HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 27 October 1983

The SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY BILL

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION REDEVELOPMENT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Members will recall that in answer to questions from the Leader of the Opposition asked in this House last week I undertook to provide full details of the agreement signed between the State Government, the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust and Kumagai Gumi & Co. Ltd. I do not at this stage intend to table the actual agreement as there are a number of minor matters which are still the subject of discussions with other parties. However, I assure the House that the statement I am about to give covers all major aspects of the agreement and, in particular, details the financial incentives which the Government has offered.

The ASER development is to take place on an area of land bounded on the west by the Morphett Street bridge, on the south by North Terrace, on the east by lands occupied by the Constitutional Museum and the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, and on the north by land held by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. The South Australian Superannuation Fund has agreed to invest $15 million in the project together with a further $43.5 million in loan funds. Kumagai Gumi will invest $15 million in the project by way of equity funds together with a further $48.5 million in loan funds. The development will include:

(1) An international standard hotel containing about 400 rooms with appropriate associated facilities.

(2) A commercial office building containing about 22 000 square metres of net lettable area, or thereabouts.

(3) An international standard convention centre to seat about 3 000 delegates together with associated facilities.

(4) Retail and restaurant areas of about 2 000 square metres gross area.

(5) A car park for about 800 cars.

Under the terms of the agreement between the Government, SASFIT, and Kumagai Gumi and Company Limited, the Government has agreed to:

(1) Sublease from the joint venture partners (SASFIT and Kumagai) the convention centre and car park for a rental linked to the capitalised cost of these facilities for a period of 40 years.

(2) Sublease up to 11 000 square metres of office space from the joint venture partners for a term of 10 years.

(3) Guarantee that SASFIT will realise a return of 8.5 per cent of the capitalised cost of the international hotel, adjusted each year for c.p.i. increases, for a period of the first five years or 10 years (as shall be agreed) from the date of opening of the hotel. Should the returns from the hotel be less than this amount, then one-half of the shortfall will be payable by the Government to SASFIT. Should the returns be greater than the prescribed rate, then SASFIT will pay one-half of the extra return to the Government.

(4) Guarantee all loan moneys provided by the project by Kumagai.

As members will see, the financial obligations of the Government could vary depending on the returns generated by the hotel. The Department of State Development has calculated that:

The minimum financial obligation of the Government under the terms of the guarantee for the hotel is estimated at $200 000 in the first year of operation. The total cost of the subsidy (in 1983 dollars) over five years, beginning 1986, is about $2.5 million, and over 10 years is $5.6 million.

The maximum financial obligation under these arrangements is estimated to be about $1.4 million in the first year of operation. The total cost of the subsidy (in 1983 dollars) over five years beginning 1986 is $3.5 million and over 10 years is $5.6 million.

The maximum financial obligation of the Government under the terms of the guarantee on the other facilities (that is, convention centre and car park) is estimated to be $1.25 million in the first year. This amount can be expected to be significantly reduced depending on the extent of the revenues derived from the public use of these facilities.

The total maximum financial obligation of the Government for the hotel, convention centre, car park and public facilities in the ASER project is therefore estimated at $2.65 million in the first year. This compares favourably with the $3 million a year in subsidies which had been promised to the project by the Tonkin Government in 1982.

During negotiations with the joint venture partners I insisted that any agreement be drawn up without regard to the possibility of a casino being located within the development. As members would be aware, the location of that casino is not a matter for the Government. However, a casino would obviously improve the financial position of the hotel and, consequently, the agreement provides that, in the event of a casino being located within the ASER project the guarantee provided by the Government for the international hotel will lapse.

The Government has also agreed to forgo stamp duties relating to the project as well as water and sewerage rates, except ordinary excess water charges, for a period of five years after the official opening of the international hotel, and will also forgo land tax for a period of 10 years after the official opening of the hotel.

Members will be aware that these concessions are similar to, but not as generous as, those offered under the Victoria Square (International Hotel) Act, 1980. The Government has also agreed not to provide financial assistance whether directly or indirectly for the erection of any international hotel where building of that hotel commences within four

years of the opening of the international hotel comprised in this development.

The question of an indenture has also been raised. The Government has agreed to introduce such legislation as is necessary to give effect to the agreement. Crown Law has advised that at this stage it does not believe that an indenture is necessary but that an empowering statute similar to the Victoria Square (International Hotel) Act, 1980, will be required.

The agreement which I signed in Tokyo on 1 October has now cleared the way for this major development to take place. As I said in my answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question on 18 October, I give full credit to the Minister of Transport in the previous Government who was also working towards securing this project. I believe all members will appreciate that it will bring major benefits to South Australia, in terms not only of the significant employment that it will generate, but also of the impetus that it will give to our growing tourist industry.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: EDUCATION POLICIES

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I publicly announce the issuing of the first of a series of policy development papers from the Education Department of South Australia entitled *The Early Years of School.* This paper is the first policy development paper to be issued in accordance with an undertaking made by this Government to adopt consultation procedures that give opportunities to the wider community to be heard on matters of education policy. This undertaking was made in our pre-election policy. Education, more than any other area of government, involves large numbers of people—students, teachers, parents—everyone who has been to school. All of these people are capable of holding opinions about the direction of education and are affected by Government decisions. This Government believes these people have a right to be involved, to some extent, in the formulation of policies on educational matters. This is what we are inviting them to do through the releasing of this policy development paper.

The question of how long children should spend in junior primary classes has generated much interest among teachers and parents in recent times. Indeed, the matter was raised in this House on 1 September 1983 in the form of a question from the member for Goyder. It has arisen, I believe, because of the wider availability of pre-school services in our State, and as a result of the now common policy direction that provides for continuous intake of five-year-olds into our school system. This is the question to which the paper addresses itself, along with the allied issues of the features of junior primary education: curriculum development in junior primary years to ensure continuity in primary and secondary education; the type of in-service and pre-service preparation needed for teachers of young children; and the arrangements that are needed to ensure that sufficient leadership and support are available for teachers of young children.

The obvious need to review the policy of the Education Department in relation to the provision of services for children's early years at school became apparent some time ago. The paper is a set of policy proposals that have been formulated within the Education Department after consultation with some parent and professional associations. These proposals are now being put forward publicly to provide the opportunity for school councils, other school-community groups, teachers, and parents, all either individually or in groups, to discuss them and report back. Comments should be forwarded to the Director-General of Education. Proposals contained in the paper will be reviewed in the light of comments received, and a firm policy statement determined and published.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: TOURISM STATISTICS

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Tourism): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I think it is necessary today to respond to an interpretation placed on certain statistics yesterday in this House by the member for Coles. The member maintained that we had been experiencing a downturn in tourism on the basis of the June quarter Australian Bureau of Statistics bulletin on tourist accommodation. That bulletin provided figures (which I have no intention of contesting) on room occupancy rates (in percentages) and bed occupancy rates, in motels, hotels, and caravan parks throughout the State.

Those figures, as the honourable member explained in some detail, seemed to suggest that there was a trend downward that was continuing and was a matter for serious concern. Our marketing initiatives, she contended, should have shown up in the figures for that June quarter. My brief reply yesterday, before I had been able to study the Department's analysis of those statistics, included the observation that anything that tends to dampen enthusiasm within the tourist industry would have bad effects. I now repeat and underline that remark. In fact, there is absolutely no need to be other than enthusiastic.

The better indicator of the real state of tourism is the rise and fall in the number of rooms sold and, surprisingly, that is a theory that was subscribed to by the member for Coles herself, as Minister of Tourism. She pointed this out, with some emphasis, during the Budget Estimates debate on 30 September last year, and also earlier, in a reply given on 1 December 1981 to a Question on Notice from the member for Gilles.

Using the 'rooms sold' index, South Australia is seen to be advancing, and not retreating. I am glad to be able to give this House, the honourable member and the tourist industry this assurance, for the number of rooms sold in hotels and motels in South Australia in the June quarter was 3.2 per cent higher than for the same quarter in 1982, and this pleasing result is above the national average.

I think I should explain briefly why room occupancy percentages are not the most reliable index. Although occupancy rates as detailed in the A.B.S. Bulletin used by the honourable member declined from the 1982 rate, the number of rooms available was 10.1 per cent more than at the same time last year. In fact, the past 12 months reflects the highest increase of rooms available for any period in our entire recorded history. For caravan parks, also referred to by the honourable member, frankly the national picture has been depressing, showing a 10.5 per cent decline. Our decline, as measured by the number of sites sold, was only 6.1 per cent. However, in this State we had 440 fewer sites available. This would necessarily have caused a substantial drop in the number of sites sold over Easter and the May school holidays. Overall, Sir, public figures who should bear our flourishing tourist industry some goodwill should exercise caution before producing apparent proof that there has been a disappointing response to our product.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT REVISION

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Local Government): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I wish to advise the House that a draft Local Government Act Revision Bill will be sent out to all councils, interested parties and members of Parliament tomorrow. In distributing the revision Bill in this way, I am honouring the commitment that I made to give an additional 28 days for consultation following the 90 days my predecessor gave when he distributed a first draft revision Bill while in office. The Bill is being sent out accompanied by a set of explanatory notes. These have been provided to assist in understanding the content of the Bill and also to indicate where the changes have been made in relation to the old Local Government Act.

In considering this Bill, I stress to all interested parties the importance of examining the document in terms of the next 20 to 50 years in the history of local government in this State. The Bill provides for a structure that will match local government with other levels of government and also bring its electoral provisions in line with all other Governments in the Commonwealth. The draft Bill has already been discussed with the senior executive of the Local Government Association, and I understand that it will be further considered by the full executive this afternoon. I have provided each member of the executive with a copy of the Bill and explanatory notes. I have issued a general invitation to all councils to meet on a regional basis, and officers of my Department will explain the content and features of the Bill. I believe that this draft contains a very positive statement on the future of local government, and I know that all interested parties will study the proposed legislation positively and constructively.

QUESTION TIME

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION REDEVELOPMENT

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier explain why Kumagai has reduced the loan it will make available for the Adelaide railway station redevelopment and which party or parties will make up the balance of the $140 million required for the project? When the Premier announced an agreement for this project in Tokyo, in the *News* of 2 October it was reported that Kumagai would invest a total of $80 million in it. The *Advertiser* of 3 October reported the same thing, and gave further detail that Kumagai's investment will involve $15 million in equity and $65 million in loans. However, in a statement today, the Premier has stated that Kumagai's loan will be $48.5 million. He has outlined equity and loans for the project totalling $122 million, whereas the total projected cost is $140 million.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The commitments made to aspects of the project on which Kumagai Gumi is engaged are consistent with the figures I gave earlier. The figure of $140 million, which is the overall global figure that it is suggested the total project will encompass, includes also other aspects of work being done by the State Transport Authority, under resignalling and line realignment, and one or two other elements. However, in order to obtain a precise breakdown of those figures, I will take the question on notice and supply an answer to the Leader.

WEED SPRAYING

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Chief Secretary ascertain whether the Minister of Health in another place is aware that local councils in my electorate have been using 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D for spraying weeds?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is entitled to put the question in his own fashion. The honourable member for Peake.

Mr PLUNKETT: An article in today's *West Side* states:

> Highly toxic chemicals are being used to control weeds in the western suburbs. They include the controversial 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T, both banned by the Australian Workers Union.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Peake.

Mr PLUNKETT: The article continues:

> The most important reasons why they are used is because they are much cheaper than other labour-intensive methods and do not disturb the soil.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: I would expect that sort of comment—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Peake to order and ask him to continue with his explanation, and I do not need the assistance of gentlemen on my left in support of my ruling.

Mr PLUNKETT: The article continues:

> 'The toxic effects may cause injury directly from swallowing, breathing or skin contact with the chemical,' his report said . . . 'Children are susceptible to indirect contact by touching sprayed weeds or playing with animals which have been in contact with sprayed weeds.'

