

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 19 August 1986

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.P. Trainer)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The **SPEAKER**: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the House for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. this day. I ask the mover and seconder of the Address and such other members as care to accompany me to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting the Address.

[Sitting suspended from 2.2 to 2.15 p.m.]

The **SPEAKER**: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address in Reply to His Excellency's opening speech adopted by this House, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

To the honourable Speaker and members of the House of Assembly, I thank you for your Address in Reply to the speech with which I opened the second session of the Forty-sixth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 115 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose any measures to decriminalise prostitution and uphold present laws against the exploitation of women by prostitution was presented by Mr Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: ELECTRONIC GAMING DEVICES

Petitions signed by 213 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to permit the use of electronic gaming devices were presented by Ms Gayler and Mr Tyler. Petitions received.

PETITION: HAPPY VALLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 172 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide off main road access to the Happy Valley Primary School was presented by Mr Tyler.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: 14, 33, 52, 61, 95 and 103; and I direct that the

following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PEST CONTROL INDUSTRY

In reply to **Mr ROBERTSON** (31 July):

The **Hon. G.J. CRAFTER**: On 31 July, the honourable member for Bright requested the Minister of Consumer Affairs to consider implementing an inquiry into alleged overcharging in the pest control industry. In the explanation of his question the honourable member referred to the experiences of a constituent who is a landlord and to quotes that were obtained from three pest control companies for the treatment of premises that he had leased under a residential tenancy agreement.

This matter appears to stem from at least two misunderstandings. The first relates to the form which Adelaide Pest Control normally uses when quoting for pest control treatment. When the landlord received the quote in question he mistook it to be an invoice. The quote form has been examined and, while it might be mistaken for an invoice, it is understood the items on the quote were explained in detail to the honourable member's constituent during a subsequent telephone conversation he had with a Director of the company. The quote given to the honourable member's constituent consisted of two items: \$85 for treatment to eradicate bird lice and fleas and \$165 to birdproof the premises to prevent a recurrence of the problem. The treatment to eradicate the lice and fleas had already been completed and paid for in part by the tenant, before the abovementioned quote was prepared. It is understood that this item was included on the landlord's quote at his request, as he had agreed at that stage to pay for that part of the work.

The second misunderstanding relates to comparisons that have been made with quotes obtained from two other pest control companies and for exactly what work these quotes were prepared. At this stage the infestation had been treated. What remained was to birdproof the premise. For this part of the work, Adelaide Pest Control estimated that three to four hours labour was involved and quoted \$165, not \$250. The quotes given by the other companies for birdproofing were \$95 and \$75. The company, which quoted \$75 and ultimately carried out the work, quoted only for work which the landlord instructed the company to do and this the company estimated would take one to two hours. If there is any difference in the three quotes it appears to be due to differences in the work that was quoted for and estimates of the amount of time involved to do the work.

The Minister of Consumer Affairs is satisfied that this matter does not disclose evidence of over-charging in the pest control industry and that an inquiry into the industry is not justified. On a final point, the Minister has asked me to clarify any misunderstanding which may exist concerning the rights and obligations of landlords and tenants, as prescribed in the Residential Tenancies Act, in relation to expenses of this kind. Section 46 (1) of the Residential Tenancies Act 1978 provides:

It shall be a term of every Residential Tenancy Agreement that the landlord—

- (a) shall provide the premises in a reasonable state of cleanliness;
- (b) shall provide and maintain the premises in a reasonable state of repair having regard to the age, character, and prospective life;
- (c) shall compensate the tenant for any reasonable expenses incurred by the tenant in repairing the premises where a state of disrepair has arisen otherwise than as a result of a breach of the agreement by the tenant and is likely to cause injury to personal property or undue incon-

venience to the tenant and the tenant has made a reasonable attempt to give the landlord notice of the state of disrepair; and

- (d) shall comply with all requirements in respect of buildings, health and safety under any other Act as far as they apply to the premises.

Subject to the qualifications described in section 46 (1) (c), the Residential Tenancies Act recognises that there may be circumstances where a tenant is justified in authorising repairs to be carried out on rented premises and that the tenant shall have a right to compensation for expenses incurred. Where a business is asked by a tenant to carry out work the business is entitled to claim for that work against the tenant. The question of whether the landlord is liable for the cost of the work is a matter between the landlord and the tenant.

YOUTH MUSIC FESTIVAL

In reply to Mr OLSEN (14 August).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Coca-Cola will be repaid the \$100 000 it provided as a loan to the Youth Music Festival to overcome cash flow problems, with a further allocation from the Jubilee 150 Board. Coca-Cola's sponsorship and support for the festival has been very generous.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon):

Pursuant to Statute—

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Report, 1984-85.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter):

Pursuant to Statute—

Trade Standards Act 1979—Regulation—Jacks and Ramps.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Pursuant to Statute—

Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981—Regulation—Roof Plumbing.

Motor Fuel Licensing Board—Report, 1985.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Pursuant to Statute—

Seeds Act 1979—Regulation—Noxious Weeds, Testing and Labelling.

QUESTION TIME

MARIJUANA

Mr OLSEN: In view of the Minister of Health's statement at a public meeting last night that marijuana is by no means harmless and that there remains considerable uncertainty about the effects of this drug, will the Premier order the Minister of Health not to proceed with moves to introduce on the spot fines for the possession of marijuana?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition obviously misunderstands both the purpose and the importance of the proposed legislation. It is all very well to extract from it one particular element and suggest that that means that a permissive attitude is being taken.

What that ignores completely is that the initiative the Government proposes is, in fact, part of the massive assault on drugs and the drug menace in our community that we have been undertaking. We have done more in our period

of office than had been done for the previous 10 or 15 years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader of the Opposition manages a bit of a smirk because he knows that he is not telling the full story about this and that in fact what is intended is to tighten penalties, to improve enforcement, to make sure that those who are responsible for peddling and dealing in drugs are dealt with properly and adequately. As part of the Bill that is involved there will be a major increase in penalties in relation to drug offences but in this limited area, which is taking up an inordinate amount of trivial time, the intention is not to decriminalise at all, not to give the imprimatur of society to it at all, not to suggest that it is safe at all, but to ensure that in that minor or petty area we do not waste time, energy and resources that would be far better used dealing with the drug menace as it stands.

BUSINESS MIGRATION

Mr DUIGAN: Did the Minister of State Development see an article in the *Advertiser* of 6 August where the Opposition spokesman on ethnic affairs is quoted as saying:

South Australia's share of the national intake of immigrants—and, with it, business acumen and investment funds—were dwindling.

Is it the case, as suggested by the Opposition, that South Australia is having trouble attracting overseas business acumen and investment funds?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I did see the press report and it is yet another example of the ongoing litany of negativism that is coming from the Opposition benches—a litany that is not based on any research of the facts. The facts are not as the Opposition would have us believe, that two plus two equals one and a half—the facts are quite different. The situation is that the total flow of immigration to Australia goes through various patterns of increase and decline and it is certainly the case that the figures for Australia at large are less than they have been previously. However, it is not correct for it to be said that South Australia's share of the national intake, particularly of business migrants or business acumen and investment is falling—that is absolutely incorrect.

The situation, as the figures show, has not been properly quoted by the honourable member in another place; in fact, he is choosing figures that are quite out of date. If he had chosen to compare those figures with the figures for the year before, he would see that even the figures he quoted were an improvement and if he had gone on to look at the figures for the latest period of time, he would find that they have improved yet again.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member asked whether I would state the percentage. I certainly will, and I am pleased to respond to his request, because I hope he will take the opportunity to share the information with his colleague in another place; that is more than his colleague in the other place chose to find out.

In 1983-84, of all the overseas business investors worldwide who wanted to take up residence in Australia, only 4.5 per cent wanted to come to South Australia. If we then break up that worldwide figure into various parts of the world, we find that, of the South-East Asian investors who wanted to migrate to Australia that year, only 5 per cent moved to South Australia. Of the Hong Kong investors (in other words, part of East Asia) none of them wanted to come to South Australia.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Mitcham says that is pretty low, and it is pretty low; that is true, because that is 1983-84. It was too early for policies that we had been putting into place to really start taking effect. In 1984-85, success was starting to show. Of all the overseas business investors in that financial year who moved to Australia 7.3 per cent moved to South Australia, an increase on the previous year.

Of all the South-East Asian investors, 9.2 per cent came to South Australia, as compared to the previous year when no investors from Hong Kong came to South Australia. In 1984-85, however, 6.6 per cent came to South Australia. I refer to the next financial year, 1985-86, for which we have only the first 11 months worth of figures at this stage. For that financial year, of all the overseas business investors who migrated, South Australia attracted 9.6 per cent; the figure for South-East Asian business immigrants was 12 per cent, and the figure for Hong Kong business immigrants was 13.3 per cent. That clearly indicates not a decline, not a falling share of national business migration to Australia, but quite the contrary. If those figures are compared with the figures for Western Australia, one can see just how well South Australia is doing. Let us try to translate some of that into the net effect on the economy of South Australia. I can say that present bank holdings for business migrants in Adelaide are in excess of \$19 million. Business investment totals in excess of \$9 million, and 267 jobs are known to have been either created or retained as a result of their activity. I believe that, again, the Opposition should research its claims and determine a policy of support for development in this State rather than always choosing to misquote facts in an attempt to drag South Australia down.

MARIJUANA

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On the basis of the Premier's earlier answer that the possession of marijuana was a petty offence, I ask the Premier whether he agrees with the Police Association that the introduction of on the spot fines for possession of marijuana will promote wider use of the drug and place even more pressure on police resources. If he does not agree with the association, will he produce evidence to support the Government's proposals?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have not had the advantage of studying the Police Association's submission, and I point out—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order on both sides of the House!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I point out that in fact it does not represent an official standpoint of the police, as communicated to the Minister through the Police Commissioner: it represents the views of the police union. That is fair enough; it is entitled to its opinion. I do not know on what evidence it has been based. I would simply say that, in the view of the Government there does not seem to be any evidence that this will promote the usage of marijuana. On the contrary, by the action we take in increasing penalties and in improving policing in those areas of distribution—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —and dealership—in other words, by getting back to the source and stop persecuting, if you like, at the end of the scale where those people involved are not contributing to crime and other activities—we will do more to discourage the use of marijuana than by any other means. That is what it is all about.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Coles to order. The Chair can understand that there may be occasions when the temper of the House is such that persons find it difficult not to interject. Nevertheless, interjections are out of order, and the Chair is firmly of the belief that no Minister should need to raise his or her voice in order to be heard because of interjections coming from the other side of the House or from backbenchers on the Government side of the House.

POLICE NUMBERS

Mr RANN: Will the Minister of Emergency Services give the House details of the police-to-public ratio in South Australia compared to other States? It has been put to me that a deliberate campaign is being waged to suggest that our excellent Police Force is under-resourced. I have also been advised that this campaign is similar to one that was initiated prior to last year's election in which the Opposition sought to cynically capitalise on genuine fears in the community and to deliberately undermine police power through—

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I submit that the member for Briggs is commenting in his explanation.

The SPEAKER: At the time, such was the level of interjection that the Chair found it very difficult to hear what the member for Briggs was saying. In those circumstances, it is very difficult for me to uphold that point of order. However, I caution the member for Briggs against introducing comment into his explanation.

Mr OSWALD: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I bring to your attention my Question on Notice No. 78, which in fact canvasses this subject.

The SPEAKER: While the Chair refers to the Question on Notice, I call the honourable member for Coles.

YOUTH MUSIC FESTIVAL

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Premier immediately table the departmental report on the financial failure of the Youth Music Festival and say what further action the Government intends to take? The Opposition seeks the tabling of this report to establish the extent of the budget deficit incurred by this festival, the reasons for it, how the Government intends to financially rescue the event, whether and how it intends to repay to Coca Cola the outstanding \$100 000 loan, and whether the Premier will seek a further inquiry by the Auditor-General, as he suggested last week that he might.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We are not in a position to table the report at this stage. Much further work is being done on the matter and, as soon as possible, obviously the Minister will report, as he has said.

POLICE NUMBERS

The SPEAKER: After having examined the question, the Chair is of the view that the question from the member for Briggs does not cover the same ground as Question on Notice No. 78, which deals with the actual number of police as distinct from the ratio of police to public. The honourable member for Briggs may resume his question.

Mr RANN: I have been advised that this campaign is similar to one initiated prior to last year's election, in which the Opposition sought to cynically capitalise on genuine—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule, from the utterances which no doubt you have just heard, that the member for Briggs is commenting.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Briggs has completed his question. The honourable Deputy Premier in his capacity as Minister of Emergency Services is the Minister called upon to reply.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have some figures which would be of interest to the honourable member and members of the House and which are somewhat reassuring.

In giving them I have to make the point that the presumptions built into such figures in the various States and the Territory vary somewhat. The definition of active strength of Police Force—and whether, for example, trainees would be included in some of the statistics—is something which changes from State to State. However, I can find no consistent bias in any particular State in any one direction. I believe that the variations as between States would largely cancel each other out; so, in a broad sense, I believe the figures are comparable.

The police/population ratios are as follows: Northern Territory, one per 225 of population; South Australia, one per 416; Tasmania, one per 427; Western Australia, one per 464; Victoria, one per 469; New South Wales, one per 517 and, running a distant last, Queensland, one per 525. I would be as interested in the quality of policing as I am in the quantity of police resources, and I doubt whether there would be one member of this Chamber who would want to argue with my contention that, not only in qualitative terms but also in quantitative terms, our Police Force rates extremely well throughout the country.

REDWOOD PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

Ms GAYLER: Would the Minister of Education be prepared to re-examine the relative costs of providing additional classroom space at Redwood Park Primary School by way of building in the existing undercroft of the main school building as compared with relocating transportable classrooms from elsewhere? Enrolments at Redwood Park Primary School are expected next year to rise well above the actual capacity of the school. Late last year the former Minister of Education had a cost estimate prepared on enclosing the undercroft to provide three additional classrooms. That came to \$42 000, but the department decided against that approach and in favour of relocation. I am now advised that the relocation involves a building which would literally fall apart in the removal process, because of its dilapidated state, and would need approximately \$40 000 spent on it to bring it up to Education Department standards. The school council is pleased with the Education Department's cooperation in pursuing this matter, but would appreciate a re-examination of relative costs.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question and for the interest she has shown in the well-being of those associated with the Redwood Park Primary School. I will certainly undertake to obtain information from the Education Department relating to the provision of additional classrooms at that school. As suggested in the honourable member's question, there are obviously both short-term and long-term solutions to the problems confronting this school and a number of other schools experiencing increasing enrolments, particularly those in the outer suburban areas of Adelaide.

I will discuss this matter with the relevant officers, as I understand that there have been considerable discussions between officers of the department and the school community with respect to the provision of these amenities. However, I will ascertain whether a speedy resolution to current problems can be found.

MARIJUANA

Mr OSWALD: Has the Minister of Emergency Services received a submission from the Police Commissioner relating to the Government's proposal to have on the spot fines for possession of marijuana and, if so, will he make that submission public?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I do not recall having done so. It may be that there were discussions from time to time, and quite a while ago, in relation to this matter. However, I do not recall receiving a submission from the Commissioner in recent times.

DOG CONTROL

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Local Government, inform the House whether the Local Government Department believes that penalties under the Dog Control Act are sufficient to allow councils proper control under that Act? Last night local television broadcasts showed the results of dog attacks on sheep in the Adelaide Hills, where several sheep have been killed and others badly mutilated. It was a really disturbing scene. The telecast suggested that the Adelaide Children's Hospital is treating 100 children each year as a result of dog attacks. It has been put to me, and was further suggested during the telecast, that penalties under this Act should be increased substantially.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will certainly refer this matter to my colleague the Minister of Local Government in the other place and seek an urgent response to this very important question asked by the honourable member. I think that most members of the House are aware that the Government receives advice from a committee of eminent South Australians who look at this very important area, which people sometimes tend to trivialise; however, it is not a trivial matter but quite an important one. That committee's advice is taken seriously. It may well be that this matter can be referred to that committee for further investigation and advice. I will ask my colleague to respond to the honourable member's question.

