placed in *Hansard* that any evidence that was gathered by the previous select committee will be made available to this select committee and, if there is a further need to recall those witnesses, we shall do so.

Motion carried.

The House appointed a select committee consisting of the Hons B.C. Eastick and T.H. Hemmings, Mrs Appleby, and Messrs Mayes and Oswald; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on Tuesday 22 March 1983.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the evidence given to the Select Committee on the Local Government Boundaries of the District Councils of Balaklava and Owen be forwarded to the committee.

Motion carried.

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That three members of the House be appointed, by ballot, to the Council of the University of Adelaide as provided by the University of Adelaide Act, 1971-1978.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, Messrs Ferguson, Gregory and Lewis were declared elected.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA COUNCIL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That three members of the House be appointed, by ballot, to the Council of the Flinders University of South Australia, as provided by the Flinders University of South Australia Act, 1966-1973.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, Mr Baker, Ms Lenehan, and Mr Mayes were declared elected.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker and Messrs Duncan, Eastick, Gunn, and Trainer.

Library: The Speaker and Messrs Eastick, Mayes, and Meier.

Printing: Mrs Appleby and Messrs D.C. Brown, Ferguson, Mathwin, and Plunkett.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That, in accordance with section 4 of the Joint House Committee Act, the House of Assembly members on the committee be the Speaker, Dr Eastick, Ms Lenehan, and Mr Plunkett.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Environment and Planning) I move:

That pursuant to the Public Accounts Committee Act, 1972, a Public Accounts Committee be appointed consisting of Messrs Becker, Duncan, Gregory, Klunder, and Oswald.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That the House of Assembly members on the committee be Messrs Ferguson, Groom, and Gunn.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Environment and Planning): I move:

That a Committee consisting of Mrs Appleby, Mr Bannon, Ms Lenehan, and Messrs Trainer and Wright be appointed to prepare a draft Address to His Excellency the Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament and to report tomorrow.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 9 December at 2 p.m.