I wonder what the other side would say about that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is definitely out of order. The honourable member for Peake.

Mr PLUNKETT: The article continues:

> 'The safety of the operator and people living nearby are paramount.' Australian Workers Union secretary Alan Begg said members were recommended not to use 2,4-D or 2,4,5-T . . . 'Unfortunately few contractors are members of the union and they use these sprays without protective clothing or gas masks. They either don't know or don't recognise the probable danger . . .'

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the honourable member to wind up his explanation.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

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

Mr PLUNKETT: The article continues:

> Health Commissioner Dr Leon Leleu said precautions should be taken whatever chemicals are used for weed-spraying. 'Contact with them can cause dermatitis and soft-tissue sarcomas (a type of cancer),' he said.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am surprised that such a responsible question could result in some inappropriate comments by some members opposite—and I say 'some members opposite' because the overwhelming majority of members opposite I believe agree with me and the Government that this is a responsible action by a member representing his electorate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Here we go again. It is a very important question, and I will raise it with my colleague. I will ask him to have this matter investigated and to recommend what action can be taken to protect the people to whom the honourable member has referred.

CASINO LICENCE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say why the Government is putting pressure on the Casino

Supervisory Authority to grant a casino licence for the Adelaide railway station redevelopment? On 18 October the Premier told the House that the agreement that he signed in Tokyo for the railway station redevelopment did not involve the establishment of a casino. However, in a press statement today the Premier has revealed that the casino licence does in fact have some bearing on the railway station redevelopment agreement. The Premier has revealed that, if a casino is located within the redevelopment, the Government guarantee for the international hotel will lapse. It has been put to me that this arrangement puts considerable pressure on the Casino Supervisory Authority, because it means that, if the Authority grants the casino licence to the railway station redevelopment, taxpayers' funds will not be put at risk to guarantee loans for the international hotel. It has been further put to me that this puts the Authority in an invidious position, and that, in fact, it makes a farce of any statement that the Authority is in fact independent.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the Premier, I indicate that questions framed in the manner in which the Deputy Leader's question was framed will in future most likely be ruled out of order because of the imputation that one can gather from such a question.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I certainly reject the imputation in the question and point out that that is not what the Government is doing. I would have thought that I had made the position abundantly clear on a number of occasions in this House. All that the Deputy Leader is drawing attention to is the fact to which my Ministerial statement has also alluded, namely, that, of course, those involved in developing a convention centre, an international hotel and other facilities would be very interested in having a casino as part of such a development. They have stated that publicly and clearly. No doubt they will be making submissions to the Supervisory Authority with that view in mind, and so indeed will a number of other groups.

It is obvious that certain commercial benefits would be derived by such developers and, in this instance, the Government, if a casino were part of an overall complex. The Government quite properly is pointing out such benefits and is quite properly pointing that out to the Supervisory Authority. That does not in any way trample on the Authority's independence (established by Statute) in making its decision. The Authority's decision will have to be made on the basis of all the submissions that are put before it, and if it gave weight to the fact that there are certain very specific financial advantages in relation to this project, and that they outweighed other factors, so be it. But I do not really understand the purport or implication of the Deputy Leader's question, when it is quite clear to everyone that, if the casino were to be associated with the development, it would provide certain financial advantages that would not be evident if it were not associated with it. That is a simple statement of fact, plain to all, and to be explored by the Supervisory Authority.

BUSH FIRE

Mr KLUNDER: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning give the House any information about the fire which yesterday destroyed a portion of the Hincks Conservation Park? With your leave, Sir, and that of the House, I will briefly explain the question, merely to indicate that I am asking it in view of the imminence of the coming fire season and the disastrous experience that this State went through during the last fire season.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I can confirm that 10 000 hectares (or about 16 per cent) of the Hincks Conservation Park has been burnt out, and I am very angry about what has happened. I believe that all members will share my anger after I have explained the circumstances under which this arose. From time to time the National Parks and Wildlife Service has been under attack, I believe, unfairly, in relation to its fire management programmes. Some months ago I was able to demonstrate to this House that by far the vast majority of fires which affect our parks begin off park.

Last summer a portion of the Deep Creek Reserve was destroyed as a result of embers from a camp fire lit on a fire ban day. Shortly before that a good portion of the Mount Boothby Park in the upper South-East was destroyed by fire which began from sparks from a header operating on a nearby agricultural property. This is a very valuable park. It has not been subjected to fire in living memory, and in the past two years the department has spent $30 000 on access tracks and breaks in it. I am sure members will agree that that is a responsible operation on the part of the service.

These are the circumstances in which the fire went in to the park. It resulted from the burning off on adjoining land. I have thought long and hard about whether I should name the person who appears on the evidence to be responsible for lighting the fire. I have decided I will not do so, because I do not want anything I say here to compromise any action that the law enforcement authorities might want to take in relation to this matter. Let me simply say that on the advice I have the burning off took place in ridiculous circumstances: the temperature was 38°C, the wind speed was between 35 and 45 kilometres per hour, the relative humidity was 10 per cent and the flame height of the burning off was estimated at about 6 metres, and in those circumstances the fire had a potential to spot at 1.5 kilometres beyond the front of the flames.

What more can one do? We have had seminars about fire control, and Mr Johns has continually been on the media asking people to be very careful about the way in which they use fire in any circumstances, yet we are confronted with this sort of occurrence. This is agricultural land and, therefore, of course, it is subject to vegetation clearance control, and that matter is also being followed up.

CASINO LICENCE

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Can the Premier say whether the Government has already informed those who have expressed an interest in obtaining the casino licence about its policy on where the casino should be located and, if so, will the Premier now tell the House what that policy is? Many companies and establishments have expressed publicly an interest in the casino licence. The Opposition understands that the Premier has informed some companies in writing of the Government's policy in relation to the attributes a location should have before it can be considered for a casino licence. The deadline for submissions to the Casino Supervisory Authority is tomorrow and, as the Premier has already said that the Government will be making a submission, he should now be in a position to tell the House what is the Government's policy.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer back to the question from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in which he made certain implications about the Government's posture before the Casino Supervisory Authority. I made clear then that the Government certainly has a right to (and I have said all along that it will) make a submission to that Authority, but it is not our purpose to exercise undue influence on the Authority; it would be quite improper to do so, and any such provision is certainly not contained in the Act.

We have prepared a submission in which we have indicated the Government's attitude. Incidentally, it does not refer

just to location: it refers also to financial matters, because Treasury elements and other aspects are involved also to which the Government must direct the attention of the Supervisory Authority. That submission will go in tomorrow, along with all the other submisions, assuming any others are made, to the Authority, which I understand will commence considering them next week. I am not aware of the exact nature and way in which it will handle those submissions.

The Government's intentions in a formal way and the Government's overall preference are matters that I have been careful not to spell out too explicitly, because I believe that the Supervisory Authority ought to get our submission in context as a full submission. I do not believe, for instance, that it should be tabled or canvassed here; let it be summed up on its merits when it goes before the Authority. One should also clearly bear in mind the nature and type of the development and the points I have referred to in the Ministerial statement today.

There are financial benefits in the casino being a part of the railway station project, but that does not mean that it must be there: it could be in another area. One could argue that the further one takes the casino from the Hindley Street core the more other considerations enter into the question. The Government will certainly suggest to the Supervisory Authority that it must have regard to the general economic benefits to be derived from the construction of the casino. It is not just a matter of facilities that may or may not earn revenue for the State besides providing a tourist facility, but also of the benefits that can flow from the construction of the facility and the employment involved. The full nature of the Government's submission to the Authority will presumably be revealed by the Authority, before which we will be represented.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Have you written to anyone about it?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have not written to anyone indicating the nature of the submission, but our general preference is clear. I am not sure to what the honourable member is referring, but I will undertake to have the matter investigated. May I take the opportunity to correct an aspect of the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition: I am pleased to say that the answer to his question is simply that there has been a typing error in my notes. The proper figure regarding the Kumagai contribution by way of loan fund should be $58.5 million, not $48.5 million. The total is $132 million and, after considering the ancillaries and contingencies that may arise, the overall total is $140 million.

SUICIDES

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister of Local Government ascertain what steps have been taken to prevent persons suiciding from public buildings, especially car parks? Some constituents have expressed to me their concern about the unfortunate but repeated occurrence of suicide from public buildings, especially car parks. It has been suggested that one such incident should be sufficient to generate positive action to prevent such disturbing happenings.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter here, and I assure the House that I share her concern regarding the tragic occurrence of people trying to commit suicide from multi-storey car parks. Having noted reports of such occurrences in the local press, I have referred to the Building Advisory Committee the question of whether regulatory action could be taken to require the incorporation of protection in the design of these car parks to minimise the accessibility of these locations to potential suicide cases.

RAILWAY STATION REDEVELOPMENT

Mr EVANS: Will the Premier say when the Government first discussed with potential investors in the railway station redevelopment project any arrangement whereby the guarantee to the international hotel would lapse if a casino is located within the project?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That condition was negotiated between the South Australian Superannuation Fund and the partners in the consortium. That is the proposition they put to us. Basically, the package of incentives that Mr Pak-Poy was offering to interested investors was the packet of incentives which had been offered by the previous Government but which this Government modified. In fact, as I have already said, setting aside any element of a casino, the packaging incentives that we have offered still see us coming out well ahead of the offers made by the previous Government. I think that is a very useful saving, if you like, to have negotiated in that context.

As far as the casino is concerned, I repeat that those involved said, 'We require a guarantee for the hotel, and it is on that basis.' The Government said, 'Yes, we will honour that agreement.' They said, 'However, we will not require that agreement if we get the casino because the economics of the hotel will improve.' This would have been in the course of negotiations, probably around September.

I first saw the actual details of that when I signed the agreement and the agreement was finalised. I am not sure that timing is very relevant at all. As I say, it is a pure commercial fact of life: if there is no casino—and I have insisted throughout that the agreement should be drawn on the basis that there will not necessarily be a casino—a guarantee is required. We are prepared to give that guarantee. If there is a casino the people concerned have advised us that they will not require such a guarantee, and that is to our financial advantage.

WORKERS COMPENSATION

Mr PETERSON: Will the Deputy Premier say whether, when a person applying for a job is rejected because of his non-acceptability to the firm's workers compensation insurance company, that person has any means of appeal against such rejection? If not, will a right of appeal be included in the Workers Compensation Act? Recently, a young male constituent who has been working for about 15 years came to see me. When he first started work he had a back injury from which he has now fully recovered. For many years he has worked in strenuous labouring jobs in which he has had no trouble whatsoever.

His place of employment suffered a down-turn in business, and he was laid off. He applied for a position with another company for which he was accepted, subject to that firm's insurance company accepting him. However, he was rejected for employment because of this pre-injury some 15 years ago from which he had recovered and with which he had had no problem whatsoever for many years. As he told me, while he and others like him have no opportunity to prove their medical fitness they are doomed never to be employed. Will this matter be considered by the Government?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member asks a two-part question. First, I advise him to inform his constituent, if he has not already done so, to see the Rehabilitation Unit to find out whether it is possible for him to be rehabilitated by some form of retraining. I cannot suggest an occupation because the honourable member has not mentioned one. The answer, therefore, to the first part of the question is that, once the insurance company has rejected this man, there is no appeal from that decision. Of course,

insurance companies act in this way quite often. Ample evidence is available of people, who have had accidents, trying to get back into the work force and employers being prepared to take the risk of an old injury, but often the insurance companies debar a person from employment because they see an injury as an extra risk. Much depends upon a medical certificate. I imagine that this man has obtained a certificate from a doctor, but it sounds as though the medical profession is not prepared to give his constituent a 100 per cent clearance to return to work.