COMMITTEE FEES

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Will the Premier table in this House prior to the forthcoming budget debate a schedule of all committees attracting fees paid with public funds and outline those servicing him, his department, the departments of the respective Ministers, the Ministers themselves, and the statutory authorities to the year ended 30 June 1986? Will the Premier, in identifying those committees, list the names of the people involved on each committee and the annual or, where applicable, meeting payment made to each member including that made to the Chairperson?

Last week I raised in this House a matter involving an alleged payment to a Chairperson, Ms Debra McCulloch. While I was raising that matter the member for Adelaide, by way of interjection, told the House that Ms McCulloch

was paid under regulation. Information brought to my attention subsequent to that interjection revealed that Ms McCulloch, the person mentioned in my matter of concern last week, is paid not under the canopy of a regulation but directly by her Minister from a fund held in Treasury known as Information Services Fund.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr DUGAN: The member for Alexandra suggests that last week I said that Ms McCulloch was paid as a result of a determination made—

The SPEAKER: Order! I suspect that the honourable member has said enough to indicate that he is making a personal explanation that must be left to the end of Question Time.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: It is further a matter of fact that it was without malice or personal attack but simply the citing of Ms McCulloch as a classic example of public funding waste. It was drawn to the attention of Parliament, and of the Premier in particular, in that context. It is against the background of those statements last week (the assertions and interjections from the member for Adelaide and the clear expressions of concern from the other side) and I raise this matter today in all sincerity to clarify the position for all concerned, without the risk of being branded as one who identifies a single person, albeit a woman—

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the honourable member against debating the question.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I call on the Premier for the information within the time constraint that seems reasonable.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: This question could be more properly placed on the Notice Paper. I do not know what Ms McCulloch has done to incur the honourable member's attention in this way, nor do I know what it is about information services that makes them a classic example of public sector waste. I think that there would be a large proportion of the public both in State and local government and in community organisations who would reject that utterly. It is not a question of waste. Information and the development of information services is an important priority in our community and I am amazed that the honourable member sees any attempt to do something in that area as a classic example of public sector waste. That is an extraordinary statement. I suggest that the work that would be involved in trying to answer the honourable member's question would be a classic example of public sector waste. The resources that would be tied up would amount to many thousands of dollars—for what purpose? To try somehow to vindicate the honourable member's view that a certain Ms McCulloch was being wrongly or improperly paid for the service she was asked to do by the Government or the Minister! The honourable member knows that there are a number of committees and organisations that have been established by Statute and regulation for which there are set scales of fees and that from time to time *ad hoc* committees are established that have an emolument attached to them because, especially for those people who put themselves out, we wish to reward the members. Therefore, I do not understand why the honourable member wants us to spend all this public money to find out information that is irrelevant, except from some obscure point that he wants to score.

ILLEGAL WEAPONS

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Education ask his colleague the Attorney-General to examine the present leg-

islation covering the sale of illegal weapons and ascertain whether an anomaly exists with respect to the sale of specific knives? I was approached earlier this week by a constituent who had found his 14 year old son with an 11 inch knife that had an 8 inch thin stiletto shaped blade. The knife also had a lock-back mechanism. It had been obviously a flick knife and somehow modified so that it was not now a flick knife but in fact a dangerous weapon. My constituent described the knife as looking like a dagger. On telephoning police headquarters at Angas Street, he was told that the possession of such a knife was illegal and that possession attracted a penalty of a \$2 000 fine and up to six months imprisonment.

My constituent was also told by police headquarters that there is no legislation to prevent the sale of these knives. On returning the knife to the local hardware store, from which it was purchased at a cost of \$10.09, my constituent was again told that there was no law preventing the sale of these knives—even to minors. First, will the Attorney-General investigate whether this legal anomaly exists? My second question is, if it does exist, will the Attorney amend the legislation as a matter of urgency to prevent the sale of this form of illegal weapon, particularly to minors?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member referred to a second question. I think she meant the second part of the same question.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Thank you for that clarification, Mr Speaker. I will be pleased to refer this matter to my colleague in another place and obtain the information sought by the honourable member. I am sure the information will be of interest and indeed importance particularly to parents in the community and to all citizens to ensure that there is not the sale of these knives which obviously amount to the possession of a dangerous weapon, so that all necessary steps are taken to ensure that the existing law is applied and, if there is a need to review our laws, that that is done expeditiously.

TOILET PEDESTALS

Mr LEWIS: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction investigate what appears to be a classic example of Government waste in every sense of the word in the replacement of all toilet pedestal and cistern units within Parliament House? In recent days I have witnessed the removal of two perfectly good, sound Fowler brand pedestal and cistern units in good order—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LEWIS: —from the second floor male toilets. I have watched with bated breath as they were duly replaced with two brand new Caroma pedestal and cistern units. I have been reliably informed that such cosmetic changes have also taken place in recent days in two cubicles in the ladies rest room on the lower ground floor.

An honourable member: Is that hearsay?

Mr LEWIS: I assure the Minister that it is certainly not 'her-say'. I have been told subsequently that the winds of change are to blow right through the corridors of Parliament House and that the Caroma units will take the place of the hardy Fowler units from top to bottom. It has been estimated by certain users of these facilities that the Government's intention to replace a total of 29 units will cost well over \$5 000 (at current prices). I have no wish to add paper work at the end of things in asking my question, and I am hopeful that the Minister will dismiss my anxieties as being a further example of his lavatory humour at work. However,

I fear I may well have exposed another sorry saga of predominantly Government waste.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will resist the temptation to comment, and calls on the Minister.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question: it certainly reassures me that in this week the drought has been broken and that my colleague, the Minister of Labour, and I will be receiving some questions. We thought that we were being ignored because of our accents. I am a little disappointed that, now that I have eventually been asked a question, it was in this vein. I assure the member that I will investigate that matter with all diligence and bring down a report for him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair calls on members to restrain themselves from getting too excited about what may be just a flash in the pan.

STOLEN CARS

Mr ROBERTSON: Will the Minister of Emergency Services consider issuing a warning to alert the general public to the possibility of their cars being stolen while 'prospective buyers' engage in a test drive? This question relates to a constituent of mine whose 18-year-old grand-daughter advertised to sell her car. A young man duly arrived, inspected the car and asked if he could take it for a test drive. I am informed that that was the last she saw of the young man or the car for six weeks, at which time I am told an arrest was made and the vehicle was returned. In the light of this, will the Minister consider drawing this incident to the attention of the general public in an attempt to prevent the theft of motor vehicles in that way?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The context in which the question was asked opens up new vistas in my portfolio which really had not occurred to me previously. I thought that perhaps another portfolio might have been appropriate to the context. I can understand the anguish on the part of the honourable member's constituent. I congratulate the honourable member on using the forum of this Chamber to make public a practice which should be stamped out wherever possible. People should certainly take precautions against being conned in that way. I will try to ensure that adequate cautionary messages are given to the general public, and I hope that those who are listening now will be prepared to take up the question he has asked so that they can use the resources available to them to give similar cautionary warnings to the otherwise unsuspecting public.

USE OF LOCAL GRANITE

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier take up with the State Bank concerns within the South Australian quarrying industry that granite to be used on the new State Bank headquarters will be supplied from New South Wales rather than locally? The Opposition has been given information that a contract for the supply of 4 000 tonnes of granite to provide polished natural granite and a reconstructed granite finish for the exterior walling of the State Bank headquarters may be awarded to a New South Wales company—when a South Australian product was specified as most appropriate and is readily available. I understand that this contract would provide the following employment opportunities in South Australia: three months work for six quarry workers,

eight months work for six cartage contractors, and up to 10 months work for four supplier and crushing contractors. There would also be opportunities in concrete precasting comprising, as reported to me, 43 man/work years in manufacture, one man/work year in local cartage and more than eight man/work years in metalworking, fitting and cementing. In total, about 55 man/work years in concrete precasting would be involved, but I have been told that concrete precasters in Adelaide have already been advised that they will not be involved in this work.

In view of rising unemployment in South Australia and, particularly in view of the CES figures released yesterday showing South Australia as having the worst record for long-term unemployment of any State, I ask the Premier if he will take up this matter with the State Bank to ensure that, where local suppliers are competitive and have the capacity to supply the bank's needs, they will be given the opportunity to do so.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will certainly get a report on the matter for the honourable member. Buildings, and indeed any work undertaken by authorities in South Australia, seek to use to the greatest extent possible local product and manufacture. Of course, there are considerations of cost and quality in any contract. I do not know the circumstances behind this—whether a contract has been let or what the alternatives were—but I will certainly find out, because I agree that we should be ensuring maximum use of South Australian products wherever possible.

EDUCATION PROJECT

Mr PETERSON: Is the Minister of Education aware of the 'Into the 90s guaranteed equal opportunities for reception to year 7 children' project currently being undertaken by the South Australian Primary Principals Association? If he is aware of that project, will the Minister say what is the Government's policy on this proposal? The basic principles of the proposal are the reallocation of educational resources from secondary schools to junior primary and primary schools. As the proposal includes an increased teacher provision at the primary level, it has been put to me that teachers would have to be transferred from secondary schools to primary schools to provide the levels required. As there has been no official Government statement on this proposal, will the Minister clarify the Government's position?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. Yes, I am aware of a document, which was first circulated late last year and which is known to me as 'Into the 90s'. I understand that that document was prepared by a group of primary school principals in the Adelaide area and that it has since been circulated throughout the education system. Late last year the Education Department responded to that document and an announcement was made by the then Minister of Education and the Director-General of Education that a primary education review would be conducted in South Australia. An interim report of that review will be presented later this year, and a final report is anticipated in mid-1987.

Among other things, the review will consider the matters that have been raised in the 'Into the 90s' document. As well as those quite fundamental resource issues raised in the document, the review will also address matters related to curricula, good teaching practice, specialisation, the social and emotional needs of children, leadership, technology, professional development, and so on.

It must be said, however, that, given the present budgetary restraints, it would be extremely difficult to implement all

the proposals sought by the advocates of the 'Into the 90s' document. Nonetheless, the Government is proud of its record in education generally, particularly in the primary sector. On our election in 1982, the Labor Government restored 231 salaries for the 1983 school year, the bulk of which went to primary schools. In 1984, 150 salaries were made available to improve the staffing formula for primary schools, small schools and special rural schools. In 1985, an additional 65 salaries were made available to primary schools, mostly for curriculum and staff development as well as improvements in library provisions. In 1986, 210 salaries were redeployed as a result of falling enrolments, with the bulk of those salaries going towards improving the level of staffing in primary schools, including 25 for primary school curriculum development, 25 for additional librarian positions and 10 for additional language teachers.

As the Premier has said in this place recently, the Government is committed to introducing 100 additional school assistant positions in the 1987 school year. The majority of those positions will assist primary schools and special education areas. It should be noted also that both primary and secondary pupil-teacher ratios improved in the 1983 to 1986 period, and that the difference between them has now narrowed. In conclusion, I point out that I am aware of the document referred to, the work that has been put into it by its authors and indeed the interest expressed in it by many school communities. The matter has been given cognisance by the Education Department. The Education Department is very strongly committed to a very thorough review of primary education in this State and the resources that are allocated to that sector. I am sure that we all look forward to the results of the review. I believe the review is an exciting opportunity to influence the quality and direction of education for primary school children in South Australia, and it is hoped that a commitment will be made to a partnership amongst all the parties concerned and that that will result in significant improvements for primary education in South Australia.

RADIO STATION 5AA

Mr D.S. BAKER: Did the Minister of Recreation and Sport or any other member of the Government seek to influence the management of radio station 5AA in its recent decision to remove announcer Arch Tambakis from his weeknight talk-back show? It has been suggested to the Opposition that the Labor Party was becoming increasingly embarrassed by some of the disclosures made on Mr Tambakis's program and by his constant criticism of ALP policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D.S. BAKER: It has been further suggested to the Opposition that the State Government, through its ownership of radio station 5AA, decided to put an abrupt end to its night time image by, and I quote this morning's *Advertiser*, 'giving Arch the flick.'

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Obviously, the member does not appreciate the relationship that exists between the Government, as the executive arm, and the statutory body, the TAB, and the relationship with 5AA. For his benefit I will explain that there is no direct ministerial involvement with the management of 5AA, in my experience, nor has there been any involvement whatsoever.

The only time I have ever met Mr Tambakis was recently at a fundraiser at which he was auctioned for a considerable sum of money, to raise funds for charity. I was at the same function in the same role.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: No, he had a few dollars more than I did, unfortunately. The Government has had no involvement and there has been no contact from my office or anyone I have any contact with to influence or direct 5AA. It has been a decision of the management of 5AA, and I think that is a clear inference to be read from the *Advertiser*. I would resist any situation where such an influence would be directed from officers of the department or officers within my office itself.

DOG CONTROL

Mr TYLER: I ask the Minister of Lands a supplementary question to that asked earlier today by the member for Henley Beach. Will the Minister tell the House whether the RSPCA has been called to assist injured animals which have been attacked by domestic dogs in the Happy Valley and Hills areas? Over a number of weeks now, I have been contacted by constituents concerned that animals are being left in a mutilated state on the constituents' properties. It has also been put to me—and was mentioned by the member for Henley Beach—that penalties and the problems of identification should also be looked at.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I appreciate the question from the honourable member and the concern that has been expressed in relation to this matter. I am not aware as to whether the RSPCA has investigated this incident, but I will have my officer, Mr David Watts—who, incidentally, is a chief inspector under the new Animal Welfare Act—investigate this matter and call for a report from the RSPCA. I will inform the member accordingly.

PAROLE LEGISLATION

Mr BECKER: In view of the widespread public concern which will follow the early release on parole of a man who has served only eight years of a 16 year sentence for 10 rapes and three attempted rapes, will the Minister of Correctional Services indicate when the Government intends to honour the Premier's election promise of immediate changes to our parole laws? I ask this question in view of the statement made in this afternoon's newspaper and the revelation about the release of the so-called phantom rapist, Brian James McDonald.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The gentleman referred to was released as he had completed his sentence—nothing very dramatic about that. Whether we feel that the sentence is appropriate or not is, of course, something else. Changes to parole legislation will be put before the—

Mr S.J. Baker: He was sentenced to 16 years. He has not completed the sentence. All he has done is the non-parole period, under the new Act.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: He was released in accordance with the law.

Mr S.J. Baker: That is what we are talking about.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Is the honourable member suggesting that perhaps, by some means, I ought to keep the parolee when his sentence is finished and the law says he can go out? Is that what you are saying?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair would suggest to the Minister that in responding to interjections in the way he has been doing for the last minute or so he is, in effect, conducting a debate, and that is quite out of order.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As regards the second part of the question, the amendments will be brought into the Parliament in due course.

BIRKENHEAD BRIDGE

Mr De LAINE: Can the Minister of Transport inform the House of the expected length of the future life of the Birkenhead bridge in respect to allowing shipping access to the west end of Gawler Reach in the Port River? The useful life of this bridge as an opening structure allowing ships to pass through, and the useful life of the bridge purely as a passage for vehicular traffic to and from the LeFevre Peninsula, are two different things. Because of the age of the bridge, and despite regular adequate maintenance, the time will undoubtedly come when the bridge can no longer be opened safely.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will have this matter investigated, but to the best of my knowledge the bridge at Birkenhead is working very competently. It is in very good condition, both as a bridge to cope with vehicular traffic and as an opening bridge to let vessels through which need to enter the upper reaches of the Port River.

I will have a word with my colleague the Minister of Marine, but at the moment I understand that the only vessels that have a use for the opening bridge are the *Troubridge*, the show boat *Matthew Flinders*, the *One and All*, the *Failie*, I think some naval vessels periodically and the odd high-masted pleasure craft. Therefore, the bridge is not put to overwhelming use. If, in fact, vessels were not able to go south of the bridge we would be able to close it, I guess, and reduce maintenance, which is costly. At the moment there is nothing wrong with the bridge: the opening mechanism is well looked after. I have no knowledge of any lifespan being placed upon the bridge.

Although the Jervois bridge is well used by a lot of vehicular traffic, there is no possibility of a new bridge being constructed in that area in the foreseeable future—none at all that I am aware of. If there was, it would be an incredibly expensive bridge, because of the height and length. Therefore, we have to work with the bridge we have, which is working competently. Its future is unlimited, to the best of my knowledge, but I will get a more detailed report for the honourable member and the House.