The second part of the honourable member's question related to what would occur if amendments or changes were made to the Workers Compensation Act. Of course, the Government has not really determined this. It has created a public debate to try to see what people think about workers compensation generally, and that debate is continuing. People come in every day with ideas for provisions in the legislation. Discussions are taking place in a strong and widespread debate on the matter.

The incident to which the member refers, while it can happen under the compensation schemes operating in this country (with the exception of Queensland), cannot happen under the single-channel scheme in New Zealand. In that country, if a person is injured either at work or out of work—it does not matter because it is a no-fault scheme: it operates irrespective of where the injury occurs, be it on the road or at home—the A.C.C. undertakes a responsibility to that employee for the rest of his life. It does not have to be an employee: it can be a road accident victim or any other kind of victim.

That is the very heart of the inadequacies of the present workers compensation scheme here as it operates in this country. Someone is paid $55 000, $60 000 or whatever it may be, then put on the scrap heap: I do not think that is the answer. Rehabilitation must be upgraded, and I believe that the present system requires serious examination. We can do better. However, apart from that, and the conditions afforded to people under the New Zealand scheme, we can do it more cheaply than we are doing at present.

Employers are regularly telling me that, if workers compensation premiums were not so high, they could employ extra people. As a Government we have a responsibility to ensure that proper protection is given to the people we represent and, secondly, to evolve some system that will work better than does the present one.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: My question, directed to the Premier, relates to his Ministerial statement earlier today. What rental will the Government pay for the sublease at the convention centre and car park for a 40-year period, and will the rental or the capitalised cost be adjusted for c.p.i. increases each year? On page 2 of the Ministerial statement under subheading (1) the Premier stated:

> (1) Sublease from the joint venture partners (SASFIT and Kumagai) the convention centre and car park for a rental linked to the capitalised cost of these facilities for a period of 40 years.

He has not indicated whether the rental will be adjusted for c.p.i., as he indicated under subsection (3). He also has not indicated what the rental will be, even though under subsection (3) he referred to an 8.5 per cent return on the hotel. Can the Premier indicate whether it will be the same 8.5 per cent or some other percentage rental (as it obviously will be), and whether it will be adjusted as envisaged under subsection (3)?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I do not have that detail in front of me, I will try to obtain that information for the honourable member.

TAILEM BEND RAILWAYS

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Transport obtain a detailed report into the future of employees engaged within the Chief Mechanical Engineers Branch of Australian National Railways at Tailem Bend? Over the past week I have received many telephone calls from employees in this branch expressing their concern for the future of their jobs and that of their families. The Australian National Railways Union State Branch Secretary, Mr John Crossing, verified this concern at 1.50 p.m. this afternoon when I telephoned him. Also, just after 12 noon today I received correspondence from Mr Brian Busch, South Australian Secretary of the Australian Transport Officers Federation, that states:

> Dear Mr Hamilton,
>
> During discussions between unions and management of Australian National at Tailem Bend on Tuesday 25 October 1983, the Chief Mechanical Engineer of A.N., Mr M. James, advised in response to a question from myself that A.N. was not obliged to comply with Part III Section 17 of the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Act, 1975, which states:
>
>> The Australian Minister will obtain the prior agreement of the State Minister to the implementation of any proposals for reducing, by reason of redundancy, the general level of employment at railway workshops to be vested in the Commission pursuant to this agreement, and failing agreement the matter shall be determined by arbitration.
>
> in regard to proposed changes in the Mechanical Branch at Tailem Bend, because Tailem Bend was considered by A.N. to be a depot and not a workshop.
>
> The A.T.O.F. is most concerned that A.N.'s stance is a 'play on words', as any layman would consider Tailem Bend to be a workshop area, whereas to a railwayman it is a depot which operates on a 24-hour per day basis dependent upon traffic demands, as against, say, Islington workshops which operate on a 7.45 a.m. to 4.15 p.m. Monday to Friday basis only.
>
> Could you please establish from the Hon. Minister of Transport if he is, in fact, of the view that A.N. has a responsibility to ensure that the Australian Minister receives his prior approval before implementing their proposed changes, particularly as A.N. has indicated a staff reduction of some 26 officers and employees.

I am led to believe that there will be eight positions left at Tailem Bend in the Chief Mechanical Engineers Branch after this reduction of 26, and that some tradesmen, tradesmen's assistants, train examiners, and others will have to leave that depot, and also that the traffic division employees are most concerned about their future if a reduction takes place in the Chief Mechanical Engineers Branch at that depot.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I will examine this matter for the honourable member. From what the member has quoted, I would seem to need advice on the concerns expressed by the Australian Transport Officers Federation that the Australian National's stance is just a play on words. I am not sure whether Tailem Bend is regarded as a workshop area or a depot, which operates on a 24-hour a day basis. However, if a clear definition is necessary to resolve the matter I will undertake to examine this and advise the honourable member of the outcome.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE'S BEHAVIOUR

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Will the Premier say whether he has already censured, or if he has not does he intend to censure, the Minister of Agriculture following that Minister's behaviour, as reported recently in the press?

The SPEAKER: Order! I rule that question totally out of order, because the reports in the press that I have seen deal

exclusively with certain events in another place. The honourable member for Mawson.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. I have no desire to delay the House, but I ask you, Mr Speaker, with due respect, to identify how you know which article, on which day, and about which subject the Minister of Agriculture has misbehaved.

The SPEAKER: The only public newspaper that I have in front of me has a large picture of two wellknown figures of another place, and a large block of print which deals with the Minister of Agriculture. I can see nothing else that deals with the Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, with due respect, the front page of the *News* that you have plucked from the desk and referred to does not mention the Minister of Agriculture on any part of that page.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will sort this out. If the honourable member looks at page 4, he will find that I am fully justified in my contention. However, quite apart from that, I would like to ask him a question. Would he like to identify any other issue apart from the issue that I have ruled out of order?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Do I get the floor?

The SPEAKER: Yes, I am asking the honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I would not like to delay Question Time, but I can refer to several other areas wherein in my view the Minister of Agriculture has misbehaved.

The SPEAKER: Order! I asked the member for Alexandra, because he posed a challenge (which theoretically, I suppose, could have been correct), whether he could identify any issue raised in the public media of one form or another, including the press of this day or last evening, that is outside the ambit of that part of his question that I have ruled out of order. That is the simple question.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the opportunity. In answering your rather complicated question, may I say that at no stage did I refer to a paper of today, yesterday, or last evening. I said 'recently reported', and I meant what I said. If I can go back a day or two, it is as easy as falling off a log to identify misbehaviour by the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have ruled the question out of order.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Why?

The SPEAKER: I attempted to see whether there was any basis at all for allowing the question.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Why is it out of order?

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Alexandra for his behaviour. The member for Mawson.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. In view of your warning, might I reasonably expect an explanation of why my question or any comment I have made today is out of order in relation to Standing Orders of this House?

The SPEAKER: I have already given that explanation, and the reason why the honourable member was warned is that—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member wishes to be named, he will get that courtesy very quickly if he makes—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Name me if you like.

The SPEAKER: I name the member for Alexandra.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

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

That the member for Alexandra be suspended from the service of the House.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Government members: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Alexandra to withdraw from the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will come to order, or I will vacate the Chair and suspend the sittings of the House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members on both sides of the House to retain some semblance of dignity. Standing Order 171 states:

Whenever any such member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman of Committees, such member shall have the right to be heard in explanation or apology, and shall, unless such explanation or apology be accepted by the House, then withdraw from the Chamber; whereupon, if the offence has been committed by such member in the House, Mr Speaker shall, on a motion being made, no amendment, adjournment, or debate being allowed, forthwith put the question, 'That such member be suspended from the service of the House'...

I take it that the member's complaint is that he was not given the opportunity to give an explanation or make an apology. I now give him the opportunity to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to come to order. It is the honourable member for Alexandra who is involved in this. Does the member for Alexandra have Standing Order 171 in front of him?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member wish to be heard in explanation or apology?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I take the opportunity to give the House an explanation of the reasons why I asked the question and the reason why I objected to the ruling of the Chair. I raised a simple question with the Premier this afternoon following what I believe has been a series of incidents of misbehaviour by Ministers of the Government. My question related in this instance in particular to reported behaviour of the Minister of Agriculture. The question simply asked whether the Premier had already censured or, if not, whether he intended to censure that Minister for the recently reported misbehaviour. At no stage did I refer to a newspaper or media coverage of today, last evening or before that, but simply to a recent report. On that basis—

The SPEAKER: I might help the honourable member by indicating that I would be interested to know whether he proposes to apologise; if he does, I would be interested in the way in which he apologises.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I thought I made it clear when I got to my feet that I was taking an opportunity to explain and, as now called, I indicate to you and the House that I have no intention of apologising for raising the question or objecting to your ruling, then first your warning, and later your naming of me this afternoon. May I continue with my explanation?

The SPEAKER: Certainly.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Further to my raising the question, I was then faced with a series of questions from you quite unprecedented in my term of office in this place over a period now of more than 10 years. However, despite the new precedent you set in this instance, I did fairly and honestly attempt to answer those questions from you. Despite that, whether the precedent has been set, whether or not it is favourable or desirable, I request that my question be ruled in order and that the Premier be called upon to answer it because, as I have indicated in this explanation, the implication in my question refers specifically to the Minister of Agriculture but indeed a number of other Ministers in relation to their behaviour in the community, at hospital

premises, and at other places since this Party came into Government.

In my view there is nothing untoward, nothing contrary to any section of Standing Orders that control behaviour in this place, and I object to your proceeding with a hasty warning and then following it up with the naming of me in this place, an issue with which I have not been faced during my career, and I believe that on recollection and consideration of the matter you will find that quite unreasonable. That concludes the explanation I have for the House in this instance. I do not apologise. If the House goes through the procedures and votes, and so on, and if I am dislodged for the day, I will take it on the chin, but in no circumstances will I back off or apologise to you or anyone else.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the member for Alexandra's explanation to the House be accepted.

The member for Alexandra posed a question to the Premier in relation to the actions of one of his Ministers. Surely a member is entitled to ask the head of the Government to account for the actions of his Ministers. That was the objective, as I clearly understood it.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I understood that the explanation ought to have been directed to telling the House why the honourable member disregarded the Chair's ruling and the Chair's instructions. We are going through now a debate not on that subject but on whether the member was right in bringing up the subject.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not need the assistance of the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: There was the subject matter which the honourable member wanted to bring up and there was the disregarding of the Chair's instructions. I thought that was what we were talking about.

The SPEAKER: As I understand the situation, Standing Order 171 deals with an explanation or an apology, and I treat that as being both—there can be an explanation or an apology, or both. I understand the Leader of the Opposition to be moving that the explanation (because there was no apology) be accepted. I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My purpose in canvassing the matter at this stage is to point out that the member for Alexandra sought legitimately to objectively ask the head of Government about a matter that is of significance and importance to South Australia. He sought—

The SPEAKER: Order! The problem here is the very problem I raised with the honourable member for Alexandra. As I understand it, the Leader wishes to canvass certain matters which I have already ruled out of order. As I have understood him so far, he wishes to ask that the explanation of the member for Alexandra be accepted, but in so doing he is canvassing matters which I have already ruled out of order. Therefore, I must warn him that, while I shall attempt in every way to be fair to him, the debate is very limited. I refer the honourable Leader again to Standing Order 171.

Mr OLSEN: The honourable member, in accordance with Standing Order 171, was given the opportunity to explain to the House the reasons for his question and subsequently his seeking clarification from you as to why he was not permitted to proceed with posing to the Premier that question on an issue before the public of South Australia. The member for Alexandra, during the course of his explanation, has been explaining why he challenged your ruling and the request that he made of you, as Speaker, for a clear and concise—

The SPEAKER: Order! Again I think we are straying from the topic. The honourable member was named because I, as Speaker, considered that he had defied me. The Leader of the Opposition is canvassing the merits or demerits of an earlier ruling, and I am really not able to allow him to continue in this vein. I cannot find, even on the widest interpretation of Standing Order 171, how I can do that.