RETICULATED WATER SERVICES

Mr MEIER: In view of the report in the *Advertiser* on Monday 18 August 1986 that heavy rains in South Australia in July and August are saving the South Australian Government millions of dollars in the cost of pumping water from the Murray River, can the Minister of Water Resources tell the House whether some of these saved millions will go towards extending reticulated water services to areas such as Moorowie and Hardwicke Bay on the Yorke Peninsula, which could cost of the order of \$400 000 to \$600 000, and towards replacing or upgrading existing services where pipes are so corroded and blocked that either water pressure is totally inadequate, often discoloured, or very little if any water is able to pass through the pipe. This occurs in the Windsor, Dublin and Two Wells areas where costs of repair or replacement would vary from some tens of thousands to some hundreds of thousands of dollars, depending on how much piping was replaced or upgraded.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: First, I give a guarantee to the honourable member that such maintenance will continue so as to ensure that the existing system is able to provide the services that are demanded of it. I also indicate that even in the best of seasons some continuing pumping is necessary in the interests of those people who feed off the pipes that carry water to the reservoir, or to whatever the ultimate repository of that water is.

However, having said that, I cannot give the honourable member a guarantee along the lines that he has indicated. Any extensions to this system would be paid for out of loan moneys and that is something about which he will be informed when the Premier brings down the State budget soon. We must make some sort of notional allocation year by year to cover pumping costs, and we hope that we get out of it reasonably well. It does not follow that a huge dollop of money is available there simply because we have not pumped as much water as we might have: the whole thing is averaged out year after year. Regarding the specific matters that the honourable member has raised on behalf of his constituents, I ask him to await the publication of the State budget.

MAIN SOUTH ROAD INTERSECTION

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Transport say whether the Highways Department has plans to modify and upgrade the section of Main South Road adjacent to Government Road and the James Craig Inn in the suburb of Hackham? I have made representations to the Minister concerning safety factors at the intersection of Main South Road and Government Road, especially following the recent death of a motorist there. I have today presented to the Minister a petition containing 545 signatures requesting that safe turning bays be provided for both south and north-bound traffic, that the speed limit on this section be reduced from 100 km/h to 80 km/h and that a turning apron be provided for vehicles turning into Government Road and the James Craig Inn. Can the Minister say whether the Highways Department has plans to accede to these requests?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for her question. The Highways Department has investigated this intersection, which is presenting considerable traffic problems to commuters using Main South Road and the road into James Craig Inn to which the honourable member has referred. As a result of those studies, planning work is now being done on devising a method to provide easier access and egress at this intersection so as to eliminate the present problems and dangers confronting people using Main South Road. I will check with the department to see how far planning has proceeded. I would be anxious for the department to speak both to the honourable member and to her constituent, the owner of the inn, so as to ensure that their representations are taken into account in the final resolution of this matter. In summary, there is a traffic problem at this intersection that needs to be redressed, and the Highways Department is going through the planning process at present.

OUTER HARBOR BREAKWATER

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Marine say why the Government has taken no action to repair the breach in the Outer Harbor breakwater opposite No. 6 wharf? I understand that the breach is growing month by month and that the eventual cost to the Government is mounting daily. Members of the Royal South Australian Yacht Squadron have stated that they believe that the basin is silting as a result of the breach in the breakwater. Does the Government intend to ignore this problem in the hope that the sand being washed in through the breach will go away of its own accord, or will it take positive action and have the breach repaired for the overall protection of State assets?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am not aware of any action by the department. I will take up this matter and bring down information for the honourable member. There is a problem, I understand, especially at low tide in respect of the sand bar and the breach referred to.

HOSPITAL PARKING

Mr DUIGAN: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say when Commissioner Tomkinson will report to him on the future use of land on Frome Road adjacent to the Reid Building at the Royal Adelaide Hospital? I have been approached by constituents who are nurses at the hospital and who are having difficulty in finding parking spaces, especially when they are on night duty. The parking spaces available at the hospital must be rostered because there is a staff of 4 500 and there are only 750 parking spaces. The rostering system is based on the distance that the nurse has to travel, the availability of public transport, and the time of night that her shift ends. Adjacent to the Reid Building there is a large open space on Frome Road that could be used for parking. The problem does not necessarily relate to funds: rather it is that at present the area is regarded as parklands. The Institute of Technology is in a similar predicament in terms of use of some of that land during the day. I understand that Commissioner Tomkinson has been asked to report on whether this land should be considered as parklands and whether it could be made available for some other use. When is it expected that Commissioner Tomkinson will report on this matter?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Commissioner Tomkinson has reported to me, but in a busy few days I have not yet had a chance to peruse his report. However, I intend to take up the contents of the report with the Minister of Health as soon as possible, because both the Minister and the member for Adelaide have been assiduous in reminding me of the current concerns of the hospital regarding parking and the security of its employees. The Frome Road precinct is not an easy area. The Reid Building was probably located inappropriately by our forefathers. Nonetheless, it is there and has a considerably useful life ahead of it. I will take up the matter as soon as I can.

ROXBY DOWNS SCHOOL

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister of Education assure the House that the school planned for Olympic Dam to service the Roxby Downs project will not be delayed by the irresponsible claims of certain elements in the South Australian Institute of Teachers? In the 6 August edition of the institute's journal, under the heading 'Roxby Downs school controversy', the following appears:

The planned area school for children of the Roxby Downs mining site is causing some controversy. Health hazards for departmental employees and children are at the heart of the issue . . . Roxby Management Services have given assurances that there are no hazards. But one does not have to be a history student to know that safety assurances from companies and Governments have too frequently proven false . . . A considerable amount of work and investigation has been done by SAIT staff, and there is concern about health hazards at the proposed Roxby school site . . . Bob Jackson said that SAIT has negotiated several important and fruitful improvements. There are two outstanding issues which remain. The department has not agreed to build the school at least 20 km from the site; however, Director-General John Steinle has agreed to take the issue to the interdepartmental Roxby Management Group for further discussion. The department also refused to give an assurance for life time monitoring of those who will work there.

It would be unfortunate if this important part of the Roxby Downs project was to be delayed by this sort of activity, which is only a course of action designed to delay and frustrate this important project. Will the Minister of Education ignore this sort of nonsense?

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister to ignore the comment in the last part of the question.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I cannot give an assurance as to what may or may not occur in the future. However, I add that the Education Department is the client for the proposed building project: it is not being constructed by the Education Department as such. An interdepartmental committee is taking into account representations that are being made to it by the teachers union and by others, and I hope that those matters can be resolved satisfactorily.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Ms DEBRA McCULLOCH

Mr DUIGAN (Adelaide): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr DUIGAN: During Question Time the member for Alexandra in a question to the Premier suggested that I had said in this House last week that Ms Debra McCulloch, as Chairperson of the Information Services Advisory Committee, was paid in accordance with a particular regulation determining her level of remuneration. I said no such thing, as an examination of *Hansard* will illustrate. In fact, I said that I took particular offence at Ms Debra McCulloch being singled out as a person who was not entitled to earn as much as was determined for the position she was appointed to by the Government for that advisory committee. I also said that, if the member for Alexandra had any point to make, it should be in terms of the level of remuneration that is paid to members and chairpersons of boards, rather than concentrating on any individual who may well have been appointed to any of those boards. I still hold with that position. In this House last week I also said that a determination of those salaries is often made by regulation and, as an example, mentioned some that were already laid on the table of this House and were being examined by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

At no time did I suggest that any of the regulations currently lying on the table of the House applied specifically to the Information Services Advisory Committee. I simply gave that as an example of the way in which appointees to boards have their salaries determined: in other words, to show that there is no arbitrary payment to people who are appointed to Government boards—whether as chairperson or as a member; and certainly people are not appointed arbitrarily by Governments without consideration of their skills and experience. In this particular case, the skills and experience of Ms McCulloch in the information services area are beyond dispute.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PEST CONTROL INDUSTRY

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I seek leave to make a personal explanation on the question of overcharging.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member does not need to expound at this stage; he is merely seeking leave.

Leave granted.

Mr ROBERTSON: As members will recall, in this House on 31 July I called for an investigation into overcharging in the pest control industry. My question was prompted by an incident brought to my attention by a constituent in which he obtained quotes for the same job, and those quotes varied by as much as 330 per cent. In my question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs I mentioned the name of a company which quoted \$75 for a particular job and another company which quoted \$250 for what was ostensibly the same job. The Minister's reply essentially confirms that there are wide variations in assessment and pricing procedures in the industry. However, it is the Minister's view that such variations do not constitute grounds for an inquiry. It is also clear from the Minister's response that the companies quoting for the job had differing views on the amount of time and materials that the job might require.

It is fair to say that, although the guarantee offered by Adelaide Pest Control Services was not as long as that offered by Amalgamated Pest Control, the job as envisaged by Adelaide Pest Control would have been carried out with a good deal more attention to detail. It is also fair to concede that Adelaide Pest Control has established a well deserved record in the community for thoroughness and efficiency. I reiterate the fact that at no time did I impugn the reputation of the company's workmanship.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ROBERTSON: I cast doubt on the form of documentation supplied by the company to prospective clients.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ROBERTSON: I repeat my initial assertion that the document received by my constituent appeared, to all intents and purposes, to be an invoice. That fact is borne out in the Minister's reply.

Mr Gregory interjecting:

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Ms DEBRA McCULLOCH

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I am offended by the remarks of the member for Adelaide again today, as I was last week. In particular, during Question Time today the Premier supported the member for Adelaide in his suggestion that I was reflecting on Ms Debra McCulloch.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member make clear where he has been misrepresented so that he can then proceed with his explanation.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Today, both the Premier and the member for Adelaide implied in this House that I singled out a person and criticised her in a public place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I object to and reject the remarks from both the Premier and the member for Adelaide and indicate that I am offended by their persistence in that direction. In seeking to explain my personal position, I draw the member for Adelaide's attention—as I already have—and the Premier's attention to page 22 of last week's *Hansard*, where I made it patently clear that at no stage during my remarks about Debra McCulloch's appointment

was I reflecting on her. I was simply citing the position and the payment made for that position as a gross waste of money—and I do so again. Further, in the member for Adelaide's remarks against me—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra is getting very close to making a speech on this subject rather than making a personal explanation in order to refute what he believes is a misrepresentation.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: In order to refute the misrepresentation by the member for Adelaide, I further explain: last week I referred to Ms Debra McCulloch in the context of her being appointed to a position by her Minister, for which appointment public funds of an inordinate amount were paid. I pointed out that that was out of step with any of the regulated salary levels applicable to such committee positions. To contradict that, the member for Adelaide said:

Those positions and their remuneration are determined by the Public Service Board and the Executive, come before this Parliament and the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and are finally approved.

That claim, made by the member for Adelaide, implying injustice on my part, is blatantly untrue. The payments and the person who received those payments and still receives them are not the subject of a Subordinate Legislation Committee determination; indeed, they are the subject of a determination made by the Minister. In that context, the member for Adelaide and the Premier were wrong, and I object to the reflection on me.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): By leave, and pursuant to section 15 of the Public Accounts Committee Act 1972, I move:

That the members of this House appointed to the Public Accounts Committee have leave to sit on that committee during the sitting of the House today.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the time allotted for all stages of the following Bills be until 6 p.m. on Thursday:

River Torrens (Linear Park) Act Amendment Bill, Clean Air Act Amendment Bill, North Haven (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill, Roads (Opening and Closing) Act Amendment Bill, Statutes Amendment (Analysts) Bill, Roseworthy Agricultural College Act Amendment Bill, South Australian College of Advanced Education Act Amendment Bill, Government Financing Authority Amendment Bill, Local Government Finance Authority Act Amendment Bill, South Australian Institute of Technology Act Amendment Bill, Oil Refinery (Hundred of Noarlunga) Indenture Act Amendment Bill, Mobil Lubricating Oil Refinery (Indenture) Act Amendment Bill.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the motion be agreed to. Those in favour say 'Aye'; those against say 'No'.

Mr S.G. Evans: No.

The SPEAKER: I think the Ayes have it.

Mr S.G. Evans: Divide!

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: Order! There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it. The question is agreed to.

Motion carried.

RIVER TORRENS (LINEAR PARK) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 190.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The River Torrens (Linear Park) Bill 1981 was introduced in the Parliament on 21 October 1981 by the Tonkin Government to provide for the acquisition of land necessary for the purpose of carrying out flood mitigation work and establishing a linear park along the River Torrens. At that time, in introducing that legislation and in giving the second reading explanation, I made the following statement:

Subject to satisfactory formal agreement being reached with all riparian councils concerning the scope of the work to be undertaken by the Government, cost-sharing arrangements and responsibility for ongoing maintenance, the Government has announced its intention to establish a project team within the Engineering and Water Supply Department to implement the proposal. The Government has also decided that, due to the possible serious consequences of a major flood along the River Torrens, the flood mitigation scheme in particular should be allocated top priority for its full implementation. Furthermore, since this scheme is fully complementary to the River Torrens-Linear Park Scheme, as defined in the earlier River Torrens Study Report, 1979, the Government has decided that both schemes should proceed simultaneously, with the target completion date of 1986 to coincide with the State's sesquicentennial celebrations.

The only regret that I have is that it has become necessary to extend the legislation until the end of 1989; that is a pity. The project will be of immense benefit to South Australia and particularly to people living within the metropolitan area. I would say that the River Torrens Linear Park in itself will be a permanent monument to the Tonkin Government and also to the sesquicentenary but, above all else, the flood mitigation works that are being undertaken at the same time will afford enormous protection to those people living in the low-lying areas of the Torrens Valley, where the potential for flooding is very significant and where the enormous damage that could be done in the event of a one in 200 years flood would be quite devastating.

As I say, it is a magnificent project and it is a pity that the time has to be extended to the end of 1989—but so be it. When the project is completed and the development of the linear park and the trees that have already been planted reach full maturity, it will be a valuable resource to South Australia and certainly a great attraction for many people. The Opposition supports the amending legislation.

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): I cannot let the opportunity pass by without rising and echoing the comments of the member for Chaffey for the magnificent work that has been done along the River Torrens, both as a linear park and as a flood mitigation scheme. I always thought that both the linear park and the flood mitigation scheme had bipartisan support in this House even when the legislation was introduced on the first occasion and I do not wish to lay any claim to it being a Labor Government initiative. The legislation had the support of both Parties in the House, because it was of considerable benefit to the community of Adelaide right along the banks of the river. The scheme provides protection to the community against the possibility of a 100-year flood combining with a very high tide and it also provides the amenity of a linear park.

I would like to express my support for the work that has been undertaken along the river by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and by the various contractors who have been engaged in both the flood mitigation and the linear park work, including Land Systems, whose work on the landscaping has been absolutely magnificent. I also

pay a tribute to the various councils right along the length of the river from the Hills to the sea. Those councils have an enormous amount of earthworks and have made a considerable effort in contributing to the enhancement of the river and providing protection to the people living adjacent to it.

As the member for Chaffey indicated, it will be one of the enduring monuments of 1986 as a bequest, if you like, to the future generations of South Australia; it will be a park that will give pleasure to many future generations. The park is already giving an enormous amount of enjoyment to those people who are fortunate enough to live close to the sections that have already been completed.

The recent heavy rains over the past few months have shown just how valuable the flood mitigation side of the arrangements have been. Further, it has been demonstrated that large numbers of people want to use such a park, particularly on weekends. I support the Bill. I again pay a tribute to all those people who have been involved in its design and implementation. I acknowledge that people were expecting it to be completed by the end of 1986. However, that will not be the case and this is simply an enabling Bill to ensure that the work remaining to be done can be undertaken under the general aegis of the powers in the original Bill.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the Bill. I am disappointed that we were unable to achieve the goal that was set by the Tonkin Government and that the development must be extended until 1989. However, there is no doubt that the completed park will stand as a monument to the Tonkin Government and its foresight in commencing the development and seeking to ensure that our State's heritage is enhanced and maintained as it should be, which I hope will be the case with future generations. I have one or two reservations. I believe that within parts of the development more opportunities could have been provided for horse riding activity. That has not been done but we must consider this aspect in metropolitan Adelaide, because horse riding is a healthy form of recreation. It might be expensive, but many people in the community realise the benefits that this activity can provide for families, whether the family owns a horse or leases it from someone else. It is a pastime that all members of the family can enjoy, if not all their lives at least during the younger part of their lives. So, that was an opportunity that perhaps we did not grasp; perhaps the issue was not promoted as strongly as it should have been at the time by interested parties. Now there is a greater emphasis on horseriding as a healthy recreational sport and the decision makers are now more aware of this.