Mr OLSEN: You have given, you say, Sir, a wide interpretation; perhaps some may say differently. The member for Alexandra took up the opportunity to explain his actions. He has given an explanation to the House of his actions relative to your ruling. I believe that it is a substantive explanation that deserves the recognition and acceptance of this House.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I cannot support the motion. It is not a question of the member's rights to ask questions. The fact is that the Speaker made a ruling. The member challenged it and then continued—

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Exactly the same as last night, in the other House.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: All this lends weight to the fact that we are seeing here a put-up job and an attempt to reproduce the circumstances elsewhere.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Did Ted draw the short straw this morning?

Mr GUNN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. As the Deputy Premier is out of order in interjecting, why has he not been named under the same Standing Order as that applied to the member for Alexandra?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There has been a tendency towards total disorder, and I ask all honourable members, especially senior members, to show a good example.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suggest that members opposite stop getting excited about or being influenced by events somewhere else and what they have read in the paper, and consider the circumstances under which the Speaker acted in this matter. He acted in a situation where the honourable member asked a question, which the Speaker ruled out of order. The member challenged that ruling by way of a point of order, and the Speaker repeated his ruling. The member then persisted in interjecting and the Speaker asked that he desist. However, he continued to interject from his place. There can be no denial of that. Every member in this Chamber knows what he did.

If the honourable member was fair dinkum about this matter, he could have done what I have done occasionally, and what I am sure that, with his long experience, the member for Alexandra has done many times. On his question being ruled out of order, he could have approached the Chair quietly, explained to the Speaker the nature of his question, and ascertained whether, in the light of that explanation, the Speaker might allow him to ask it. However, he did not do that at all. He continued—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If what we are being told—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In that case it is even worse, as though the member went to the Speaker, was given certain advice, rejected that advice and, not content with raising the matter under Standing Orders, proceeded to raise it by way of repeated interjection. That is childish behaviour that should not be tolerated in this Chamber. Surely, ways and means exist by which we can conduct our business in an orderly way. This is either a contrived situation to try to recover somehow from the fiasco concerning the friends

of members opposite in another place or, alternatively, it is to cover up the fact that the member for Alexandra was not prepared to treat this in the usual way. A member with his experience who has been in this Parliament as long as he has would know that such behaviour would result in his suspension. It is strange that he now says, 'I did not expect that and I do not deserve it.' I am afraid that that is not good enough.

On the other hand, the honourable member may have been prepared to say, 'In the heat of the moment I persisted with the interjection, and I apologise for that. I will approach you, Mr Speaker, quietly and privately to see whether we can sort things out.' He did not do that, but instead he persisted, saying, 'I will not apologise. I was within my rights in interjecting.' That sort of behaviour should not be tolerated in this Chamber. If it occurs, it is at the risk of suspension. The honourable member clearly knew what would be the outcome of his behaviour. I reject the motion.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, do these circumstances permit me to make a brief personal explanation following the Premier's remarks?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that all members approach this matter quietly and show some responsibility. Although it is most unusual, as I am told by the table officers, I will hear the honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I seek leave of the Chair and of the House to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: During the Premier's speech on the motion, he alleged that I should have had sufficient experience in this place to realise that I must take a certain course of action prior to my asking the question I asked today. I point out that, only minutes after I was told that the matter should have been raised, I had a discussion with you, Sir, about the delicacy of the subject matter, and the parameters within which I could canvass the subject were clearly outlined. Equally clearly, I adhered to those parameters in asking my question. In this personal explanation, and to refute the Premier's allegations, I place on record what happened.

The House divided on Mr Olsen's motion:

Ayes (20)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen (teller), Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr Allison. No—Mr Payne.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Alexandra to withdraw from the Chamber.

The House divided on the Hon. J.C. Bannon's motion:

Ayes (23)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen (teller), Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr Payne. No—Mr Allison.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 8 November at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to impose a duty upon financial receipts; to provide for the assessment and the collection of the duty; 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 designed to introduce a broadly based duty at a very low rate on the receipts of financial institutions. This will enable the Government to remove certain existing stamp duties which fall unevenly on the community. At the same time we hope to raise additional revenue to help the Government achieve its aim of halting the deterioration in the State's financial position.

The report of the Campbell Committee of Inquiry into the Australian Financial System commented at some length on the lack of neutrality, equity and efficiency of the stamp duty on credit and instalment purchase transactions. At present in South Australia, it is levied at the rate of 1.8 per cent on credit provided at an interest rate in excess of 17 per cent per annum. Over the years, the duty has been the subject of representations from many groups, prominent amongst them the Australian Finance Conference and the Council of Wool Selling Brokers.

One effect of the duty is to disadvantage individuals (frequently lower income earners) who find it necessary to borrow at high rates of interest to buy consumer goods. Another effect is to place small businesses at a disadvantage relative to large companies which have access to overdraft facilities made available by banks at preferential rates. The Government has therefore decided to abolish this duty at a cost of about $7.5 million in a full year. Stamp duty on the issue and discounting of bills of exchange and promissory notes has always acted as an inhibition on the capital market. Now, with the abolition of the corresponding duties in New South Wales and Victoria, the market in South Australia is severely disadvantaged by the continued necessity to pay stamp duty. A number of institutions have made representations about the need to remove the duty if a healthy bill market is to re-emerge in this State.

The Government is persuaded by these arguments and has decided to abolish the duty. In 1982-83 it is estimated that over $1 million was collected but receipts for 1983-84 would almost certainly have been lower. Both New South Wales and Victoria have abolished stamp duty on the transfer of mortgages and mortgage-backed securities, which is said to be an obstacle to the development of a secondary market in these securities. We have, therefore, decided to remove this duty as a useful step in freeing the capital market and improving access to housing finance. It will not result in a significant loss of revenue.

The Government has decided that the new duty should apply at the rate of 0.04 per cent, or 4 cents per $100. This compares with a rate of 0.03 per cent currently operating in New South Wales and Victoria and a rate of 0.05 per cent proposed for Western Australia. We would have liked

to have achieved parity with the larger eastern States but, after discussions with financial insitutions, it became apparent that a rate of 0.04 per cent would be necessary if we were to make the desired changes to stamp duty and provide some of the exemptions which were sought by the institutions. Even at this rate it is anticipated that the revenue to be raised in a full year will be only $22 million, giving a net benefit to the budget of $14 million instead of the $16 million mentioned in the budget speech.

The impact of this measure on the average taxpayer will be minimal. For a family with the following characteristics:

a single income equal to average weekly earnings;
a $30 000 mortgage to repay over 25 years;
a $5 000 personal loan to repay over five years;
a monthly Bankcard account of $300; and
family allowance benefits for three children;

it is estimated that the impact of the duty will be between 15 cents and 20 cents per week, or between $7 and $10 per year.

As members will be aware, the Government has sought the views of a wide range of financial institutions on a draft Bill for the introduction of f.i.d. To the best of our knowledge this discussion process is unprecedented in South Australia with respect to a major revenue measure. The organisations principally concerned have been:

Australian Bankers Association
Australian Merchant Bankers Association
Australian Finance Conference
South Australian Association of Permanent Building Societies
Credit Union Association of South Australia
Council of Wool Selling Brokers
Stock Exchange of Adelaide
Retail Traders Association of South Australia
Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Australian Society of Accountants
Taxation Institute of Australia.

It should not be inferred from this that these bodies are universally in favour of the introduction of f.i.d. Many remain quite strongly opposed. Nevertheless, they have had an opportunity to contribute to the content of the Bill in a manner which has not been available to them in the past.

The process has been most helpful to the Government and its officers and we would like to express our thanks to the industry groups involved for the constructive manner in which they have approached the discussions. Our understanding of the impact of the proposed duty on their operations has been greatly enhanced by their submissions and, while it has not been possible to accede to all their requests, a number of the provisions of the Bill reflect arguments put to us by these bodies.

Fundamental to the concept of the new tax is the definition of a receipt. Extensive provision is made in defining receipts, and it is considered that the approach adopted in this legislation will overcome many of the problems experienced in the other States where financial institutions duty applies. The financial institutions required by the Bill to register and pay duty will do so by way of monthly return and will calculate their liability by reference to their total receipts for the month. Their subsequent banking transactions will not attract duty. By contrast, individuals and institutions not required to register will not pay duty on the receipt of money. However, when they deposit the money with a financial institution, the latter will become liable for duty. In order that non-bank financial institutions, which have a primary liability for duty, do not also attract duty when they bank, they will have the right to apply for exempt accounts with banks. They will be permitted to pay into these exempt accounts all receipts in respect of which they have already paid duty.

Special provisions have been included in the legislation to deal with short-term money market operations. A rate of duty of 0.04 per cent on each receipt is not appropriate for a market where the rate of turnover can be extremely high, and so a different approach has been adopted. Rather than liability for duty being determined by the volume of receipts in a given period ('flow on' concept), it will be determined by the average daily liabilities of the financial institutions concerned (a 'stock' concept). These liabilities are to be calculated on an Australia-wide basis to remove any incentive for short-term dealers to avoid duty by transferring transactions to other States.

For the purposes of calculating their liability for duty, the relevant financial institutions will be required to include one-tenth of their short-term borrowings on a national basis. This is a broad estimate of the share of the national market which might be appropriate to South Australia. A short-term money market transaction is defined in the same way as in New South Wales and Victoria—the minimum size is $50 000 and the period must be less than 185 days. The rate of duty to apply is 0.005 per cent per month—also the same as in New South Wales and Victoria.

These special provisions for financial institutions operation in the short-term money market would have been of little value without corresponding concessions for non-financial institutions participating in the market. Such organisations would not have been liable for duty upon the receipt of money, but would have been affected every time they banked. Accordingly, the Bill permits them to open short-term dealing accounts at banks, such accounts to be exempt from f.i.d. at the rate of 0.04 per cent, but to attract duty on the basis of 0.005 per cent per month of the average daily closing balances.

The Bill provides for a list of South Australian Government departments and instrumentalities to be published in the *Government Gazette*, whereupon they may apply to the Commissioner for authority to open an exempt account. Much of the banking of Government departments is done through the Reserve Bank and would not have attracted duty in any case. It seems sensible, therefore, to widen the exemption to cover all their banking.

The same argument does not apply to Government instrumentalities, and it is the Government's intention to treat most bodies of this nature in the same way as private sector bodies, rather than give them access to exempt accounts. However, there are organisations, such as the South Australian Health Commission, on which it would be pointless to impose duty, and the Government wishes to have the ability to gazette them so that they can apply to the Commissioner for exempt accounts. Departments of the Commonwealth or of another State or Territory may also apply for exempt accounts.

No provision is made for special treatment for local authorities and their banking will, therefore, attract financial institutions duty. Under the Stamp Duties Act in this State it has always been the practice to treat local authorities in the same way as other taxpayers and that practice has been continued in this Bill. Members will note the manner in which concessions will be granted to charitable institutions. Under the original proposals for the introduction of f.i.d. in the Eastern States, charities were to attract duty in the same way as other bodies. However, in the course of the passage of the legislation through the various Houses of Parliament, concessions were made. There was very little time to consider the best way of providing these concessions and, as a result, different systems have evolved in the two States.

In New South Wales the decision on whether or not to provide an exempt account rests largely with the banks themselves. This is unsatisfactory both because it imposes

a responsibility on banks, which is more appropriately exercised by Government, and because it encourages 'fringe' charities to shop around amongst banks for one which will provide an exempt account. In Victoria applications for exempt accounts are made to the Comptroller of Stamps. While this is a more appropriate system of granting exemptions it has presented the Comptroller with a very considerable administrative task in trying to maintain an up-to-date record of all the accounts (probably in excess of 100 000) of Victorian charities.