Another aspect of the development is that I believe we could have planted areas of gums that could have been used for fuel in the future. They could have been planted, harvested later and then more trees could have been planted. That could have provided a source of fuel for residents of the inner metropolitan area. Local councils could have assumed control for those plantings and the maintenance as well as further planting and harvesting. Thus, fuel would have been available for disadvantaged people in the community. Knowing the human race, I point out that there are always some who are not as fortunate as others, and this applies particularly to the aged. Other forms of fuel are becoming expensive and wood may be cheaper than other fuels that become available in future.

I make these comments as a person who represents those in the area through which the other major Adelaide stream travels, that is, the Sturt River or creek, depending on your interpretation. In relation to the Sturt River, we did not

show the necessary foresight and a concrete drain was constructed. I hope that when the River Torrens project is completed the decision makers of the day, or even before that, will appreciate the benefit of planting vegetation along the Sturt River, particularly the reserves that belong to councils or the Government. Plantations of eucalypts could be used for fuel in homes while other stands could be left there permanently to enhance the environment. Such vegetation can make use of the water that causes some problems during the winter months when it lies around for a considerable time, while in summer it is confined mainly to the underground aquifers. Also, perhaps some way of getting away from the concrete drain structure that now exists could be considered. At the moment all the waste in the Sturt River is deposited in the Patawalonga and this concerns people in that area. However, if water meadows were used, a lot of that material would remain on the level meadow areas and be more easily collected when the creek level subsided. There would not be the build-up that we now have at one point which very often rots and pollutes the water in the Patawalonga. Once the material gets into the Patawalonga it remains there permanently, whereas if it was collected on the fringes further up by shrubs and trees it would be held there and more easily collected in terms of manpower and costs. I commend the Tonkin Government, the present Government and the local government bodies involved for the ongoing development and enhancement of the River Torrens. However, I think that the aspects that I have mentioned should be considered for the future.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): As the Bill comes out of Committee, which of course is precisely as it went into it, I take this opportunity to indicate that I believe this project has added greatly to the amenity of the city of Adelaide and indeed the parts of the metropolitan area in which the Torrens valley is situated. I express gratitude on behalf of my constituents, that is, the constituents of the old electorate of Coles. The flood mitigation development has saved a great many people living at Athelstone, Paradise and Newton from extreme worry about the prospect of being flooded, that worry having now been very substantially reduced.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 August. Page 300.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the Bill.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I want to raise one or two matters in relation to this Bill. First, I refer to the principle of allowing public servants to delegate their authority. In my judgment it is a very bad principle for any Government or Parliament to allow (that is, to pass) a law that stipulates that public servants have certain authority, when that authority should be vested in the Minister. The Minister is answerable to the Parliament and is thus responsible for the actions of his departmental officers and can withdraw the authority vested in them. The Parliament has, in my view foolishly, passed

the Clean Air Act and has allowed in it the provision that the Director-General has certain discretion, but that does not mean that on this occasion or on any other occasion we should give away the authority of this Parliament. We are the ones who are elected and who must answer to people in the community—not the public servants. It is very bad and we should not continue to go down that road.

We all know that within a bureaucracy departmental officers can make very bad decisions; they can become arrogant and it is the public who then miss out. We could all quote classic examples of this. We have too many departments and too many officers with this sort of authority. There are too many boards and too much bureaucracy. I have had discussions with the Minister already about a case in my electorate in relation to which an officer had made a draconian decision which had detrimental effects on employment opportunities. Once these decisions are made it is difficult to get them reversed. However, if it is a ministerial decision, there is no problem. But the situation becomes difficult with large bureaucracies, like those that the Deputy Premier administers. There are many departments, and I do not know how, in wearing so many hats, he copes with the paper work involved.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: The Minister administers many departments and has many officers making decisions on his behalf, and it is easy for a Minister to just hand over this authority. It prevents a bit of paper going over his desk. If we reach the point where we are trying to simplify things just for the convenience of a Minister, that is a very bad principle. My concern as a member of Parliament has always been that Parliament ought to be supreme.

If we do not like the Government, we get rid of it and elect the Government that will carry out the wishes of the people. What is required is not Acts of this nature with this sort of provision: we should be scrutinising all these Acts and making sure these sorts of provisions do not apply. If Ministers are overloaded, we ought to start getting rid of unnecessary departments, boards, committees and other statutory authorities, and I hope in the next few weeks to bring in legislation that will help in that process.

I do not want to unduly delay the sitting of this House this afternoon, but I strongly object to these sorts of provisions, because we all know that when we give certain people a little bit of authority, it goes to their head. We know what sorts of terrible predicaments the people of this State find themselves in because they are not game to stand up to some of these little dictators who are racing around the country—and the State Planning Authority would have to be the classic example. I make no apology whatsoever for saying that. I want to put on public record that I am opposed to these sorts of provisions, because they are dangerous.

Members can smile and say 'he is making wild allegations', but they should just talk to some of the people who are affected by the sorts of actions which we all have brought to our attention on a daily basis. Many public servants know they can get away with it, because they say to people, 'Look: we have these powers under the Act. If you object, the penalty is so and so.' I always enjoy it when they say that to me, because what these people do not realise is that they really need to be mentioned on the floor of the House.

I could cite a number of cases to further the points I am making. I will not do that today, but I just point out to the Minister that I hope we do not have any more of this sort of legislation, because it is absolutely wrong in principle

and its effects are far-reaching. This House ought to protect its rights and privileges so they can act in the best interests of the people of this State. They should not hand over that authority to public servants who are not answerable because they are protected. They are like bronze-winged pigeons: they are protected, unfortunately. If they were not protected, or if some of them were on contract or did not come under this life tenure system, they would be a little more discreet in dealing with the public. I wanted to put on record those comments. I could comment further, but I do not think it would serve a useful purpose. I hope this is the last of this sort of legislation.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I am pleased to be following the member for Eyre. I think he is right in much of what he said, because we are talking about delegation, particularly in regard to this legislation. I represent an electorate which faces many problems with policing of clean air, and I agree with what the member for Eyre says. The problem is that the Minister really cannot do much about it. If I bring up a matter here, if I complain and protest about a situation (and my opinion is the same as that of the member for Eyre), I believe that the Minister should be responsible. He is the elected representative in this House and he is the Minister responsible for looking after that area. What the member for Eyre says about public servants is right, too.

Under previous legislation we have vested this authority in a Director-General, and we cannot delete it at this stage. But there is a problem and I agree that we must consider the situation in the future. There was a problem with air pollution in my district recently. When we talk about delegation, who the hell do we go to? That is the problem. If we are to delegate responsibility, terrific, but for God's sake, we should give it to someone we can call at 8 o'clock any week night when there is a problem. Who do we get on to?

An honourable member: The Minister.

Mr PETERSON: The Minister has no responsibility; the Director-General has it. Tell me where the Director-General is at 8 o'clock at night! They are just not contactable. The situation is wrong. The people of this State have the right to be protected by the legislation we pass; thus there must be someone who is responsible and answerable. But we cannot do that. I refer to a recent incident: the Premier was on a talk-back radio program and a constituent rang me and I said, 'I am sorry, it is 8 o'clock at night. You just will not find public servants after dark. They are just not available to come down to look at the problem.' The problem related to an odour or something in the air. I still do not know what it was.

An honourable member: Try after 4 o'clock.

Mr PETERSON: We have a chance then: we certainly have no chance at 8 o'clock at night. The constituent said, 'The Premier is on the radio: I will ring the radio station.' She rang the radio station and said something along the lines of 'Mr Bannon, we have a problem down here with air pollution and we cannot get anybody to look at it.' He said, 'You cannot get anybody to look at it? What do you mean? It is their job to look after it.' She said, 'We cannot find anybody at all at this time of the night to come and see what the problem is.' He said, 'I will look into it'—the mirror. I have heard nothing and my constituent has heard nothing.

An honourable member: They are still looking.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, still looking. So, there are problems. As the previous speaker said, we are responsible to the electorate. People come to us. If we cannot go to anyone who is answerable and who will respond to our requests, I ask the Minister to tell me, on behalf of my constituents,

to whom can we go? If we have to delegate authority, it should be delegated to someone who can be contacted and from whom we can get action.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Most people think that the local member has that power, but in that sense we do not and in many situations—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Perhaps we should change the Act.

Mr PETERSON: That might be a step, too. Perhaps we can bring the responsibility back to the Minister. That might be an amendment we could consider in private members' time. In my electorate in particular—and I am sure that others have the problem—there are ongoing problems, such as industrial problems, problems with discharges, and noise problems as well—and we just cannot get anyone to police them.

I ask the Minister, when he responds, to please give me some answer for my constituents: he should tell me about someone I can contact from whom I can get action—not from nine to five (although that is difficult enough) but outside those hours and on weekends, because that is when we need problems fixed, when we need to contact someone who is responsible to come and give us an answer.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I suppose that those who have worked closely with me within the Party know that I also have an objection to this practice, but I have not been quite as vocal in this area as has the member for Eyre, although I hold the view just as strongly as he does, according to a similar principle and basis. From where I sit at the moment, I have no alternative but to say that I oppose the proposition. I do not oppose the proposition in total, because there may be some areas where we pass an Act of Parliament but do not realise how binding it is on all the decisions being made by the Minister. Quite logically, there might be some decisions a Director-General might be able to pass down the line from his portfolio.

Quite often the law we make is binding on the Minister or, in this case, the Director-General—perhaps it is too binding. The opportunity to delegate power in the right areas is not given. A Minister of the Crown can stand up and tell us that he wants this power to delegate responsibilities to be given to the Director-General, and that we should trust the Minister of the day. That is all right if we know who the Minister will be in the future, but we do not know that.

In passing laws we have learnt the lesson that promises cannot be kept by the successors. We know that from our Standing Orders: the times during which members may ask questions have been changed. Promises are not kept by subsequent members elected to Parliament, because they did not give the promise. They may belong to a political organisation, and people expect that organisation to keep the promise, but that is not the point. The organisation does not give the promise and, in this case, neither the Australian Labor Party nor the Minister can guarantee that the promise will be kept. The Minister might get up and say, 'They just want the Director-General to be able to delegate this power or that power.' A future Minister might be a lazy Minister or might not be a bright Minister. There might be a semi-dictator as the Director-General: he might go to the Minister, keep on bouncing the table and say 'I want that power to delegate this particular authority.' And if the Minister is weak (and there have been weak Ministers in all Governments), a strong Director-General can get power that a Parliament never expected and never intended that person to have. So when we make this move, that is what

we are doing. I have not really had a lot of trouble with the people who administer the Clean Air Act.

In fact, I have had nothing but cooperation from those people. I do not say that I have always agreed with their decisions, at all, but I have always received cooperation from them. I put to the Minister that I do not support one power that can be delegated down the line; the power, for instance, for a Director-General to say that it is embarrassing for him to make a decision about who should be prosecuted after he has issued warnings to a so-called offender and that therefore he would like to delegate the matter to an officer down the line to make a final decision about who is prosecuted after the necessary warnings have been given, and if those warnings were suitable ones. If this involves areas of straight-out negligent pollution, then that is difficult.

It appears that a matter can now be delegated down the line to an inspector who might perhaps develop a personality conflict with an offender who is also aggro and who in a fit of temper has told the officer where to go. The officer might think that he will fix the person by not giving the usual warning, which is often the case with this sort of regulatory law. The inspector might think to himself that he will charge the person immediately, just because of that clash of personalities.

If that sort of power is passed down the line that will be very dangerous. Clause 2 of the Bill states:

Section 55 of the principal Act is amended by striking out subsection (2) and substituting the following subsection:

(2) The Director-General may, with the approval of the Minister, delegate to any officer of the Department any of the powers, functions, duties and responsibilities vested in, imposed upon or delegated to, the Director-General under this Act.

In fact, if the Director-General wants to pass responsibility down the line so as to have an easy time, and the Minister is weak, there could be 10 people down the line with the same power as the Director-General—it is as cold and as hard as that.

I would not mind if there was an amendment to the Act which included making it obligatory upon the Minister to inform the Parliament that he intended to give the Director-General authority to delegate certain powers. Surely that is the proper way to attack the matter, if the Parliament is to be responsible to the people. People elect parliamentarians to ensure that they make laws to protect them as individuals and to protect them from any aggravation from a person who wishes to get stuck into them just to show their authority. We know that happens.

Once a charge is laid it is very difficult for an individual to win. Even if an individual wins a point of law he loses by being out of pocket, because the cost of legal advice today is very high. If a person believes that they are right in principle and fight to prove it, a charge from which the penalty is a fine of \$100, by the time they pay court costs to defend it, it could cost them \$200 or \$300 just because they fought the delegated power which somebody possessed and which the Parliament never intended them to possess.

There is nothing in this amendment to suggest that the Minister of the day should inform the Parliament that he has given an opportunity to the Director-General to delegate certain powers to a lower ranking officer. The Bill does not stipulate that it is a person at the next level to the Director-General—it can be bestowed on a person of the lowest status possible in order of seniority in the department. I can do nothing but vote against this amendment. On principle, however, if there was an attachment saying that the Minister must advise the Parliament of what powers the Director-General was allowed to delegate, and if the Parliament had an opportunity to debate that matter, then I would

have no argument with it. However, that proviso does not exist, so I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I am really amazed! I exclude the member for Coles from what I am about to say, because I know that she has read the Bill and the parent Act and knows what we are doing here. However, I seriously question whether the members for Eyre and Davenport understand what we are doing here. We are correcting a mistake that was made when the Bill which set up the 1984 Act went through this Chamber: that is all that we are doing. If the member for Davenport, for example, were to read section 55 of the parent Act he would see that subsection (2) states:

The Director-General may, with the approval of the Minister, delegate to any officer of the Department any of the powers, functions, duties and responsibilities vested in or imposed upon the Director-General under this Act.

What we are adding here are the words 'delegated to'. Without those words it is not possible for the Act to function effectively.

Honourable members say that we do not know what may be delegated here, and that we do not know what are the limits to the powers that would be exercised by these people. I simply invite honourable members to look at the parent Act. They have already, by statute, circumscribed the powers of my officers. Honourable members should read section 53 of the parent Act in detail, in particular, the saving clauses, which relate to controls under the terms and conditions of breaking and entering. If they were to look at section 40 of the parent Act they would see in the margin:

Minister may cause work to be done where any notice or order is not complied with.

In fact, if we worked right through the parent Act we would find that this place, in its wisdom, has already circumscribed the freedom, if you like, of my officers to undertake certain things in the furtherance of this legislation.

I believe that the member for Eyre was outrageous in what he said about public servants. Public servants, for the most part, are people who are faithfully carrying out their statutory functions. If we want to proscribe certain of those responsibilities, then we look to the Statutes and do something about it. If we want to enlarge those responsibilities, we look to the Statutes and do something about it. Where a public servant exceeds his or her authority, there are various remedies available to the average citizen. The member for Eyre, in relation to that matter, which he did not canvass in any detail as he would have been out of order, has already illustrated that there is no recourse available to him, otherwise why was he bothering to talk to me about it as Minister if I was powerless to control the activities of my officers in relation to that particular matter?

That matter related to an area of environmental control which is not dissimilar in many respects from the clean air concerns addressed by this legislation. I give honourable members an assurance that, where they are satisfied that the operations of the legislation to date have not been unsatisfactory, nothing we are doing here will in any way disturb that happy picture; rather, we are doing what I thought we were doing when the Bill to create this Act passed in 1984. I commend the legislation to honourable members.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Delegation by Minister and Director-General.'

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister inform me, in relation to delegation of responsibility, whether there is somebody with delegated power to police the Act after hours?

The Hon. D.J.HOPGOOD: I apologise to the member for Semaphore. Although I had noted the point that he raised, I overlooked it in my remarks on the second reading debate. In a sense, the point raised by the honourable member is the reverse side of the coin to that raised by the member for Eyre, who seemed to think that what we had to do was to tie down public servants as much as possible in their capacity to police the provisions of the legislation effectively. I take it that the member for Semaphore, representing an industrial area and wishing to have these powers exercised from time to time in relation to problems referred to him, wants to know which officers to contact so that they can exercise all their proper responsibilities and functions under the legislation. Indeed he would be most unhappy if we were to circumscribe too severely those powers and responsibilities of public servants.

There is a chain of responsibility down the department. Under me as Minister there is the Director-General (Dr McPhail). Then, the Director of the Pollution Management Division is Dr Geoff Inglis, and under him Mr Alec Smith is in charge of the Clean Air Section. It would seem that in most circumstances Mr Smith would be the appropriate gentleman to contact. If the honourable member wants more specific information, I shall give it to him outside the Chamber.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

NORTH HAVEN (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 13 August. Page 301.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): The Opposition supports this Bill, which is the second amending Bill to facilitate the transfer of the responsibilities of the North Haven Trust, which was established as the result of an indenture between the South Australian Government and the Australian Mutual Provident Society, to Gulf Point Marina, which purchased land from the society. The whole project has been interesting for metropolitan Adelaide in a planning sense and the further it proceeds the more advantageous it becomes in such a sense. I say that, having attended the launching of Gulf Point Marina, I believe in March 1985, and having viewed the models of what was proposed for the development at Gulf Point.

My interest was especially caught on that occasion by the medium density waterfront development which was proposed and which will ultimately lead to an even more pleasing development with a fairly high density population from the point of view of metropolitan Adelaide development with all the benefits of space and waterfront views. Gulf Point Marina is to be very much commended for the way in which it has tackled development in the area. The first task confronting it was the sorting out of soil problems. What needed to be done was an effective reconstruction of the soil, eliminating seaweed and organic matter in order to make it suitable for subdivision.

In March 1985, the subdivision was put on the market and 75 of the 87 allotments had been sold by the end of last year. The company then proceeded to subdivide an additional 80 allotments at the northern stage of the development, closer to Outer Harbor, and 56 of those allotments are now on the market. When Gulf Point Marina took over from the North Haven Trust originally, of the 260 moorings

in the marina some were vacant. Those moorings are now fully booked and I understand that the company is proceeding to construct additional moorings.

I wonder whether all South Australians realise that we have at Gulf Point a marina of exceptionally high quality by world standards. In 1982, when I undertook a ministerial study tour as Minister of Health and Minister of Tourism, I visited some European and North American cities. Nowhere did I see a marina that could approach Gulf Point in quality and facilities for boat users. As a former user of that marina, both under the management of the North Haven Trust and, more recently, under its present management, I found it a pleasure to use. The facilities there are excellent and the staff extremely helpful. The whole project gives great amenity to South Australian boat users and also to the tourism industry.

Some of the cruise yachts that are leased by charter are based at the southern end of the marina and any visitor who wants to lease a cruise yacht cannot but be impressed by the facilities, the general view and the safety. Indeed, the whole experience is an extremely pleasant one. In Committee, I shall ask questions, as a matter of interest, about the timing of the repeal of the North Haven Trust Act and other machinery matters. In the meantime, on behalf of the Opposition I support the Bill and commend all those involved in the project from its commencement until now. Further, I certainly wish Gulf Point Marina well in its continuing management of what is I believe a valuable and imaginative project.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): In speaking briefly, I support what has already been said by my colleague the member for Coles. I was the Minister responsible when it was decided to invite private sector interests into the future development of North Haven. That move was made only after great consideration: it was not treated lightly. We sought considerable advice and I had much support from people whom I consulted regarding the way in which the transfer should be made.

Although it is not appropriate for me in this place to refer to many people, I wish to refer to a couple. First, I commend the work of Mr Robin Wright, who did a splendid job in the high office that he held in respect of the North Haven redevelopment. He was there from the start; he guided it through; and now he has gone on to the private sector. Mr Wright is to be commended for his input.

I also refer to the past Chairman of the North Haven Trust, Mr Murray Downer, who I am sure treated North Haven as one of his babies. He gave it a lot of attention. He was always ready, along with other members of the trust, to discuss matters of import. He did much to make sure that North Haven was the success that it has proven to be. I also refer to the significant involvement of the AMP Society. Altogether, it was a very pleasing project with which to be associated. I had the opportunity as Minister, and previous to that and since, to visit North Haven on many occasions, and I always found it an enjoyable experience. It was a privilege to be associated with it, and I join with my colleague the member for Coles in wishing those behind Gulf Point Marina every success. It started out the right way, and I am sure that all those associated with it have a considerable amount of experience now that it has been going for a period of time. They can now build on that. I commend those people in particular for the sterling work they did and the support they gave to ensure that what is now Gulf Point Marina is one of the greatest assets, I suggest, that South Australia has.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I support the comments of the two previous speakers. I have known the area all my life and I know of the involvement of the two previous speakers as Ministers.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Stinking seaweed.

Mr PETERSON: The honourable member can also remember back that far. I have a knowledge of the area right back before anyone thought about developing it. I also support what has been said, and I support the development. We now have what is undoubtedly a world class facility. The transfer was appropriate. I do not think that there is a doubt in anyone's mind that the development would never have occurred unless the transfer was negotiated. The development has proceeded fairly quickly since then.

The North Haven Harbor Development has been a long time coming—about 14 years. However, it is still not really where it should be. It has taken a long time to develop it. There have been many problems, and one was with the soil. To my knowledge there were 10 or 12 different concepts on how the project should have been developed. At one stage it was going to be an island, but that was rejected. The project was dug out and then filled in. It has been a long time coming, but it is a world class facility. The boating facilities are top quality. In fact, there is no complaint at all. The only long-term problem is that it is not big enough. That is the real problem.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Have you got your boat in?

Mr PETERSON: No, I do not berth it there. I am an associate member of the CYC, which is a great club. The spirit of the whole development is that of a top class facility: overall, there is nothing about it to criticise. I fully support the member for Heysen's comments about Robin Wright and Murray Downer. I knew them both well when they were working on this project. Certainly, their enthusiasm, involvement and encouragement made the project happen. I support what has been said about them.

I have a couple of concerns about the transfer. Certain restrictions were placed on development in the area in relation to height, the type of structure that could be built and whether it was commercial or residential. What will happen to the area south of the road to the boat ramp between the breakwater and that road when the trust is no longer responsible? What will be the rights of the Coast Guard, which is established down on the ramp? There could be development of a section to the south of the breakwater. There is a space of some 100 to 200 metres to the south of the breakwater that is lying idle at this stage.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: What's happened about the life-savers?

Mr PETERSON: That is a wonderful set-up. When the project was first set up, it caused a problem for the life-savers, as the honourable member remembers. There was a problem with seaweed build-up to the south of the breakwater. The member was helpful in overcoming that problem and I thank him for that assistance.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: They made me a life member so, of course, I am happy. I wonder whether that is a fringe benefit. I do not think so. I wish to make a couple of other points. The future of the golf course at this stage is in the hands of the Minister. That is also linked to a stretch of land which is under the care and control of the Minister of Marine.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Have they found the golf ball I hit to open the development?

Mr PETERSON: No, that went to sea, that is, after the member hit it: he took 10 shots to hit it. What of the future? Will the restrictions remain? I am sure that during the

Committee stage the Minister will be quite prepared to answer those questions because they are of concern to people in the area. Unfortunately, the residential aspect of the development is held up because of the economic climate. It is a world class development.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: If I had the money, I would buy a block. It is a great place in which to live and, of course, it has added to the electorate. It has made Semaphore, as an electorate, a better place. There are now talks of building a marina development at Port Hughes and there are plans for Porter Bay at Port Lincoln.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: It is a wonderful policy. Port Hughes and Porter Bay might not have gone ahead if it had not been for the successful development at North Haven. During the Committee stage I will put specific questions to the Minister.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I will be brief. I was fortunate, or otherwise, to be a member of the select committee that first investigated the development. I think it is now fitting, when I hear the praise for the project, that I point out that when the project was promoted the environmentalists attacked it very strongly. The environmentalists wanted to stop it. One person appeared before the select committee with a small goanna in a bag. He used that as evidence of the species that lived in the area. The member for part of the area, the Hon. Paddy Ryan, challenged the witness about where he obtained the reptile and the witness admitted that he caught it at St Kilda. It was an example of the traditional species of reptile that lived in that area before the arrival of the white man. I do not know how the witness knew that. To top it off, another witness appeared with a three foot snake which he tipped on to the floor to show the select committee another type of reptile that lived in the area. The Hon. Paddy Ryan suggested that he knew one way of getting rid of it, but the witness could not get it back into the bag. That is an example of the sort of pressures brought to bear on the select committee, members and Parliament to try and stop the development from going ahead.

There were photographs of birds, names of birds, names of bushes, and comments made that it was similar to the mangrove swamp areas in the north arm of the Port River. I raise that matter as an example of the expense environmentalists sometimes put a State to. As much as they have a right to put their point, they bent the truth a little at that time when trying to put their point. I have not heard one member in the debate speak against the North Haven Trust project. It has been all praise.

I laud what has taken place, as it is now a more beautiful area. I have no doubt that some birds, as well as reptiles, were disturbed in their native habitat, but with the development that took place in the housing area some of the birds that had traditionally been there returned to the area. So there has been a regeneration, if you like, of the native life.

As far as the boating facility is concerned, I have to admit that the AMP did not achieve what we thought it would achieve, and there were some problems—there were years when the economy was not running well. I therefore praise the Minister of the day, and others, who negotiated to have a trust set up. However, there are some questions I would like to ask the Minister, and I give warning now so that he has time to collect his thoughts. Under the Bill we are going to exempt Gulf Point Marina Pty Limited from certain Government charges, and I know that exemption can be

stopped at any time by this measure, because it is not a permanent provision. I would like an indication of how much per year we are allowing that company by way of those exemptions. It is only fair that the taxpayer has an indication of what sort of money we are saying the State is prepared to forgo in providing a facility which in the end will return some monetary amount to the organisation.

As I do not recollect receiving a full explanation, we need to have an indication of who is involved in Gulf Point Marina Pty Limited; in other words, is it just a club or are certain business interests involved? I hope I am not showing my ignorance here, but I think we should be told, and the Minister can do that in winding up this debate or in Committee. I support what is in the Bill if it will give an opportunity to further enhance that area. Therefore, if the Minister can reply to those points, it would be appreciated.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I would like to thank members for the consideration they have given to this measure and to echo some of the points made by members about the success of the venture.

In relation to the points made by the member for Davenport, I must say that I think it is not inconsistent for people to be concerned on the one hand, about the environmental impact of urban development but, on the other hand, to congratulate the developers later in the day in relation to the development itself, because in a sense different criteria are applied. We know that when we transfer a certain natural area into an urban development there are criteria which will be applied as to the nature of that urban development once we have seen it established. It is a development that may be more or less aesthetically pleasing; it may be more or less efficient; it may be more or less humane in the way in which, as an area, it treats the people—how it protects them against traffic flow and how easy it is for them to have access to the sort of services they require.

None of that, nor the confident expectation that all of that will be achieved, necessarily sets aside the importance of ensuring that environmental impacts are properly investigated at the time when the matter is first raised. Certainly there are those people who represent that thrust who go overboard in the way in which they represent the point of view they are trying to make, but that does not absolve people of moderate opinion from the responsibility they have in these circumstances to thoroughly investigate environmental impact when a project such as this is initiated.

In relation to those other projects to which reference has been made during this debate, of course, that environmental impact process and assessment is, at whatever level is prescribed by the legislation, very important indeed. I commend the legislation to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Repeal of North Haven Trust Act and distribution of property, etc., of the North Haven Trust.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Would the Minister advise the Committee of the anticipated timetable for the repeal of the North Haven Trust Act and implementation of the various other provisions?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I would anticipate between 12 and 18 months time would be the timetable we are currently looking at. I shall endeavour to refine that as we go along and keep the honourable member informed.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'Exemption of parts of prescribed land from certain rates.'

Mr PETERSON: As I mentioned in the second reading debate, there are a couple of questions I would like to ask the Minister. At certain stages of the development there have been restrictions on the type of development allowed in the North Haven Trust area. With this reallocation of responsibility to the buyer (probably Gulf Point Marina Pty Limited), will those restrictions be retained? I am referring to the area south of the southern breakwater, the area between the boat ramp road and the breakwater, which is now open land with certain restrictions applying, and there is the golf course, where the rights of the Coast Guard are established. If the ownership changes from trust land to private ownership, how will it affect the Coast Guard, the development south of the breakwater to north of the breakwater and the golf course and adjacent land? Will all restrictions be retained?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: What the honourable member raises is a myriad of issues which still have to be resolved although there is a good deal of progress in relation to those issues, and therein lies the 12 or 18 month period to which I have already referred. First of all the honourable member will realise that of course there is provision in this measure for certain areas to continue to be vested in the Crown and, where that seems to be the best procedure for ensuring the continued rights of occupancy of those people who are involved in particular activities there, then that will probably be the outcome.

I would assume that vesting in the Port Adelaide council would also be another way of ensuring that that activity could continue. So there is still the matter of the pattern of landholding—the division of responsibility between private property, local government land and Crown land—which still has to be finalised, although I am given to understand that there has been a good deal of discussion and agreement about these points.

The second point that the honourable member raises is irrespective of land tenure, and that is the planning provisions—the development control provisions—which will apply. As I understand it, the Port Adelaide corporation would, on the repeal of this legislation, undertake the role normally set down in the Planning Act for local government; that is to say, it would become the development control authority. What must be ensured in that process is that the plan for that area should reflect the present planning prescriptions set down in the indenture and the legislation.

So, I can give the honourable member the assurance that the reasonable expectation of the local people that the planning prescriptions as they apply to the area at present will be secured by an appropriate supplementary development plan, which will ensure that the general policy that will be required by the Port Adelaide Council so far as development control is concerned and which is not dissimilar to that which has existed under the conditions of the indenture.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I understand that the North Haven Trust is responsible for rates and taxes for the land that it sold to Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd and that this Bill will exempt payments of the applicable land tax, sewer or water rates. Will the Minister indicate what benefit is being provided by Parliament's accepting the proposition that the Minister has before the Committee?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I cannot put a figure on it at this stage and I apologise to the honourable member for that. I will endeavour to get the information for him. The second reading explanation referred to the background to this matter, as follows:

The North Haven Trust, as part of the agreement of sale to Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd, undertook to use its best endeavours to ensure that the area of water which is owned by Gulf Point

Marina Pty Ltd is never assessed or rated in respect of land tax, sewer rates or water rates.

I shall refer to that matter first. There is an argument that, in effect, the public is not forgoing any revenue by that measure because it is possible that it may never have been subject to an assessment or rating, anyway. So, the honourable member's assessment comes down to the second part of that explanation, which states:

... and that any land owned by Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd would not be assessed or rated likewise until such land is connected to both sewer and water mains or until the expiration of a period of eight years from the date of the settlement of the deed of sale on 31 August 1983, whichever shall first occur.

It further states:

The North Haven Trust is liable to the payment of any amount so assessed or rated contrary to the provisions of the agreement of sale.

As I have said, I will have to get the information requested by the honourable member. He would be aware that the land was sold for \$6 million, of which 800 000, as I recall, was the component of the sale to the Cruising Yacht Club. The land would be worth far more than that now, but I would caution the honourable member against trying to do the calculations: I certainly would not do it without getting expert advice as to what we might be looking at. So, I cannot give that information now, but I shall endeavour to get it.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I understand the Minister's difficulty in not having the figures available. I know that land tax is more complicated, because the amount of land tax that one pays is dependent on how much land is registered in an individual's name; in other words, the more land that one has the more tax one pays. I understand that, but an estimation would be appreciated, which can be provided by way of letter or during the debate in the other place. I show ignorance in not knowing who, in the main, makes up the consortium of the Gulf Point Marina. Can the Minister disclose that information? I believe that there is some benefit in having those sorts of things recorded in *Hansard*, when there is a substantial amount of public money involved in the concessions that are given.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have to confess that I do not have names. I have no objection to divulging the names. I have not had a lot of contact with these people, although I can recall meeting various gentlemen associated with the whole project, particularly at the time of signing the sales agreement. I will have to obtain the information sought by the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

One vital piece of information omitted from my second reading summary was that Mr Robin Wright, who has drawn the deserved praise from honourable members in relation to this matter, was a pupil of mine at LeFevre Boys Technical High School and, in fact, topped the class.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROADS (OPENING AND CLOSING) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 August. Page 387.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition supports this minor Bill, which sets out to reduce from 21 metres to 20 metres

the minimum width of any extension of any main road under the Act. I understand that the Commissioner of Highways already operates on that particular width and this amendment brings the minimum width into line with the 66 feet (the old 1 chain), which used to be the minimum width of the road. The Opposition can see no problems whatsoever with this measure and, accordingly, I do not believe that it is necessary to take up any further time of the House. We indicate our support for the second reading.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I want to raise with the Minister a sensible proposition. I agree with what the Minister is doing, but I am sure that the Minister would be aware of the long delays involved in trying to get parts of old unused roads transferred to other ownership, whether local government or individuals, where councils have agreed, and the long delays in getting a public opinion before action can be taken to close a road and, further, how expensive delays of some months can be for local people and councils involved in matters associated with a development area.