The South Australian Government has endeavoured to strike a balance between providing an appropriate benefit to charities and ensuring that scarce public resources are not consumed in needless administrative tasks. The banking of charities will, therefore, attract duty in the first instance but, after each 12 months, these bodies will be able to apply to the Commissioner for a refund of duty paid in excess of $20 per account. By this approach we expect to be able to achieve the twin aims of relieving charities of any real burden of duty and greatly simplifying the administrative task of the Commissioner. There is a category of institution which falls part way between a financial institution and a non-financial institution, and for which the provision of credit is only part of its overall operation. The best example of this type of institution is a large retail store.

In both New South Wales and Victoria these institutions are required to register. However, it is significant that in Victoria they have, without exception, elected to take advantage of a provision of the legislation in that State which permits them to choose to operate through a non-exempt account at a bank rather than to pay duty directly. Since the provisions governing the operations of such credit providers are quite complex and involve the institutions in considerable administrative and accounting work, the Government has decided not to require them to register. Instead, duty will be paid by the banks in respect of receipts from these institutions. This seems to us to be a desirable step in simplifying the legislation and is consistent with the *de facto* position in Victoria. It is only fair to warn, however, that, should signs emerge that credit providers are taking advantage of their non-registered status to expand their financial activities in a way which places them in unfair competition with registered financial institutions, the Government stands ready to amend the Act to bring them within its scope.

As with the New South Wales and Victorian legislation, the Bill contains a threshold of $5 million. Financial institutions with annual receipts of less than this figure are not required to register but at the same time are not entitled to exempt accounts so that their banking attracts duty. The purpose of this threshold is to simplify the administrative task of the State taxation office and relieve small institutions of the overhead burden associated with collecting duty and submitting returns.

The legislation in the Eastern States is framed in such a way as to require depositors to register and pay duty if they deal with a non-registered financial institution. As far as can be ascertained the only institutions which might be able to escape the obligation to register are those established under Commonwealth legislation. It is the Government's wish that such institutions have no competitive advantage over their State counterparts and the private sector banks, and so provision has been included in the legislation to enable them to register and pay duty. By taking advantage of this opportunity they will relieve their customers of the burden of complying with the legislation.

We are aware of the difficulties which financial institutions will face in complying with the legislation from 1 December 1983, particularly in view of the comparatively late announcement of the details of the Bill. Transitional provisions have, therefore, been included to enable duty to be paid on an estimated basis for the first three months. In recognition of the special problems faced by South Australian institutions provision has been made for an extension of this transitional period in exceptional circumstances.

While the Government has engaged in an unprecedented round of discussions with interested parties over these measures, there has not been time to invite comment on the clauses included in the Bill to deal with some of the issues raised in those discussions. We remain, therefore, prepared to make adjustments of a technical nature to these clauses if it can be demonstrated that they can be improved. However, it is not our intention to canvass further the issues upon which decisions have been taken in principle. 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 the short title. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure on 1 December 1983. Clause 3 is the interpretation provision. Included in this section is the definition of financial institution which will encompass such institutions as banks, building societies, credit unions, merchant banks, pastoral finance houses, dealers on the official short-term money market, some types of corporate lenders, and finance companies. Clause 4 provides that the Act binds the Crown.

Clause 5 prescribes the receipts to which the Act applies, being a receipt of money in the State or a receipt in relation to which the South Australian law is the proper law. Proposed subsection (2) deems consideration other than money in settlement of a debt or other consideration to be a receipt. Proposed subsection (3) deems the crediting of an account to be a receipt, and subsections (4) and (5) expand on the concept of account crediting. Subsection (6) relates to the situation where a person's account is debited but no corresponding credit occurs in an account. Subsection (7) relates to the recommitment of term deposits. Subsection (8) prescribes that simple book-keeping entries are not dutiable. Subsection (9) relates to exchanging cash for a cheque.

Clause 6 prescribes certain receipts to which the Act does not apply. Clause 7 relates to non-dutiable receipts. Included in this provision are receipts to the credit of an exempt account; receipts constituting short-term dealings and included in short-term dealing returns; receipts resulting from clearing arrangements between banks, building societies, and credit unions; foreign exchange settlements; receipts relating to security transactions that have been subject to stamp duty under the Stamp Duties Act; and receipts to satisfy a financial institution's engagement on a bill of sale on behalf of a customer. Subsection (3) ensures that, although money may be credited to an exempt account, it may be a dutiable receipt by the person in whose name the account is kept. Provision is also made to prevent double duty when there is both a physical receipt of money and the crediting of an account in the State. Receipts in prescribed agency situations will also be non-dutiable.

Clause 8 prescribes when amounts are received in the course of short-term dealings. The key concepts are that the dealing must relate to a term not exceeding 185 days, and must be by way of amounts exceeding $50 000. The formulae for average daily liability are also explained. Clause 9 empowers the Commissioner to declare dealers in the unofficial short-term money market to be dealers for the purposes of the Act. Clause 10 assigns the administration of the Act to the Commissioner. Clause 11 is a delegation provision. Clause 12 provides for secrecy. Clauses 13 to 20 provide

for the grouping of financial institutions. The provisions have precedents in other legislation.

Clause 21 provides for the registration of certain financial institutions. A financial institution must register if it, or a group of which it is a member, has dutiable receipts for the preceding 12 months exceeding $5 000 000, or for the preceding month exceeding $416 666. Other financial institutions may also apply for registration. Registration may be cancelled if a financial institution's receipts fall below the prescribed minimum.

Clause 22 requires registered financial institutions to file monthly returns. Clause 23 provides a means by which groups can nominate a member to file group returns. Clause 24 allows the Commissioner to certify that some financial institutions may file annual returns in lieu of monthly returns. Clause 25 provides that the Commissioner may require further or fuller returns.

Clause 26 provides for the registration of short-term money market operators, who must either be dealers or persons who carry on the business of dealing in the short-term money market. Clause 27 requires registered operators to file monthly returns. Clause 28 relates to further or fuller returns. Clause 29 prescribes the rate of duty. Duty is levied on dutiable receipts and is not payable by financial institutions that are unregistered and not required to be registered. Clause 30 prescribes the rate of duty for short-term dealings.

Clause 31 provides for applications for special exempt accounts. Applicants may include registered financial institutions, companies providing special services to credit unions and building societies, the Law Society of South Australia, the Stock Exchange, and prescribed persons. Clause 32 allows registered short-term money market operators to apply for exempt accounts. Limits are imposed in relation to the nature of the amounts that may be credited to the accounts.

Clause 33 relates to sweeping accounts. It is common banking practice for certain customers to arrange with their banks to consolidate automatically, on a regular basis, amounts standing to the credit of several accounts. Such customers may apply to have their consolidated account certified as an exempt account. Clause 34 allows application to be made for the certification of certain trust accounts to be exempt accounts. Clause 35 relates to Government department accounts. Clause 36 directs financial institutions that hold exempt accounts that lose their status as such to cancel the designation of the accounts as exempt accounts. Clause 37 provides for the filing of annual returns for exempt accounts, Clause 38 provides that financial institutions duty that is payable for a month shall be paid within the period that the return for that month must be lodged. Clause 39 empowers the Commissioner to grant extensions.

Clause 40 allows the Commissioner to fix a special period for the payment of financial institutions duty if the institution is about to leave the State. Clause 41 imposes additional duty for late payment. Clause 42 allows the Commissioner to refund overpayments. Clause 43 relates to the Commissioner's assessment of financial institutions duty. Penal duty will be payable if a financial institution fails to lodge a proper return. Clause 44 deems payable financial institutions duty to be a debt to the Crown. Clause 45 allows for the substituted service. of process on defendants. Clause 46 relates to liquidators of financial institutions. Notice of appointment must be given within 14 days of appointment. Assets cannot be relinquished before such notice is given.

Clause 47 requires that agents of financial institutions that are winding-up their business in the State must give notice to the Commissioner and set aside sufficient assets to pay duty owing under this Act. Clause 48 relates to duty outstanding after death. Clause 49 provides that the Commissioner may recover unpaid duty from executors or administrators. Clause 50 provides that a person who pays duty on behalf of another can recover it as a debt. Clause 51 allows for the apportionment of duty between persons jointly liable. Clause 52 allows the Commissioner to collect amounts owing by way of unpaid duty from persons who owe money to the relevant financial institution.

Clause 53 allows a person who is dissatisfied with an assessment to object to the Treasurer or appeal to the Supreme Court. A person who is dissatisfied with a decision of the Treasurer may also appeal to the Supreme Court. Clause 54 provides tht a liability to pay duty is not suspended by virtue of an objection or appeal. Clause 55 makes it an offence to neglect to furnish any return or information relating to financial institutions duty to the Commissioner, or to pay improper amounts to exempt accounts. Clause 56 provides for continuing offences in relation to defaults after conviction under this Act. Clause 57 makes it an offence to wilfully attempt to evade duty.

Clause 58 provides that proceedings for offences must be commenced within three years, are summary offences, and may only be commenced with the approval of the Commissioner.

Clause 59 provides that payment on account of penalties does not relieve any obligation to pay duty. Clause 60 makes it an offence to hinder or obstruct any person acting in the administration of this Act. Clause 61 extends liability for offences by bodies corporate to any officer who is knowingly a party to the offence. Clause 62 relates to the joint liability of partners. Clause 63 allows financial institutions that are not required to register under this Act to give an undertaking to pay duty as if they were registered, and be deemed to be so registered. Such an arrangement can stand until the undertaking is withdrawn or no longer acceptable.

Clause 64 allows registered financial institutions to apply to pay receipts into non-exempt accounts. When an arrangement of this nature is entered into, the institution may not make payments to its exempt account, but is deemed to have paid duty on its receipts. It is envisaged that this facility will be used by those financial institutions that although being registered, would prefer to act as if unregistered. Clause 65 provides for the appointment of public officers for companies. Clause 66 relates to agents and trustees of registered persons. It is noted that an agent may be nominated by the Commissioner (by virtue of section 3). Clause 67 relates to persons who have the control of money belonging to a financial institution resident out of South Australia. Such a person may pay any outstanding duty on behalf of the financial institution.

Clause 68 relates to the proper keeping of books and records relating to financial institutions duty. A three-year period is prescribed. Clause 69 vests various powers of inquiry in the Commissioner. Clause 70 empowers the Commissioner to gain access to books and take copies. Clause 71 empowers the Commissioner to seek and execute a warrant to enter premises. Clause 72 relates to the production of evidence in proceedings. Clause 73 prescribes the procedure for service of certificates notices, etc., by the Commissioner. Clause 74 facilitates service on the Commissioner. Clause 75 allows the Commissioner to pay outstanding amounts from consolidated revenue.

Clause 76 provides that nothing in the Act prevents the passing on of duty by a registered person to those persons for whom they keep accounts or carry out short-term dealings. Clause 77 allows the Commissioner to provide rebates to charitable organisations for duty where duty paid in relation to an account exceeds $20. The section also applies to term deposits, except those constituting short-term dealings. Clause 78 allows for the collection of duty from persons who deposit with unregistered financial institutions that are liable to be registered. Such persons must file monthly returns and pay duty in respect of its deposits at the rate

that duty would be payable by the financial institution in respect of its receipts.

Clause 79 is the regulation-making power. Included is power to control procedures for the passing on of duty. Clause 80 provides that the schedule is incorporated as part of the Act. The Schedule provides transitional provisions allowing for the filing of estimated returns and facilitating the establishment of interim exempt accounts.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES 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 Stamp Duties Act, 1983. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As foreshadowed in the second reading speech on the Financial Institutions Duty Bill, the Government is proposing to amend the Stamp Duties Act to provide relief from certain stamp duties. It has been decided also to follow the precedent set in Victoria by proposing a penalty rate of cheque duty for financial institutions which may contrive in some way to avoid their obligations under the Financial Institutions Duty Act.