I think that it can take up to nine months to negotiate the closing of a road or part of a road. I am not sure whether the opening process is anywhere near that time. In supporting this Bill, I just ask the Minister whether he will have his departmental officers look at whether there is any way of speeding up the process and avoiding the long time delays and costing delays that take place at the moment through the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, in particular in relation to closing roads. I support the Bill.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands): I thank the Opposition for supporting the Bill and agreeing that Government policy on this matter be uniform, and that the principal Act be amended accordingly. There is no cost involved—not beyond the current funding set aside for the administration of the Act and, of course, there is no effect on staffing levels currently provided under the Act. I am not sure whether or not the question raised by the member for Davenport lies more within the area of the Minister of Transport, especially in regard to those roads owned by local government or the Highways Department, but I will certainly take into account his comments in relation to trying to speed up the process of the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act. I do not think it is necessary to say any more. The Bill has been supported all round, and I will follow up that matter.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ANALYSTS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 August. Page 390.)

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): I rise to support the Bill on behalf of the Opposition. It is a very straightforward piece of legislation. We recognise that the analysis methods that are currently used need to be changed and we support any move that enables analysis by Government laboratories to be done in a more efficient way. We understand that there will be far more flexibility as far as the main people within the laboratories are concerned, and we support that move.

The only area of concern I have is that it is mentioned in the second reading explanation that it will be considerably cost effective, and I would like the Minister to explain that. There are a couple of questions I would like to ask on specific clauses when we come to the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time.
In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Amendment of Agricultural Chemicals Act 1955.'

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I noted the point made by the honourable member during another stage of this debate, when he asked me to explain how the changes would be more cost effective. I should say at the outset that the reason for the change was not simply cost effectiveness, but to provide legislative cover, if you wish, for a practice that had become common place, was very sensible, and had been accepted by the professional people who work within the field: that is, analysts' work was being done under supervision but by technical assistants, and that was a more efficient and effective use of the analysts' time, which can be more expensive than that of other technical people who work under their direction.

Where you have analysts doing work at a higher cost factor than technicians who can do similar work under supervision, but at a cheaper initial cost, that is a cost saving. It enables the operations of the Chemistry Division, within all the Acts covered by this Bill, to be more efficient, and this is in line with the recommendations of the review of Public Service management. What the Government is doing fits into line with their recommendation which has a basic principle of efficiency, effectiveness and cost saving.

So, the reason that the Bill was introduced was to give the protection and the cover for practices that were already being undertaken. Secondly, and this is essentially a by-product of the original intent, it allows efficiencies to be effected. I do not know into what detail I am able to go in explaining those efficiencies. I think I would be limited, but I would be quite happy to get a report for the honourable member if he wanted a more detailed explanation of those efficiencies.

Mr INGERSON: My major reason for asking that question was that the Bill shows that the process is already in train and it seemed a bit odd to be improving the cost effectiveness if efficiencies had already been established. I accept the Minister's answer.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member makes a very good point. I am informed that, although efficiencies have already been put in place, this legislation will let us go a little further with those efficiencies. The point that honourable member makes is correct. On the face of it, I have to accept what he says, but I am informed that further efficiencies are available that this legislation will enable the department to put in place.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Amendment of Controlled Substances Act.'

Mr INGERSON: In this clause there is a deliberate attempt to cut out the word 'botanist' from the Controlled Substances Act. Will the Minister explain why, as my advice from officials in the Health Commission is that they are a little worried about this change of name?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am informed that the word 'analyst' covers all types of professional people in this field, including botanists. I am not aware of the expression of concern mentioned by the honourable member. My department has been working in conjunction with the Health Commission and other departments involved in the preparation of this legislation, so the Health Commission is well aware of our intentions. This is not to say that the honourable member is not relating to the Committee an expression of concern made by a botanist within the Health Commission. My advice is that the word 'analyst' covers all profes-

sions involved in this type of work, so there is no need for botanists to be concerned about this amendment.

Mr INGERSON: In relation to the Controlled Substances Act, can the Minister assure the Committee existing controls over dangerous drugs and psychotropic drugs in the analytical area will be maintained?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Before an analyst is registered his or her qualifications must be provided to the Minister for his approval; that person is then allowed to do this work. The honourable member has the assurance that he seeks, that protections exist in this amendment to the Act.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROSEWORTHY AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 August. Page 190.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): This Bill, together with the South Australian College of Advanced Education Act Amendment Bill and the South Australian Institute of Technology Act Amendment Bill, is part of a package which seeks to introduce consistency in the ways in which the various institutions of higher education in South Australia deal with real property. These Bills bring the three institutions into line with the University of Adelaide and the Flinders University.

The effect will be that these institutions will not be able to sell, mortgage, charge or otherwise dispose of real property except with the consent of the Minister. The only proviso is that the restrictions will not apply where the property is leased for a term not exceeding 21 years at the best rental available.

The practical effect is that, in the case of the South Australian College of Advanced Education, it will be allowed to enter into specified types of leasing arrangements without reference to the Minister, as is presently required; and, in respect of Roseworthy College and the South Australian Institute of Technology, it will remove the present unfettered right to deal in real property and it has this qualification placed upon it.

The Opposition supports the Government's intention, but believes that some further thought can be beneficially given by qualifying the amending Bill to remove from its ambit property that is given to the colleges as a result of a bequest. In other words, the Opposition believes that, whereas property that is purchased with taxpayers' money is properly subject to the consent of the Minister before it is sold, property that is bequeathed by private individuals to the college should be simply within the province of the council of the college to determine what happens to it.

A case can be made for the argument that potential benefactors may be deterred from bequeathing property to the college if they believe that the Government is to have a direct influence on the disposal of such property. Indeed, such potential benefactors may decide to bequeath their property to other worthy causes rather than to educational causes. Therefore, the Opposition foreshadows amendments that will have the effect of qualifying that right in respect of property given to the college other than property given to the college by the Crown. Apart from that, the Opposition supports this Bill and the other Bills that are similar, if not identical, to it.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I make my remarks merely to underline and emphasise the importance that I attach to the final substantive point made by the member for Coles, our spokesperson on this Bill. That point is especially relevant, in my judgment, in the context of Roseworthy Agricultural College which, being over 100 years old, is the oldest agricultural college in the southern hemisphere. Among its old collegians are some substantial and wealthy members of families who have been involved in agriculture in this State for a long time.

The Roseworthy Agricultural College council is no more or no less competent than is the council of the University of Adelaide to decide how to dispose of assets made over to it by any person who, in the course of making a will, wishes to enhance the capacity of the college to continue to perform its role in the way that it sees that role. Such a person would be discouraged from doing so if he or she were to learn that it was possible for the Minister to coerce the college into doing something else, as a trade-off for permission to sell a piece of land, merely because such a piece of land (as might have been left to the college) was found to be less desirable or less appropriate than another parcel of equal value.

Therefore, it is legitimate for the college to feel (as, indeed, the Government should also feel) that it is in the best interests of the college and of the taxpayer to encourage people wishing to bequeath something to the college by leaving the college with the prerogative of saying how it will make best use of the assets left to it. That is the way it is for the council of the University of Adelaide: why cannot it be the same for Roseworthy?

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): In broad terms, I do not disagree with the thrust of what this Bill sets out to do, although I believe certain questions should be asked about it. Some of those questions have been raised by members opposite and I shall raise others. However, before doing so, I wish to refer to my recent visit, with members of this House and another place, to Roseworthy Agricultural College. That visit was made at the invitation of the college and under the auspices of the member for Light who, in his capacity and in his association with the college, took the time and trouble to show members around and acquaint them with the work of the college.

For some years I had intended to visit the college and, having had the opportunity to do so recently on the occasion referred to, I was pleased and impressed with what I found there: with the high standard of academic excellence subsisting at the college; with the interest shown both by the staff and by the students in South Australian agriculture generally; with the enthusiasm of all concerned with their work; and with the efforts of the staff on behalf of their students and in the interests of agriculture across the State.

One example that I draw particular attention to is wheat research programs. It is quite clear that, over many decades—in fact, right back to the 1915-1920 period—the college has been engaged in an extensive wheat research program which has served to improve the quality of that commodity enormously. I would not like to see any steps taken to undermine that position. I know that members of the college council are concerned about the steps that may be taken by the Minister of Agriculture in relation to that issue. Of course, that is a separate matter that I will not persist in raising here. However, I think the House should be aware of the work done at the college and the need to preserve and protect that institution and see that it flourishes in the future. I think much of the State's agricultural economics—our agro-political debate in this State—will certainly revolve

around people who graduate from that college and who have been professionally and personally trained by the staff there to further agriculture in this State.

To return more particularly and more precisely to the terms of the Bill, I raise a number of points in relation to the provisions of the measure as they relate to Roseworthy Agricultural College. If, for example, the college wishes to engage in leasing or licensing to occupy certain parts of the college—and I refer, for example, to student housing, and so on—is the college expected to obtain the best possible rental for its student housing? That is certainly not apparent to me in the clauses of the Bill. I would appreciate it if the Minister would address that.

What I saw at Roseworthy in the way of student housing was most impressive. There is a substantial commitment to that aspect of the work. Being a residential college, that is most important. That type of accommodation could certainly attract a high rental if it was exposed on the open market, but I doubt whether that would be in the best interests of the college; and I doubt that that is what is intended by the Bill. There are, of course, student amenities: in particular, Roseworthy has a community club on site and a number of other facilities which are occupied by the students union. That is a separately incorporated body, and the facilities may not be rented at the best possible rental because of the discount factor involved in the amenities and benefits that these people provide to the college campus as a whole. I would not want to see a situation evolve where the college was forced to actually put a building out to tender or to auction for the lease and thereby disadvantage student groups in respect of either their housing or their amenities. I would appreciate it if the Minister could address those questions and respond accordingly.

The other aspect of that question is that 21 years, in my view, amounts to a very substantial alienation of land and, if it is the case that these institutions are to be allowed to alienate land for that kind of period, what is the rationale behind it? While I can accept that a long-term lease to a student amenity or similar might be reasonable, if it is to be a commercial lease on the best available terms and conditions to a commercial enterprise, what is the purpose of alienating land for that length and period of time, if in fact it is to be strictly a commercial operation? I wonder whether we could have some justification for that because I find that period quite excessive, if in fact it is to be without the consent of the Minister and simply for commercial purposes as distinct from some beneficial internal purpose of the college.

Whilst I can see the benefits in consistency between the various tertiary education institutions, there are some differences between these institutions. Of course, Parliament has already recognised that by providing separate Acts and statutes for each institution. I notice from my previous research that the University of Adelaide Act already contains almost identical provisions, and that university has done reasonably well in terms of its activities.

One prominent example of land which the university has and which it leases out is the Agricultural Research Institution at Clare associated with the magnificent property of Martindale Hall, which was given to the university as the result of a bequest. A very large area of land is associated with Martindale Hall that is used for genuine agricultural production associated with the Waite Agricultural Research Institute. It might well be desirable—and it might even be a condition of the bequest—that that land be leased back to the existing family for the duration of someone's lifetime or for a fixed period of years. The university or other institutions in similar situations, like Roseworthy, may not

wish to extract the maximum possible return, and those things should be addressed as part of the exercise.

The wording is slightly different from that in the University of Adelaide Act, which does appear to give a little more discretion in the case of the university than in the case that is proposed for these three other colleges. If the Minister could address those issues, it would certainly help clear up those ambiguities and perhaps give the House some more information about the proposed measure.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I declare an interest in this matter not only as a past student but also as a person associated with the current council. I acknowledge that no difficulty is felt by the council in relation to the general thrust of the Bill, although the matter which has been raised by my colleagues relating to the disposal of bequeathed land is one which the Minister could well take on board. I make that point, first, in relation to the present Bill, where land can be bequeathed for the use of the college with a genuine retained interest in agriculture. That right might otherwise be lost if the land and the funds were to go into consolidated revenue.

We have seen a similar situation in relation to the Department of Agriculture where a number of parcels of land have in the past been made available to that department. However, by the time of the bequest the circumstances have changed considerably and there is not the same degree of need for the land in that form. I talk of Winkler Estate at Saddleworth, which was to be an experimental station but which was a parcel of land that did not lend itself to that project. However, subsequently the land was sold by general approval of the populace and the funds put to the purpose of agricultural extension elsewhere. From the Winkler Estate a small parcel of land was made available to the community; it could be demonstrated that that was the original intent of the late George Winkler.

We have also had the experience of Sims Farm, and the member for Elizabeth has just mentioned Martindale. Some 10 000 acres, quite apart from Martindale Hall, was made available to the university. In the case of Mundunney at Spalding, quite a large cattle and grain property was made available to the university, and there have been numerous other cases throughout the years.

In the case of Roseworthy, there is a pending bequest of which I am aware. The genuine interest expressed by the person or persons who have made the direction is that it be used for the benefit of students of Roseworthy Agricultural College—the powers that be have accepted that in principle if it does pass over to Roseworthy College it will then be used as student residential property. However, it may be that, with the passage of time and the fact that the building itself is made of old limestone, the cost of maintaining it would be too great and it would then be far better to sell it and use the funds from that for student accommodation either on the college property or adjacent to it.

I think it is the intention of those who make their wills out in such a fashion that the council at the time, having regard to all the historical events leading to the funding becoming available to that institution, determine the sale value. As I have indicated, I am in complete accord with the general thrust. I ask the Minister to recognise that, in justice, the funds or decisions that he should have the direction of are more significantly associated with public funds having been committed, that is, either from the State or Commonwealth areas, to land that is to be sold. The funds generated from such sales become very much a matter for the Minister's approval. I extend the matter one step

further and indicate that in so many educational institutions there is a foundation directly associated with the organisation, with funds coming in from past students or past scholars, and with the likelihood of industry making funds available to the foundation (and the foundation having reasons for existence which are totally in keeping with the best interests of the student body as determined by the council of the day).

I believe that, if purchases had been made by the foundation, albeit that it might bear in part the name of the institution the subject of the legislation—be it Roseworthy, the Institute of Technology, or the South Australian College—the rights of the council of the day to dispose of any sale or to put on to the market any land are quite important in the hands of the institution's governing body. The governing body is not a fly by night group. It does have corporate structure or status. Throughout the years it has shown an ability to act in the best interests of the educational institutions.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I thank honourable members for their contributions to this debate and for the comments they have made. I note in general that support is indicated for the Bill. I also note the foreshadowed amendment to be moved by the Opposition. That will be debated during the Committee stage. The prime motivation behind this Bill and the two Bills that come after it (the South Australian College of Advanced Education Act Amendment Bill and the South Australian Institute of Technology Act Amendment Bill) is, largely, to standardise the operation with respect to the disposal of land by tertiary institutions in South Australia. It will not totally standardise the operation because, in fact, the two universities still end up with a situation that is different from that of the three members of the colleges of advanced education sector.

The situation is that, prior to this, we had a series of different arrangements applying to all tertiary institutions in South Australia. By largely standardising them and bringing them into uniformity as close as possible we believe that we are serving the best interests of those institutions as well as tertiary education generally. The principal difference that now rests between the universities and the CAE sector is that with the universities the Governor's approval is still required. I noted with interest comments that were made with respect to the disposal of property that has been vested in tertiary institutions by means other than Government funds, and I respect the points that have been made. I might say that the propositions that the Government received from two of the CAE sector institutions were at variance on this matter.

The South Australian College of Advanced Education has indicated to the Government that it is entirely happy with the Bill as proposed and it made no comment at all with respect to property vested from private funds. But the South Australian Institute of Technology and Roseworthy Agricultural College had differing views on the matter. Roseworthy submitted a proposition to the Government that maintained that, essentially, it should be able to dispose of property acquired as a result of donations or bequests from non-government sources in an unfettered manner—that, I guess, is in line with the foreshadowed amendment with which we will deal later. The Institute of Technology had a different point of view on this matter. It noted that universities are required to obtain the Governor's consent to deal with real property acquired through private sources. It then went on to say that it believed that that should be the standardised procedure for all tertiary institutions.

I guess that, on balance, the Government's decision has been to come down somewhere in the middle of that. I believe that one could argue that the Institute of Technology's proposal would require more control than presently exists or is proposed in this legislation. The Roseworthy proposal suggests less than what is proposed in this legislation. The Government has come down somewhere in the middle. It is also worthwhile noting that the Government believes that it is very difficult in some cases to determine exactly what is the source of funds for a particular piece of land acquisition in a tertiary institution. There may be some cases where the land itself as a discrete unit has been given by bequest but, where funds have been given to the university and where the university for the purposes of its own activities then acquits certain expenditure activities of the tertiary institution against the bequest funds, it may well be arguable that that is not actually what has happened or that it has not happened without some impact on Government funds. It may well be argued that, if Government funds of a certain order had not been available to an institution during a certain year, the institution would have been unable to use bequest funds for a land purchase. Therefore, one ends up in a very murky area.

On balance, the Government's view was that, basically, there was little complication in expecting all such land divestiture or land changes to be subject to consent of the Minister. In that context, I want to quote the relevant sections of the university Acts, because I believe that they are consistent with the spirit of this, albeit that they require the consent of the Governor and not the consent of the Minister. Section 4 (2) of the University of Adelaide Act provides:

The University is invested with full juristic capacity and unfettered discretion, subject to the law of this State, to conduct its affairs in such manner as it thinks fit, except that the University shall not alienate (otherwise than by way of lease for a term not exceeding 21 years) mortgage or charge any of its real property, without the approval of the Governor, or where such approval has been given, otherwise than in accordance with terms and conditions stipulated by the Governor.

There is no provision there for the separation of property that is the result of bequest, either by deed or by purchase. The situation with the Flinders University Act is the same. Section 3 (4) of that Act provides:

The University shall not alienate, mortgage, charge, or demise any lands, tenements, or hereditaments of the University unless with the approval of the Governor except by way of lease for any term not exceeding 21 years from the time when the lease is made in and by which there is reserved during the whole of the term, the highest rent that can be reasonably obtained for the same.

That is the situation that presently applies to the universities and it is something that apparently they have had no difficulty in living with, for a very long time in the case of the Adelaide University. Indeed, the Institute of Technology made that very point in proposing that approval be given by Governor's consent and that by that means the universities have not experienced any difficulty with having to obtain the Governor's consent and that therefore the same situation could apply to that institution. However, I think it would not be unreasonable to argue that with small amounts of land, for example, it may be particularly onerous to expect a submission to come to the Minister, to go from the Minister to Cabinet and from the Cabinet to Executive Council for the Governor's approval, when in fact it could simply come to the Minister without necessary reference to Cabinet and Executive Council for the Governor's approval. I think the proposition that we are putting in that regard is valid.

Mr Lewis: If they were all as reasonable as you are, there wouldn't be a problem.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the member for Murray-Mallee for his endorsement, his vote of confidence, and I sincerely hope that *Hansard* has captured that remark.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It was just to give you a heart attack!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I hope that that comment proves not to be fulfilled. With respect to the comments made by the member for Elizabeth, I have written down two points on which I wish to comment. I have a feeling that the honourable member made a third point, but I am afraid that I might have missed that in the process and I hope that he will draw it to my attention. First, in respect of student housing, the honourable member proposed that it would be unfair if full market rental was to be obtained for student housing. Clearly, the spirit of this legislation is with respect to the alienation of property from the purposes of the institution, either by way of sale or by way of lease. I would argue (and I believe that this point would be sustained by legal analysis) that student housing is not by way of alienation from the purposes of the institution. In the case of an institution like Roseworthy it is dependent on there being housing available at the institution—and that is the very point that the honourable member made. So, it would be an entirely valid interpretation on the part of the institution to say that it is not something for which the institution is required to charge full market rental, because to do so would in fact be detrimental to the educational aims of the institution inasmuch as that it would be quite negatively discriminatory to the students of that institution. My understanding of this legislation is that student housing would not be covered.

The honourable member also raised the point about why the period stipulated would be 21 years. Essentially, the argument that he put was that this was reaching almost the perpetual lease stage. The period of 21 years was chosen simply because that is the time that is stipulated in the University of Adelaide and Flinders University Acts. Legally, it is not a perpetual lease, anyway, as that period is 99 years, but the Government believes that, even in the community's acceptance of such, a period of less than 21 years sometimes can be detrimental to the alternative use to which leased land can be put. I draw to the attention of honourable members the debates that took place in this House during the time of the former Government when we were looking at the arid land region of South Australia. At that time there was considerable debate about whether or not a 45 year lease period—which I think was the time stipulated—amounted to a perpetual lease. The then Liberal Government argued that, no, that could not be regarded as a stable lease period for perpetual lease purposes and that a longer period was required. It was considered that 45 years was not long enough. At the time we argued about that, of course. However, 45 years is still more than double a 21 year period, therefore, the Government holds to the proposition that 21 years is probably a valid time, given that it standardises the situation with respect to the Adelaide University Act and the Flinders University Act. The honourable member raised a further point.

Mr M.J. Evans: Student amenities.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes. The same situation would apply, although I guess not quite as directly as that in relation to student housing, inasmuch as, if student housing does not exist, the institution does not have the students, but, if student amenities are not available, the students still exist, albeit they are not well served. However, student amenities still come within the acceptance of the activities of a tertiary institution, and the Government has always taken that point of view. For example, we took it with

respect to the provision of child-care services, that they should be considered as being an inherent part of the provision of services that are required in a tertiary institution and that, likewise, with general student amenities, they are intrinsic to the purpose and so the tertiary institutions need not feel constrained to rent them out at full market rates. Notwithstanding, there may well be internal management reasons whereby it is considered that to charge full market rental is a reasonable decision to make. That is fine and they have discretionary power to do that. Once again, I thank honourable members for their contributions to this debate. Our purpose is to try to standardise the situation. We believe that this proposal does that. I foreshadow that we do not propose to accept the amendment moved by the Opposition, for the reasons that I have outlined.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Continuation of the college.'

Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I move :

Lines 24 to 26—Leave out subsection (5) and insert new subsection as follows:

(5) Subsection (4) does not apply—

(a) to a lease for a term of 21 years or less at the best rental available;

(b) in relation to property given to the college (other than property given to the college by the Crown).

The effect of that amendment is to incorporate clause 2 (5), as provided for in the Bill, into the amendment and, in addition, to give effect to the Opposition's wish to ensure that potential benefactors are not deterred from bequeathing land to the colleges on the grounds that the Minister may ultimately gain control of that land by providing that such land is exempted from ministerial control.

In foreshadowing the amendment I gave the Minister the opportunity in his second reading reply to provide grounds on which the Government would be opposing the amendment. However, the Opposition believes that the desirability of providing if not incentive then at least ensuring that there is no disincentive to potential benefactors to the colleges is so important that it warrants the insertion in the Bill of this amendment.

I take the Minister's point that it can become difficult to determine a source of funds, and that land given to a college can thereby release funds belonging to the college which may otherwise have had to be put to the purpose of land acquisition. That being the case, the Minister claims that it can then be difficult to determine what is the source of funds over which the Minister needs control. The complexities of possible sources of funds need not be pursued with such a pedantic attitude that the origins of every last 10c or \$100 have to be traced. All that the Opposition is trying to do is to ensure that potential benefactors are not deterred by the inclusion of these amendments which are before the Committee in the relevant Acts.

In doing so, we are trying to keep the matter simple by merely saying that subsection (4) does not apply in relation to the property given to the college other than property given to the college by the Crown. That amending clause 2 (5) (b) ensures that the proper accountability, which we should be striving to achieve, is achieved in respect of land purchased with taxpayers' funds.

We believe that it also ensures that such accountability, which is not required in respect of private property bequeathed to the colleges, is exempted as a result of this amendment. In other words, we believe that the amendment achieves the desirable goal of exempting private property; it maintains the desirable goal of ensuring accountability by the Government for taxpayers' funds and by the councils

of colleges for taxpayers' funds. We therefore believe that it is worthy of the Committee's support.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I once again indicate that we will not accept the amendment proposed by the Opposition, and in so doing I certainly respect the spirit with which it has been moved. I understand that the aim is to prevent a disincentive of the bequeathing of land to the tertiary institutions in South Australia. I certainly would not want to be a party to something that would be a real danger to that happening. However, I want to refer to the points made by the member for Coles: first, to the matter of people perhaps being wary of giving land to a tertiary institution inasmuch as it would come under the Minister's control. This Bill concerns ministerial consent, not ministerial control. The control, the effective administration or management of the assets, still rests with the governments of the tertiary institutions. Ministerial consent, I would argue, is a different proposition. The other point I want to make is that here we have two propositions pitted against each other. The absence of the Opposition's amendment in the Bill is being put to us as a disincentive to the bequeathing of land—

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: Possible disincentive.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —possible disincentive; I accept that. On the other hand, the point of view put by the Government is that the insertion of the Opposition's amendment in the Bill would introduce unnecessary complexities in terms of finally analysing what it was that is being bequeathed without any hint of community resource through taxpayers' funds. It really comes down to a matter of deciding which is the more likely proposition, which is the more likely danger. All I can really argue on this matter is that universities, since their legislation was brought in, have had the very thing that we are now proposing, except that Governor's consent is there, not Minister's consent. I have had no evidence presented to me that any potential donor to either the University of Adelaide or the Flinders University has ever felt disinclined to give, or has somehow modified their bequest, on the basis of a worry that it is coming under the Minister's control. In the absence of any evidence to support that, plus the point of view that one other tertiary institution actually went further in terms of the consent/control line than we are proposing, I would have to stand by the proposition that the Government is putting and not accept the Opposition's amendment.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I can see the reasonableness of the Minister's case. On the other hand, we stand by what we believe is the reasonableness of our case. I would like to respond to the Minister's statements about the South Australian Institute of Technology and its view, and the South Australian College of Advanced Education and its view, by comparison with the view expressed to the Minister some time last year by Roseworthy College. As mentioned by the member for Murray-Mallee, Roseworthy College has existed longer than any other college. It has experience of bequests of land and the expectation and hope of further bequests. It is possible that the councils of the two other colleges may not have taken into account the likelihood of bequests in the same way as Roseworthy has on the basis of its experience, and I suggest that the manner in which those councils are approaching the question does not take into account the highly desirable goal of removing any possible impediments from potential benefactors.

At this stage of the debate there is no point in labouring that matter, but it is valid. It is one that the Liberal Party places great value upon because we certainly have a very fundamental belief in the input of private benefactors to public purposes and for public good. We want to ensure

that that is encouraged and at the very least that it is not discouraged. Therefore, we support the amendment.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Once again, I respect the motivation of the Opposition in putting this amendment. I acknowledge the points made. However, I return to the comments that I made before; it is pitting the potential disincentive against the potential for complexity, and then coming down with a decision based on the outcome. Neither of the universities has ever presented evidence that it felt disadvantaged by the wording in its Act. There is a balance between the absence of evidence of any disincentive having actually occurred to them, and what we believe to be the real possibility of great complexities in terms of determining what should and should not be coming to a Minister.

On a separate issue, as the member for Light will appreciate, one can know how complex land issues can be, especially with respect to Roseworthy because, from 1938 to 1985, one matter was in train. I am well aware that matters of land holdings by tertiary institutions can generate a life all of their own. Once again, this comes down to a different viewpoint. I am confident that I can say to this Committee that the disincentive that the Opposition fears may be the case (I appreciate that it says it 'may be' and not 'will be') is not in our interpretation the likely possibility. The complexity issues that would result from including the amendment would be a likely possibility, we believe, and thus we oppose the amendment.

Mr M.J. EVANS: After 10 years on the council of the University of Adelaide and after dealing extensively as we did during that period with bequests from private people, there is not much to concern the Committee in respect of either the amendment or the opposition to it. I do not believe it will make any difference either way. It was my experience during that whole time that people gave freely to the university in that respect. I imagine that attitude would continue to other institutions, particularly Roseworthy.

Also, one has to look closely at the way in which the universities, and subsequently the colleges, will deal with these things. In my view, this area would be easily circumvented in terms of the way in which the university now deals with its property through an investment trust and a separate investment company. The university's private assets exceed \$10 million, and most of those are dealt with often through private companies and other corporate vehicles, apart from the University of Adelaide itself.

I am not sure how one interprets these amendments, but it would seem to be not an unreasonable interpretation that, if the university held shares in a private company that held land, it would not be bound by these terms and conditions. Many bequests will come to the university, or college in this case, in that form. Certainly, no resistance was ever encountered by me or I believe the council in that respect.

There is also the possible interpretation that a donor may well feel safer and more secure knowing that the land once granted to the college can only be alienated, charged or sold, not only with the consent of the council, but also with the consent of the Minister. Therefore, a two-layer process of additional safeguard is imposed in respect of the subsequent alienation or sale of that land. There is another side of that coin when examining the viewpoint of a prospective donor. One thing that would concern the average donor (if I can put it in such simplistic terms) is the worry that the land may be used for other purposes, disposed of, sold, etc.

If, in fact, a two stage process is put into that then a lot more control arises, in my view, because fortunately—and if there was any suggestion of this I would oppose it utterly—there is no hint of ministerial control, simply of ministerial

veto. That is a different proposition as the Minister cannot direct the college to sell or alienate, or direct how it will alienate: he can only respond to a specific request from the council to alienate or sell. He has no initiative in this area at all. Therefore, we are simply adding another power of veto down the line of the process.

I notice that there is no provision here for the Minister to impose terms and conditions. I intend to ask him about that later. That is an appropriate omission from the wording of the university's clause in that it would prevent the Minister imposing terms and conditions on that grant, which I think is a much better way to go. That may not have been an intended consequence by the Minister when drafting these amendments, I do not know. But, as it turns out, if that is the case it is a fortuitous accident, because I believe that to be superior drafting to the terms of the clause for the University of Adelaide. The omission of the terms and conditions clause is a much better way of treating the matter. I have no objection to that additional power of veto. I would certainly object to terms and conditions being imposed because, while the Minister may impose terms and conditions through the Governor on the University of Adelaide with some trepidation, I doubt that he would be so constrained in respect of his dealings with the Roseworthy Agricultural College because of the nature of the relevant institutions and the nature of the administrative and legal set-up.

Therefore, I am much more comforted by the wording here. Of course, bearing in mind the way in which they are dealing with requests through private companies, investment trusts and so on these days, it is a simple matter for a private donor to circumvent this whole process entirely by simply leaving it to the college through a linking corporate structure which will absolve the college from compliance with these provisions altogether. So, although I wish to confirm those other interpretations with the Minister later, I think that we would be well advised to have regard to the corporate structure of the universities these days and to the way in which they deal with agencies such as Luminis Pty Ltd, which entirely circumvents this structure, anyway.

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

That the sittings of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the member for Elizabeth for his comments. Given that the nature of those comments was supportive of the wording of the motion, I assure him it was not a fortuitous accident but hard work and diligence that resulted in the wording being as it is. Had he held a different view of the wording of the Bill I might have had a different answer for him. In any event, the member for Elizabeth hit the nail right on the head: the point that I was trying to make before was that there is a difference between consent and control in a number of ways and one of them, quite clearly, is the fact that the Minister of the day—be it myself or any other person—does not by this legislation have the power to instruct any tertiary institution to divest itself of any land, or acquire any land.

I reassure the honourable member that, to that extent, his interpretation is quite correct. Also, I have sought confirmation of my opinion on this matter and that is that any property held by an institution, corporation or company in which a tertiary institution has shares is likewise not affected by this legislation, so indeed that protection exists. Once again, I indicate that I believe that this Bill will not provide the worry that members fear that it might. I call on members to support the Bill without amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr M.J. EVANS: I seek confirmation of my question about terms and conditions being omitted; does that mean that terms and conditions cannot be imposed?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: As I said, it was diligence in the drafting that resulted in that and it was not as a result of a fortuitous accident. It was something that was seen to be a logical direction in which to go and as being sensitive to the governing bodies of those institutions. The wording which I read out and which appears in the Act no longer seemed appropriate and I suppose one could argue that, at some stage when those Acts come before us for amendment for other reasons, that matter could perhaps be addressed with respect to Flinders University and the University of Adelaide.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 191.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the Bill.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I thank the Opposition for supporting this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Establishment of College.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I move:

Lines 26 to 28—Leave out subsection (4a) and insert new subsection as follows:

(4a) Subsection (4) does not apply—

(a) to a lease for a term of 21 years or less at the best rental available;

(b) real property given to the College (other than property given to the College by the Crown).