Stamp duty on credit and instalment purchase transactions is currently levied at the rate of 1.8 per cent on credit provided at an interest rate in excess of 17 per cent per annum. The original intent of the legislation may have been to discourage the charging of excessive interest rates, but it has worked in practice to impose an additional burden on low-income earners and small business obliged to borrow at high rates. Governments of both persuasions have been trying for some years to find a satisfactory substitute for this duty, and have been encouraged in their search by the widespread dissatisfaction which it has aroused. With the proposed introduction of financial institutions duty, we are now in a position to introduce a much needed reform and to abolish this form of duty.

It should be noted that the Government is not removing duty on rental businesses. This possibility was examined but would have involved a further significant loss of revenue and cannot be accommodated within the framework of the 1983-84 Budget. Similar duties remain in force in the other States that have introduced financial institutions duties. When financial institutions duty was introduced in New South Wales and Victoria, stamp duty on the issue and discounting of bills of exchange and promissory notes was removed. As a result, there is now a very strong incentive for borrowers approaching the market to avoid South Australia and to attempt to raise funds in the two major Eastern States. The Government is keen to see an active market in these securities maintained in Adelaide, and proposes to abolish the relevant stamp duties so that the Adelaide market may once again become competitive.

We are advised that the secondary market in mortgages and mortgage-backed securities is relatively undeveloped in Australia, but that there may be advantages from the point of view of a broader capital market and improved access to housing finance if such a market could be fostered. A major disincentive to the development of the market is the fact that transfers of mortgages would attract stamp duty at the rate of duty applicable to a conveyance. The Government, therefore, proposes to follow the lead of New South Wales and Victoria and abolish this form of stamp duty.

Stamp duty on cheques is payable at the rate of 10 cents. As an additional incentive for financial institutions to fulfil their obligations under the Financial Institutions Duty Act, the Government proposes to raise to 25 cents the rate of duty on cheques drawn on financial institutions which do not register under that Act. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is the short title. Clause 2 provides that the measure shall come into operation on 1 December 1983. Clause 3 inserts a new section 31c in the principal Act, providing that the provisions of the Act dealing with credit business shall not apply to any credit transactions performed from 1 December 1983. Clause 4 amends section 31d so that persons carrying on credit business after the commencement of the measure will not have to register. Clause 5 amends section 31e to facilitate the cancellation of the registration of persons who cease to be required to be registered. Clause 6 is a consequential amendment to section 31f.

Clause 7 inserts a new section 31ma in the provisions of the Act dealing with instalment purchase agreements. The proposed new section provides that the Act will not apply to instalment purchase agreements entered into on or after 1 December 1983. Clause 8 amends section 31n to the effect that duty will only be payable in respect of instalment purchase agreements entered into before 1 December 1983. Clause 9 inserts a new section 46a, which provides that duty shall not be chargeable in respect of bills of exchange or promissory notes issued from 1 December 1983, but will remain for cheques. Clause 10 provides for various amendments to the second schedule of the principal Act. The effect of one amendment is that duty for cheques issued by a person other than a registered financial institution, the Reserve Bank, or an interstate bank will be 0.25. Another amendment exempts the conveyance or transfer of mortgages from 1 December 1983, from duty chargeable in respect of conveyance on sale transactions.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1983. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal object of this Bill is to tighten the controls over the misuse of vehicles that are registered at concession rates. Registration of a motor vehicle at a fee less than the full normal fee, or without fee, is granted to a wide range of owners who meet specified criteria. The use of such a vehicle is restricted and certain conditions governing its use must be observed during the period of registration. The Act provides that it is an offence if the vehicle is used contrary to the terms of the statement or undertaking which was made in connection with the application for concession registration. Some time ago, however, vehicles registered solely for interstate trade at a fee of $5 were inadvertently excluded from this provision and owners of such vehicles have, in increasing numbers, been unfairly using their vehicles within the State in direct competition with those paying full registration fees. This Bill sets out to bring vehicles registered solely for interstate trade back within the ambit of the penalty section.

The Bill also provides that a court may, upon conviction, order that any registration fees underpaid, or stamp duty evaded, by registering at a concession rate are paid to the Registrar. Furthermore, so that an owner who has, pursuant to a court order, paid the balance of the registration fee cannot then turn around and cancel the registration and obtain a full refund of the fees paid, the Bill provides that amounts paid under a court order are not refundable. The opportunity has also been taken at this time to increase the penalty, particularly in relation to interstate hauliers, so as to reflect the seriousness of the offence involved.

A considerable amount of revenue is being lost through the actions of those vehicle owners who do not pay the correct registration fees according to the actual use of their vehicles and, accordingly, I believe it is necessary to provide appropriate sanctions that will act as a deterrent to those who may breach the conditions under which concessional registration was granted. 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 makes it clear that a vehicle registered under section 33 at a concession rate on the basis that the vehicle will only be used for the purposes of interstate trade falls within the ambit of this section. It was previously thought that such a vehicle fell within the meaning of the expression 'registered at a reduced registration fee' as a fee of only $5 is payable in those circumstances. However, that fee is in fact the full prescribed registration fee for interstate trade vehicles and is therefore technically not a 'reduced' fee as in other cases. The penalty for an offence of using a vehicle contrary to the statements made or undertakings given at the time of being granted a concession registration is increased from $200 to $2 000 in respect of interstate trade vehicles, and to $500 in all other cases.

New subsections (3), (4) and (5) provide the courts with a power to order (in addition to any fine) that a person convicted of misusing a vehicle registered at concession rates must pay to the Registrar the balance of the registration fees and stamp duty that would otherwise have been payable in respect of the period of registration during which the offence was committed. Such fees are not refundable upon subsequent cancellation of registration.

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

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ENFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

TERTIARY EDUCATION AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 October. Page 1231.)

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): The Opposition supports the Bill, but I have a few reservations that I will take up with the Minister in Committee. In November 1981, at the request of the then Budget Review Committee, my colleague the Hon. Harold Allison (then Minister of Education) established a steering committee to review the operations of the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia. The committee, which consisted of Dr D.C. Corbett, Mr Barry Grear, Professor E.W. Mills, and Mr Kevin Gilding (who was then and is now the Chairman of the Tertiary Education Authority) reported on 30 March 1982. The Bill before the House represents the required legislative amendments that have been determined following that inquiry. Members should realise that there is much discussion within the education community as to the future role of TEASA. However, the Committee of Review recommended that the Authority should continue, albeit with a large reduction in staff and a changed role, particularly in the field of accreditation.

The Bill seeks to (a) increase the number of members of the Authority to not less than seven or more than nine; (b) to repeal the two provisions of the parent Act relating to the special Standing Committee on Accreditation; (c) to improve the efficiency of the Authority's reporting to Parliament; and (d) to change the name (and I imagine that this is somewhat overdue) of the Department of Further Education to the Department of Technical and Further Education. I have some problems in agreeing that there should be an increase in the size of the Authority, and I will canvass that matter in a moment. The present membership of the Authority is a full-time Chairman, a Deputy Chairman, and three part-time members. The new proposals would result in an Authority consisting of a full-time Chairman, a Deputy Chairman, and up to seven part-time members. However, the report of the Committee of Review, to which I referred earlier, is quite strong in recommending this alteration. The reason for that is that the Authority tends to lack expertise on its board for the different sections of tertiary education.

At least, that is what the Committee of Review found. It is proposed that members of the new board will be appointed for their expertise in an area, and that they will not be members of current boards or staff, although that provision is not included in this amending Bill. Members of the House will be interested to know that, in regard to other States, similar board membership, or co-ordinating board membership, including part-time members is: Queensland, 13; Victoria, 8; Tasmania, 5; Western Australia, 13; and New South Wales, 14. Therefore, the increase of the present membership to nine still compares reasonably favourably with other States.

At this stage I think it is important that I read to the House an extract from the report of the Committee of Review which reported in March 1982. I refer first to an extract from page 21 of the report, which deals with an increase in the size of the Authority, which is as follows:

> 4.3.2 The Committee considers that the Authority would benefit from additional expertise and capacity to relate to post-secondary institutions. An enlarged membership could be expected to provide chairpersons for subcommittees and working parties established to investigate particular issues. The Committee therefore recommends that the membership of the Authority be enlarged to comprise: Chairman (full-time); Deputy Chairman (full-time—until 1984)—

perhaps the Minister might like to comment on that either during the Committee stage or in his speech when closing the debate—

> seven persons appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister, of whom three should be employees in or persons closely associated with post-secondary education.
>
> 4.3.3 The Committee suggests that the South Australian Group of Chief Executive Officers of Tertiary Institutions (SAGE)—

no doubt, that is because of inherent wisdom of that august body—

should be consulted for suggestions as to persons associated with tertiary education who might be considered by the Minister for membership of the enlarged Authority.

That is really one of the main recommendations of the Committee of Review on which this legislation is based. As I pointed out earlier, there is no recognition in this legislation that specifies that new appointees to the Authority should have any particular expertise in the field of tertiary education, and I ask the Minister that when he replies he gives us an assurance about that matter. I said earlier that I was not particularly happy about the increase in membership of a statutory authority, although I accept that in this case it is necessary. However, I am generally opposed to seeking increases in the membership of a statutory authority, particularly as it occurs in regard to TEASA, the role of which has been reduced over the past few months, and which indeed will be further reduced in future.

The Minister and I discussed this matter in the Estimates Committees, and I want to put on record now that I am a supporter of TEASA and I believe that it should continue. I do not agree with one of the options canvassed in the Committee of Review report that the work of TEASA should be handled by the office of the Minister. However, I have said that the work of TEASA should be kept under review by the Minister; that there is an important role for it to play as a co-ordinating authority; and that we should ensure that it does carry out that role. If the appointment of the new board members will help it play that role, then the Opposition supports that proposition.

The second important amendment contained in this legislation is that concerning the calling for the dissolution of the Accreditation Standing Committee of the Tertiary Education Authority. I point out that TEASA is not responsible for the accreditation of courses conducted within the universities, and members of the House should be aware of that. In regard to the concept of accreditation in advanced education courses, advanced education courses arose from the concern of State and Commonwealth Ministers of Education in 1971-72 that there was and would continue to be a wide range of academic standards among the then newly established or newly independent Colleges of Advanced Education unless there was some form of regulation.

It was for that reason that the Australian Council of Awards in Advanced Education (commonly known as A.C.A.A.E.) and also the State co-ordinating boards were established. That is the history of the formation of the co-ordinating authority itself and the Australian Council. Since that time there has been an evolution in the method of accreditation, and there is little doubt that, in the decade since the inception of the council, the process of systematic course and assessment required for the purpose of accreditation has contributed significantly to the establishment and maintenance of high and uniform academic standards throughout the advanced education sector.

It has also contributed to the gradual development of more vigorous course evaluation procedures within the institutions themselves and to the establishment of a substantial and increasing body of expertise among the staff of the institutions with respect to course evaluation procedures. Consequently, it seems appropriate, as the Committee of Review has recommended, that institutions take a greater responsibility for course assessment. I think it would help the House to understand this in greater detail if I quote again from the report of the committee of review on the question of accreditation. Paragraph 2.5.3 on page 9 of the Committee of Review report states:

The Committee sees some value in external assessment conducted for accreditation purposes, but doubts whether continuation of this method of assessment is warranted in cost/benefit terms. It notes that TEASA has initiated action for basing accreditation to a greater extent in assessment carried out within the institutions themselves. Greater reliance in internal processes is possible with the growing maturity of advanced education institutions and the availability of staff and procedures within the providers of TAFE programmes for purposes of course development and review. Expensive duplication involving both internal and external assessment processes can no longer be justified—

that is an important sentence—

Despite the apparent reluctance of the Australian Education Council and ACAAE to move in this direction, the Committee believes the South Australian situation permits a prompt devolution of assessment processes. One caveat, however, is that it would seem appropriate for the new SACAE to be subject to the present assessment procedures for a short interim period while the new college establishes its course development and assessment procedures.

This report was laid before the Minister in March 1983, and it may well be that that interim period has passed and the Minister might like to comment on that when he replies. In brief, this Bill is based on that report of the Committee of Review, and as far as I can ascertain at this stage this legislation follows closely the recommendations of the Committee of Review, and the Opposition will support the measure.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I thank the member for Torrens for his comments and for the support he has indicated for the Bill. It is an outcome of the review of the Tertiary Education Authority that was completed in March 1983 that this legislation refers to. Several things prevented that review taking place earlier, not the least of which was the State election in the intervening period and that has brought us to this point now.

The honourable member indicates that he is somewhat concerned about the increase in membership, and whether they would be people who have expertise in the tertiary education arena. I am happy to give the guarantee that that is certainly the direction we will be taking when we make those appointments. It was really intended in the second to last paragraph of the second reading explanation that the composition of the authority would contain that kind of guarantee, and I am happy to repeat it. The feedback I have had from the tertiary education sector is that it has requested similar guarantees, and that it supports the legislation. There is not much controversy in this area because people seem to believe that it is the appropriate direction in which to move.

The matter of accreditation was canvassed in the Estimates Committees. It has been considered that, with the setting down of adequate guidelines, accreditation can be done at the institutional level, and that the role of TEASA really is to have an overview of this whole process. It can more efficiently achieve educational objectives and standardisation of educational objectives by that kind of overview rather than by involvement in assessment procedures in each individual institution.

This legislation will change the definition of the Department of Further Education to Department of Technical and Further Education. I foreshadow that there is subsequent legislation more significant in terms of TAFE, which will change the name of the principal Act. That is coming, because it will not only deal with TAFE but also it will deal with the composition of the TAFE Council. With those comments, I thank the House for its support, and look forward to the Bill's early passage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Constitution of the Authority.'

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: This clause increases the membership from not less than seven members to not more than nine members. Will the Minister give an undertaking that he will consult the SAGE group before he makes appointments to this board, because it was one of the recommendations of the Committee of Review that the Minister should consult this group?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am happy to indicate that I will have consultations with the SAGE group and the Chief executive of the tertiary institutions. Obviously, the final decision rests with the Government in Executive Council, but I think that requires appropriate consultations taking place beforehand.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: This increases the size of the authority by four and not three. The report of the Committee of Review recommended three additional members be appointed for their expertise in various areas of tertiary education. Does the Minister intend to make four additional appointments all from tertiary education, or does he intend to bring in an outsider with other expertise?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: One of the things I have to say is that whenever one seeks to have people appointed as members of committees, one comes across people with degrees of expertise in different areas. There may well be people in one identifiable sense who do not have connections with the tertiary education sector in the sense of having been either a member of a council or a chief executive officer of an institute or whatever, and yet his role as an educator or as a person whose knowledge of education generally is so outstanding that naturally there is a great deal of relevance. While we certainly undertake to appoint people with tertiary expertise, there may well be people of excellence in education generally who, by common accord, could be viewed to have many options and much information that they could share about tertiary education. We reserve the right to appoint people of such excellence.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Nevertheless, I believe it is the understanding of all tertiary institutions that there will be expertise in their own fields whether it be as a past board member of a college or a past member of a board of an institution such as Roseworthy or distinguished alumni of universities or that sort of thing. I believe that they understand that is what will happen.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Discussions will be held with SAGE about the names to be put forward and, from my experience with the organisation, I believe that it will consider any suggestions made if we want to suggest a name not originally thought of.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Repeal of sections 17 and 18.'

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: This clause deals with the deletion of the Accreditation Standing Committee of the Tertiary Education Authority. It will still be necessary for the Authority to overview the assessment procedures of colleges and tertiary institutions. Obviously, the Authority will retain the right in respect of accreditation and recommendations to the Australian council for awards in advanced education. What strictures will the Authority place on the various institutions to ensure that assessment procedures are carried out correctly? Will the procedures be the same as those in force now?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Tertiary Education Authority is an authority in its own right. This clause simply removes the body within that Authority that has had those functions in respect of tertiary institutions. Once that happens all those powers will devolve on the Authority itself. TEASA still retains the accreditation power and that becomes the critical element of control over the courses offered by the institutions. This provision will not result in extra work being placed on the Authority because one important aspect of the work has dissolved to the institutions.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: It has been put to me that at the very least there should be a requirement for an on-going internal audit of the progress of internal and external assessment within the institutions, with regular reports to the institutions council and the Authority itself. It has also been put to me that there should be a positive requirement for the Authority to conduct examinations of the procedures relating to various course assessments so that it may report in each case the justification of accreditation to the Australian council regarding awards for advanced education, because the Australian council must always have confidence in South Australian course standards.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: One of the primary phases of the whole process of course accreditation has been handed back to the individual institutions. The successive phases leading to course accreditation still remain within the power of the Authority and subsequently within the Australian council. The Tertiary Education Authority now becomes the group responsible. This is not a diminution of the ultimate power: it is merely saying that at the early stage the tertiary institutions have the capacity and the expertise and can be trusted to handle this responsibility within their own institutions, given the fact that there is still a final point through which they must go.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: There is an ongoing role for TEASA to see that assessment procedures are correctly carried out. In saying that, I am not reflecting on the institutions. If there is to be a co-ordinating body, it has a job to do and should do it. Later, I will see what checks and balances there are in the system. As I understand it, the Authority intends to delegate assessment not only in respect of undergraduate courses but in respect of postgraduate diploma courses within institutions. I believe that they are called PG1 courses. However, the Authority is to retain entire assessment and accreditation of masters' degrees, known as PG2 courses. Will the Minister clarify that situation?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will get more information from the honourable member on the *de facto* procedures to replace the assessment procedures. I believe that the undergraduate courses and the PG1 courses are such that, in terms of coverage, the number of people involved, and therefore the number in an institution likely to have expertise in that area, would be great enough for the institutions to have internal procedures. Regarding PG2 courses, we are often dealing with a small number of people in an institution who have a direct knowledge of that kind of course construction. Therefore, the Authority still reserves the right to be involved at that stage. If my statement is not correct, I will advise the honourable member. Very few people undertake the higher degrees, therefore less expertise is available to frame such courses. Where we are not confident in respect of the tertiary institution, we retain the power in the Authority.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—'Report of Authority.'

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: As I understand it, the Authority must report on its operations by 30 June of the following year. In the past, because of the overlapping of the academic year and the financial year, the Authority has had to report in the second half of the financial year on the accounts for the previous financial year and the accounts for the first six months of the ensuing financial year, and this is causing some difficulty. Under this amendment could the Authority report to the House sooner than 30 June of the following year?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We have two methods of accounting for the Authority: one is based on the calendar

year and the other on the financial year. This has been brought about partly because of the way the Commonwealth disburses funds, and this affects other areas of education. There is difficulty in comparing what is happening in the various financial periods. Now we have asked the Authority to report on one basis rather than on the two bases, given the fact that questions can be asked about where they differ.

It is quite legitimate that they should differ because different things have happened in State or Federal Government policies in the intervening period. What the member is asking for I think is an understanding of the term 'previous financial year'. If the member is querying that that may be 12 months out of date, it is my understanding that that is not the case, as with other reports, such as the Auditor-General's Report, where it would be the most recent financial year in which the report can be given. The previous financial year would mean the one which has finished rather than the one before the one just finished.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: What I am trying to achieve, and I hope this amendment helps, is to get the Authority to report as soon as possible after 30 June to this Parliament, rather than wait until approaching the following 30 June, as I understand it has had to happen under the present legislation. That may be difficult because of the overlap of the calendar and financial years, but I would like to see that because I believe all statutory authorities should report to Parliament as soon as possible after the end of the financial year.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I support that. I know that we have had some members in the House, particularly the member for Hanson, who has often asked questions about long delays in reports of statutory authorities, including tertiary institutions. It is difficult to compare data when one is one or two financial years behind, in some cases. Any move should be in the direction of speeding up the provision to the House. The Authority, or any other institution, is not wishing to delay access to information but has been constrained by other difficulties. This we believe will help overcome one of those difficulties.

Clause passed.

Clause 8 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I would like to discuss two issues in the grievance debate this afternoon. The first is in respect of an issue which concerns the whole of South Australia, but which particularly concerns my electorate and the southern area of Adelaide. I refer to the problem of youth accommodation, in particular the problem which exists for young people between the ages of about 14 and 20 years. In my area the youth accommodation service, which is funded through the Noarlunga Family Services Board, is responsible for providing two short-term houses to accommodate the youths of the area who are homeless. Since becoming the member for Mawson I have had the great privilege of working with the co-ordinator of this service, Ruth Pickler, who has, in my view, done a magnificent job in trying to provide for the needs of youth who are looking for accommodation within the southern community. I would like to discuss some of the statistics which have applied in my area in the 2½-year period from 1 May 1981 to 1 August 1983.

In that time 100 youths have been accommodated in those two short-term houses. I think it is important to look at the sort of background and statistical information about this group of 100 youths. First, the age range for those young people was between under 15 and over 18 years, with the largest proportion being in the 16 to 17-year age group. Young people were referred from a wide range of community services, but the principal referrals came from the Department for Community Welfare. In respect to the home situation, 30 per cent of the youths came from families where they had both natural parents; 33 per cent came from families where there was one parent and a step-parent or a *de facto* parent. In respect to the work situation, of the 100 youths that we are looking at, a total of 76 (and that means 76 per cent) was unemployed. That is a statistic at which we must look more closely.

There were 66 males and 34 females. When we look at what happened to their situation upon leaving those two short-term houses, we find that 40 of the youths (that is 40 per cent) returned home or returned to a relative, 26 per cent went into their own flat or into a flat that they shared with another person, and 23 per cent went into other accommodation; the remaining 11 per cent went into unknown accommodation. Those statistics may not mean anything on the surface, but when we look a little deeper at where some of the people had come from into the shelter, where they had slept or been the night before coming to the youth accommodation, it tells a very different story.

On interviewing some of the young people, the co-ordinator found (and I quote from the answers that the young people gave) that the previous night they had slept under a gum tree, they had walked the streets, they had slept in unlocked cars, on railway seats, or in clothes bins. They had spent the night at Tilt, in a shed, under a bridge, or squatting in premises that did not have any tenants. I think that is an amazing indictment upon our community or society that young people have been forced to sleep or to spend the night in such circumstances.

Having said that, I would like to say that the youth accommodation service within the southern area is doing a magnificent job to attempt to provide for those people. In the period from 1 August 1982 to 31 July 1983, the youth accommodation service received 174 referrals in the age group 14 to 24 years. Of those 174, in this 12-month period only 65 were able to be housed in medium or short-term housing accommodation. Of those, 45 were put into short-term accommodation and 20 into long term. Of the remaining number, 51 per cent (or 37 per cent of the total number of referrals in that period) were able to be accommodated. Of the remaining youths who were not able to be accommodated 51 were assessed to be unsuitable, due to the fact that they had a drug or alcohol problem or suffered from severe aggression or depression, and for that reason were unable to be accommodated in this service.

The remaining 58 youths were turned away due to a lack of beds and these youths were in fact eligible. It would seem to me that this is a very serious problem. There is no agency. There is no one to pick up the problems of youth who have a drug problem or who are in some way emotionally disturbed. These are the young people who are at greatest risk, both to themselves and to the community. The Department for Community Welfare must begin to plan right at this moment to provide the right kind of support and accommodation for those people who at present cannot be catered for.

I would also like to refer to the latest statistics I have been given. If one looks at the period from the beginning of 1982 until the end of September 1982, 84 youths were referred to the accommodation service. If one looks at the statistics for this year until the end of September—and we have quite a few months, in fact three, until the end of the year—159 young people were referred to the youth accom-

modation service: that alone represents an increase of 89 per cent. So, instead of the problem getting better it is getting much worse.

We cannot look at the problem of youth accommodation in isolation. It is very simple for people to say they should be at home with their parents; why are they seeking accommodation outside of their family home? In my area, the level of unemployment among the mature-aged members of the community—that is, the parents of these young people—is extremely high, and it is increasing. We must look at this problem in terms of the total effect that unemployment has on the fabric of our society. I believe that unemployment is tearing the fabric of our society apart, and the problem of youth accommodation is yet another symptom of the whole problem of unemployment. In support of that, I would refer to the statistics over the 2¼ years on which my original statistics were based, and in that time 76 per cent of young people accommodated by the youth accommodation service at Noarlunga were unemployed. This is an intolerable situation. It is increasing and we, as a Parliament and indeed as a community, must look to support the agencies which are providing much needed accommodation for our young people.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I wish to pick up the honourable member's point in relation to the housing of young people—those who find themselves homeless at the moment, and those who will find themselves homeless in the future. I agree that much is to be done in this field, not only with the youth but with the families. It is unfortunate that young people find themselves in this category, and it is wellknown that quite often they are the unemployed. Quite often, part of their unemployment problem is their family background—sometimes their own fault, sometimes the parents' fault, and sometimes a combination. They have developed an attitude of a form of rebellion and, as a result, have some difficulty in retaining a job even when it is available.

I agree that anything that causes such a situation has to be of concern to the total community; the more unemployment there is, the more likelihood there is that that will occur. We have to be careful not to take on the attitude that every time a youth leaves home the parents are said to be at fault; in other words, that truth is the province of youth and lying is only in the province of parents. I have had the experience of two youths approach me and ask me, 'How do I go about getting away from home?'. They have asked what they have to tell officers in Government departments to be able to prove that they should be provided with accommodation or subsidised for rent if they left home. In other words, they are deliberately setting out to plan how they can 'stick it up mum and dad', to use an Australian term, to get away from home and depend on society for no reason other than to have freedom at the expense of the rest of society. I am not putting all young people in that category, and that is as much as I want to say about it. There are some sad situations of families having failed and there are all sorts of pressures in homes that a young person, male or female, cannot be expected to tolerate. But do not let us be misled that that is the case in all circumstances.

One matter I wish to refer to concerns a property that crosses the borders of three districts: my district, that of the member for Brighton; and that of the member for Mawson's district. I am pleased that they are in the House at the moment, because I think it is a proper time to raise it. It is not a point of grievance with the Government in the form of complaint, because the problem has been existent or imminent for years. I refer to a building situated on the border of my district, but actually in Brighton District (by only a few metres), and about half a kilometre from the border of the Mawson District. I refer to the old Happy Valley memorial hall, built many years ago for public recreation, and the only meeting place in the community. It was built with voluntary labour in the main, and there was a community oval adjacent.

In the time of Liberal Governments initially, in the early 1960s, pressures were put on that community to stop using the oval. By the time Mr Dunstan became Premier for the first time in 1967-68, after he took over from Mr Walsh, the oval was taken away or the community told not to use it because of concern about pollution. Admittedly, the toilets on the property in those times were primitive, but the community agreed to move and build an oval further along in Taylors Road, Aberfoyle Park. The community was allowed to continue to use the memorial hall for some years under a lease structure, but recently the Minister of Water Resources wrote to the Meadows council on this matter. I received from the council a letter which gives an indication of what the Minister of Water Resources was seeking. The letter states:

Dear Mr Minister,

I thank you for your letter of 7 October 1983, in which you sought details of the concerns the council now has about the termination date of the hall lease.

As you will appreciate from our previous correspondence the hall is currently being used by the Reservoir Drive playgroup and for classical ballet classes. Since the termination date of 31 December 1983 was agreed upon the council has been monitoring the efforts of these groups to obtain alternative premises for their activities, and has been aware of the difficulties involved. Unfortunately, there are insufficient meeting facilities within the Happy Valley, Aberfoyle Park and Flagstaff Hill areas to satisfy current demands, and the council is actively looking for opportunities to facilitate the construction of new buildings to house such groups as the playgroup, ballet group, senior citizens club and bowling club. It is hoped that premises for some of these groups will be forthcoming through the job creation scheme.

In regard to the very active Reservoir Drive playgroup, the council is examining the possibility of converting an area of The Hub recreation centre for use by this group, and a local committee will no doubt prepare a job creation scheme for the building conversion necessary. However, this all takes time and it is unlikely that the group will have alternative premises by the end of this calendar year.

Loss of the Happy Valley memorial hall at this time would be extremely detrimental for both the community and council, and the council seeks your co-operation in extending the lease on an annual basis pending the provision of alternative facilities for groups using the Happy Valley memorial hall. I look forward to your support on this matter.

The council was kind enough to forward a copy of that letter to me, the member for Mawson, the member for Brighton, and to other interested parties. I make a plea that the hall remain for as long as possible because of the massive build up in that community, particularly of young children. Six new schools have been built in five years—one of them to accommodate 1 400 secondary children; that is not quite completed but well on the way. One can imagine the demand that there will be for any sort of meeting place.

I hope that the Engineering and Water Supply Department does not convince the Minister that the building should be knocked down, and I am sure that I will get the support of the other two members concerned because, even though most of the users of that building come from my electorate, there are some others who come from the electorates of the members for Brighton and Mawson.

The other matter I wish to raise while the Minister of Community Welfare is here (and he might refer it to his colleagues) is one that concerns me greatly, involving a young man who turned 18 years of age last November. He had a job returning about $134 a week and bought a motor car from a major finance company. He then went back and borrowed more money from the company to buy special wheels and tyres and ran up a considerable debt. He later went to a bank, where he had no credit arrangements at all, and the Manager asked him whether he had a bank account

anywhere else. He said 'Yes', but that he had no money in the account. The bank gave him a bankcard with credit facilities for $800, with nothing in the account. He told the bank that he wanted the money to buy a set of stereo equipment, for nearly $800, to put in his car.

Subsequently—earlier this year—that young man lost his job (I will not go into the reasons why), and he ended up living in a flat and having to ask the Government for support with subsidised rent because he was out of work. Of course, now the finance company has repossessed the car, and the stereo equipment is in the car. He is locked into the situation, his parents are not in a position to pick up the tab, and he faces a massive debt. However, I know that it is difficult for Governments to interfere in private transactions.

I found out about this matter only today. I intend to telephone the bank, which is a major bank in this State, and ask why it has taken this course, and I will also ask the finance company why it allowed the matter to go on to this degree. Even though the finance company has offered some concession by delaying one of the payments until the end of the contract, I still do not think that the situation is satisfactory, and I hope that something can be done to make business houses aware that they should have at least some conscience in the way they lend money out to people and place them in an impossible situation if they happen to lose their jobs. I believe that, as Parliamentarians, we should all be concerned about that situation.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): Earlier today I asked a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Health in another place, about the use of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D in local councils. In April 1981, I wrote the following letter to all councils in my electorate:

On 7 April the Adelaide *News* featured an article, on page 11, regarding the herbicides 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T. The article featured a Swedish report claiming that 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T have substantially increased the risk of developing malignant cancer of the soft tissues. Since the report, I have received several telephone calls from constituents querying whether these chemicals are used in the electorate of Peake. I am aware that one metropolitan council is advising ratepayers to use these chemicals for the treatment of certain noxious weeds. Can you please inform me as to what your council's policy is re the use of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T.

I am sure that you will agree that following this report these chemicals should be suspended until the South Australian Health Commission has had the opportunity of studying its contents. I have written to Mrs Adamson, the Health Minister, re the matter. An early reply to my letter would be appreciated as I am anxious to allay the fears expressed by my constituents and your ratepayers.

That letter went out to four councils in my electorate. The answers I received from them were to the effect that very little, if any, 2,4,5-T or 2,4-D was used. However, in the headlines in the *West Side* and the *Times* it now appears that that is not the case. It appears that this spray is widely used by councils in the metropolitan area, and most likely this would extend to councils throughout South Australia. I am concerned about this spray because, in my previous employment prior to coming to Parliament, on many occasions I took up problems that were created by the use of these particular sprays by people who worked as weed spray operators.

The main point is that the dieldrin in this spray has been a very widely discussed chemical because of Agent Orange, and it is claimed by many people that many soldiers who served in the forces in Vietnam and who came into contact with the spray have suffered, as have their families, from the effects of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D. A member of the Australian Workers Union (who worked as a weed spray operator at Peake, out from Murray Bridge) died, and it was claimed then that there was a very strong suspicion that it was because of his previous employment as a weed spray operator. Of course, one is not readily able to get doctors to say specifically that that is the direct cause. The same applies to Vietnam veterans: it is very difficult to get specialists to make decisions against multi-national companies which produce this stuff.

One finds that the same sprays are barred in certain parts of America, yet Australia is still using them. These sprays were barred completely in Sweden, and various medical people have said that most certainly they should not be used unless under strict supervision. As I explained earlier, some of the people who produce these sprays do not abide by the rules and regulations or observe what is written on the poison packet. This means that they do not use protective clothing and, although it may be said that if they do not want to use them that is their problem, I am not talking about the people who spray: I am concerned about those people, but in this case I am also concerned about the people who live in the vicinity of the areas sprayed, because it has been proved that the sprays in question are lethal and should not be used. The only reason that they are being used is that they are recognised as one of the cheapest ways of keeping down weeds and, naturally, wherever possible, some councils and other bodies are prepared to use this type of spray at the cost of people's health.

I have much more to say about 2,4-D, but I will not deal with it any further now because there is another matter concerning my electorate with which I want to deal, namely, a third runway at the airport. While visiting the International Airport one day, I was amazed to see a plan for a third runway which is proposed to make the airport more accessible for small planes to land there. Everyone is aware that in fact some of the small planes landing at the airport are really the noisiest planes of the lot. People living in the electorate that I represent have been subjected to much noise pollution from the airport, and surely they deserve a little more than having to suffer the consequences of the construction of a third runway, which would affect the Lockleys, Brooklyn Park and Underdale areas. As well, other areas outside my electorate would be affected, and I refer to those districts represented by the members for Morphett, Glenelg and Henley Beach. A few country members getting upset is a bit of a laughing matter. The member for Eyre (perhaps I should call him the 'member for hot air') is very upset about opposition to this proposal, because he says that it would take him an extra half an hour to travel to or from the Parafield Airport, which is where small planes should be operating from.

I agree with the member for Hanson, who said that that is pure laziness: that is all it is. It is pure laziness for a country member to say that he will be disadvantaged because it will take him an extra 20 minutes to get into the city. However, by the same token, members are prepared to subject schoolchildren to the inconvenience of noise and pollution. I have received a letter of complaint about this proposed airstrip from the School Council of the Lockleys Primary School signed by the Principal and the School Council. I have also received a petition containing 290 signatures from people living in the Lockleys, Brooklyn Park and Henley Beach areas, and that petition has been circulated to other members. It was forwarded to me requesting that I bring the matter to the attention of this House.

It is about time we started to think of people who reside near the airport. They comprise a very small minority, and unfortunately they do not have a big voice. However, these people suffer from the inconveniences caused by aircraft taking off and landing, and the crockery shakes as the planes come in. Yet, it is being suggested that a third runway be constructed to allow for further small plane traffic. Again,

I agree with the member for Hanson that this will create an added danger for the people living near the airport. I think it is about time we decided that we should not continue to subject those people to any more noise, at least to noise from small planes. People who travel from the country in planes can take the extra 15 minutes or so to travel to the city from the Parafield airport, which is where they should come from. It is pure laziness to suggest otherwise.

Motion carried.

At 4.53 the House adjourned until Tuesday 8 November at 2 p.m.