Notwithstanding the result of the amendment in relation to the previous Bill, as a matter of principle I move this amendment.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I assume that this amendment is identical to the previous one and, for the same reasons that I indicated before, the Government opposes the amendment proposed by the Opposition.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 191.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the Bill.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Continuance and status of council.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I move:
Lines 24 to 26—

Leave out subsection (4) and insert new subsection as follows:

(4) Subsection (3) does not apply—

(a) to a lease for a term of 21 years or less at the best rental available;

(b) in relation to property given to the Council (other than property given to the Council by the Crown).

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: For the reasons outlined in the two previous Bills, the Government cannot accept the amendment and will oppose it.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

AGENT-GENERAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RURAL AND OTHER FINANCE) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr DUGAN (Adelaide): I take this opportunity to place on the record in this House a tribute to the former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, Professor Donald Stranks, who suffered a fatal heart attack some 10 days ago. The death of Professor Stranks deprives South Australia and the University of Adelaide of an outstanding South Australian and a man who gave a lifetime of service to the university and to the South Australian community.

Indeed, the number of people who attended the memorial service at St Peter's Cathedral last Tuesday bore testimony to the enormous esteem in which Professor Stranks was held. People from all professions and sectors of the South Australian community were at that service, and members from both sides of the House attended. It was a very moving experience and a just tribute by the people of South Australia to the enormous work that had been done by Professor Stranks in the nine years during which he had been Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide and, indeed, in the years he had spent at the university earlier.

Professor Stranks was first appointed Vice-Chancellor of the university in 1977 and early next year would have completed a second five year term. The university council, on which I am privileged to serve as a representative and nominee of this Parliament, had recently agreed to extend Professor Stranks's vice-chancellorship for a further five year period. There is no doubt that the university will have great difficulty in finding a replacement for Professor Stranks in terms of his understanding of the issues affecting uni-

versity administration, and his appreciation of the interests of the various parts of the university community, as he was someone who was very familiar with the whole operation of the funding of universities and associated matters.

When Professor Stranks was appointed in 1977 it was not, as I said earlier, his first contact with the university. In fact, he had been appointed to the University of Adelaide as the Foundation Professor of the Chair of Inorganic Chemistry in 1964, and had stayed in that position for some 10 years. Indeed, it might have been the administrative skills that Professor Stranks displayed in his role as the Dean of the Faculty of Science and the Chairman of the Research Executive Committee, as well as the head of the Department of Physical and Inorganic Chemistry and a number of academic committees, that led to his being appointed in 1977 as the Vice-Chancellor.

After 10 years at the University of Adelaide in this position as the Foundation Professor of Inorganic Chemistry, Professor Stranks broadened his knowledge by serving as a visiting professor at a number of overseas universities. Prior to returning to Adelaide he spent some time at the University of Melbourne as the Professor of Inorganic Chemistry and the Chairman of the School of Chemistry. It was after some years that Professor Stranks decided to specialise in the area of administration, and he returned to Adelaide as Vice-Chancellor.

This year Professor Stranks became the Chairman of the Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee after a two year period of service as its Deputy Chairman. A tribute was paid to him by the secretary of that committee in these words:

As Chairman of the AVCC since the beginning of the year Professor Stranks was already making his mark at a time when a number of key issues affecting the future of Australian universities required skillful negotiation and resolution.

Professor Stranks was also described in that same article as a key figure in enhancing the international reputation of Australian universities. In fact, in terms of his overseas activities and experience, he had served on the Council of the Association of Commonwealth Universities and had been a member of its executive and budget review committee. He had also worked as an examiner with both the University of Papua New Guinea and more recently the Universiti Sains Malaysia, and he was instrumental in arranging for opportunities to be extended to a number of students who had come from that university to continue their studies in Adelaide.

He had also been quite instrumental recently in ensuring that students from South Africa, particularly black students who are denied educational opportunities in South Africa, have the opportunity of coming to the University of Adelaide to continue their studies so that they are able to be well equipped to cope with the very great difficulties affecting that nation.

Professor Stranks also had an extensive range of community interests that were recognised by the Liberal Government and the Labor Government. In fact, he was Chairman of the South Australian Council on Technological Change—a position to which he was appointed by the former Liberal Government and confirmed in by the current Government. He was then very much to the fore in promoting technological change. He also played an extensive role in the formation of Luminis, which is a University of Adelaide venture development company. His involvement with Luminis also indicated his support for the close association that he tried to ensure between the university and the wider community.

Another example of Professor Stranks's desire to bring the university and the community together, was his involve-

ment with the establishment in 1979 of the University of Adelaide Foundation. There were many other achievements, both academic and administrative, to which the Chancellor of the University (Justice Roma Mitchell) referred in her address at the memorial service held at St Peter's Cathedral last week. She summarised it, really, by saying that it was sufficient simply to note that there was no doubt in anyone's mind that Professor Stranks's capacities and abilities warranted his being awarded the Order of Australia in 1984.

Professor Stranks was also well renowned for his relationships with both the academic and the professional staff of the university and for the interest he took in all personnel matters at the university. However, his interests extended even more widely. In addition to addressing many of the major policy issues facing tertiary education, he supported functions and activities of the students, and he was involved in Community Aid Abroad and the Anti-Cancer Foundation.

I am sure all members of this House were shocked and saddened upon hearing of Professor Stranks's fatal heart attack. He was a most courteous and conscientious man dedicated to the pursuit of excellence. He will be missed by the many people who came to admire his generosity of spirit and dedication to higher learning, including I believe all members of this House.

It is with these words that I acknowledge the debt and gratitude that is felt by all members of this House for the enormous benefit that the work of Professor Stranks has provided to South Australia and to the University of Adelaide.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The inconsistency of Government statements about the quality of Adelaide's water supply must leave many South Australians shaking their heads in disbelief. A article in the *Advertiser* of 27 June, headed 'Tough controls on Hills aim to protect city water' states:

Stringent new development controls in the Adelaide Hills were introduced by the South Australian Government yesterday to try to prevent further pollution of Adelaide's water supply.

Under an amendment to the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed Supplementary Development Plan, a wide range of developments outside towns will be prohibited without special agreement by the South Australian Planning Commission and the Minister for Environment and Planning, Dr Hoggood.

Prohibited uses will include caravan parks general industry, hotels, junk yards, petrol stations, shops, flats, refuse dumps, multiple dwellings, motels, restaurants, more than one dwelling on an allotment and land division which will result in the creation of an additional allotment or allotments.

The tough controls cover an area of 1 665 square kilometres stretching from Williamstown, on the edge of the Barossa Valley, in the north, to Myponga Reservoir in the south and follow Government concern over water quality for city consumers.

An E&WS department spokesman said water quality was affected by many factors including land use, storage and treatment. He said recent data had shown the quality of water in reservoirs was deteriorating at an alarming rate.

A further article in the *Advertiser* of Monday 18 August (that is, yesterday) states:

Heavy rains save millions and improve water supply.

Heavy rains in South Australia in July and August are saving the South Australian Government millions of dollars in the cost of pumping water from the River Murray.

The rains also will mean an improvement in the quality of Adelaide's water, according to a spokesman for the Engineering and Water Supply Department. . . . Mr Lawson said the quality of Adelaide's water would improve because it had come from local catchment areas.

Quite obviously, one cannot have it both ways. Either the water from the Mount Lofty Ranges catchment area is deteriorating and is of poor quality or it is not. The second article to which I have referred suggests that the quality of the water in the Murray River is much worse than the quality of water from the Mount Lofty Ranges catchment

area. Are the nitrate levels and so forth of the water being collected in the catchment area reaching a dangerously high level or are they not? Whichever way one reads this, quite obviously the Government is saying that the quality of water in the Murray River is much worse than the quality of water that is collected in the Adelaide Hills—so, that does not say much for the quality of the water in the Murray River.

What is the Government doing about improving the quality of the water in the Murray River? Why is it so concerned about the Adelaide Hills, having maintained that the water from the Adelaide Hills catchment is far superior to that of the Murray River? However, we have seen virtually no action whatsoever from the present Government. A number of vital projects, put forward by the River Murray Commission, need to be implemented to improve the quality of water in the Murray River in South Australia. I refer particularly to the Lock 2/Lock 3 groundwater interception scheme, of which the Government has been well aware. In fact, a study was undertaken by consultants in 1982 that clearly identified that, with the appropriate interception scheme, we could keep some 60 000 tonnes of salt out of the Murray River, with an estimated total inflow of 80 000 tonnes of salt per annum. The Government's statements on the quality of water from the Hills catchment area are contradictory and many South Australians must be wondering just how concerned the Government is about this matter or whether it is just window-dressing or perhaps simply responding to various press articles that have been written from time to time. Whichever way one looks at it, quite obviously, the Government must get its act together. The sooner it does so, the better. The people of South Australia would appreciate some consistency in relation to where the Government is heading and what it intends to do about the problem.

The other matter I want to raise at this time concerns the problem of obtaining boat operators' licences, particularly in country areas. I refer to a letter dated 17 June that was written to the Minister of Marine by a constituent of mine, which states:

I wish to draw to your attention a problem faced by Riverlanders wishing to obtain boat operators' licences. The marine safety officer based in Barmera is currently on leave until 21 July 1986, leaving the Riverland area without an officer authorised to conduct the test for a boat operator's licence.

The test was previously also able to be done at the Motor Registration Division at Berri. However, this is no longer possible because the authorised officer is no longer here and has not been replaced.

My husband and I wish to obtain a boat operators' licence as we have just purchased a craft for which a licence is required. I have been informed by the Boating Division of the Department of Marine and Harbors that we will have to go to Murray Bridge or Adelaide to do the test or, alternatively, wait until 21 July when the local officer returns from leave.

Both of these options are most unsatisfactory. Incidentally, the Boating Division was unaware that the licence test has been available at Berri for over 12 months, until I informed them of the fact this morning.

Boating is a major recreational pastime in the Riverland, and it is most unsatisfactory that we are unable to obtain the necessary licence because the only Marine and Harbors officer in the area is on leave. I trust you will give this matter your urgent consideration.

Obviously, this problem has arisen through a lack of manpower. I believe it was the intention of the Government to have a second officer to support the present officer in the Riverland, but that proposal has now been dropped. Certainly, the boating officer in the Riverland has an enormous job to do and a tremendous area to cover. There are only about 10 boating officers in South Australia to patrol and to look after the whole of the Boating Act in South Australia, so those officers have an enormous job to do. I would

suggest to the Minister that it is probably high time that he looked at the total structure of his department and endeavoured to get more officers out in the field—and probably a few less in the department in Adelaide—where this practical work needs to be done.

The issue raised by my constituents clearly identifies a problem: that it is unreal to expect people living in the country to go to either Murray Bridge or Adelaide to obtain a boat operator's licence when the service could be provided in the local office of the Motor Vehicles Department as an addition to the boating inspector.

That service was provided before, and it seems common-sense to me that persons within the regional offices of the Motor Vehicles Division should be so instructed as to be able to conduct the necessary boat licence examinations to enable country people to obtain the same sorts of benefits and services as those available to people living in the metropolitan area.

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): Members will be well aware from recent 'shock, horror' exposes in the local media that the Government is attempting to improve the amount of revenue which it derives from the operations of this House and this Parliament. While I do not criticise those steps which have been taken to improve cost recovery—they are quite reasonable in the present circumstances—I certainly would like to draw the attention of the Government to a potential area of savings which dramatically exceeds the \$50 000 or so which they will derive from increasing the prices of meals in this establishment. That relates to the printing and distribution of *Hansard* and Statute materials. I would remind the House, if members are not already aware of it, that the actual printing cost of the *Hansard* documents approaches \$1 million a year.

I do not refer to the cost of the professional people who work in this House. Of course, I do not think that their activities could be any more cost effective than they are now—and I say that with deference to the people who are looking down on us from on high—but, of course, the printing side of the equation is entirely another matter. The technology used in this House to convert our spoken words into electronic form for transmission to Netley is the latest available. Unfortunately, once those electronic signals in whatever form arrive at Netley, they go back to techniques which have remained unchanged for decades.

The cost of that is quite high—as I said—\$1 million a year. That produces for us 200 copies of *Hansard* for sale and about 1 000 copies for free distribution, plus those copies that are used around this House and distributed to members' offices. The Government is yet to charge us for those copies, but I am sure that that is probably not too far down the road. I have been recently refused a free copy of Acts of this Parliament, so I expect that we may shortly be charged for the Bills to which we refer. However, that is another matter that I am raising with the Government.

We have this question of how best to spend the \$1 million available to us for the printing of *Hansard*. I also draw members' attention to the fact that the Statutes are shortly to be placed on a nationwide computer base operated by CLERS Computer Power Australia, which is mounting not only the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victorian Statutes, and shortly, the Tasmanian and South Australian Statutes, but also the regulations and legal materials which the legal profession extensively uses in its work. They will be available for full text searching on a nationwide computer data base available through a dial-in service. Of course, *Hansard* has now become a very important part of legal interpretation. It will soon be the case, if it is not already

law—which I believe it is—that second reading explanations may be used in the interpretation of a Statute. My colleague shakes his head, so I assume that that legislation is yet to pass this place. However, it has passed other Houses of Parliament and it is not unreasonable to expect that it may one day pass this place, with or without the concurrence of every member.

Should that be the case, the legal profession will require access to *Hansard* and that will no doubt necessitate its inclusion on those data bases. I suggest to Government that now is the time to strike while we have the negotiations in hand for the sale of our Statute material, much desired by private enterprise and the legal profession. We could also obtain something of a free or subsidised ride for our *Hansard* material to have those included on the data base at the same time. There is no doubt that the printed publication of *Hansard* is not only very expensive but also cost ineffective. This material is contained, as members know, in huge volumes which come out some time after the material is of current relevance, and they are almost impossible to search through for material of interest, especially if that extends back some months or even years. By mounting that material on a computer data base, it would be simple to engage in full and free text searching of that material, for key words, either of the debate topic or of the member concerned, and one could limit that to House or to year of publication, or publication years.

I would venture to suggest from discussions that I have had with those private data base producers that, for substantially less than the \$1 million that we now pay, we could have that facility available to us. If the Attorney-General leaves it much longer, those negotiations will be fully signed, sealed and delivered, and we will not be able to obtain the concessions from the company which we could if we had the negotiating power that we have now. I very much fear that we will end up in a situation where the legal profession and the community at large have full if not expensive access to that material, and members of Parliament in fact are very much denied access to it because the Government did not secure those rights for us now.

The cost of us subscribing as individual members of Parliament to those data bases in the future would no doubt be prohibitive because of the intensive and extensive use which our occupations require us to make of that material. Unlike any other profession (including the legal profession), members of Parliament, particularly backbenchers who do not have the resources and research material available to them, need speedy and easy access to *Hansard* and complete texts of Acts.

Now that the annual volume of publication is two or three years behind the actual currency of the material, and given that the Government will only provide copies from this Parliament and will not allow members to have a subscription to Acts unless they pay for it out of their own pockets, it is quite difficult for us on the back bench to gain full and free access to annotated and up to date copies of

Acts with which we need to work in this place. Many Acts are not yet available in the bound volume but have been amended several times since they were first introduced.

It is almost impossible to follow the currency of that material. Once it is available as a computer data base it will be a relatively simple and straightforward operation, and one will be guaranteed of certainty in the material that one has available. Also, I invite the Government to consider the very latest form of electric publishing: known in the literature as CD ROM—compact disc read only memory. These units are almost identical to those that many people have in their homes—for the audio playback of compact discs. These units are quite cheap and *Hansard* and other material, such as Statutes and regulations, can be printed on CD ROM discs in the same way as audio material.

It would then be accessible to members in their electorate offices and in their offices here through the use of a personal computer. Personal computers are becoming increasingly available as the technology improves and the cost diminishes. In fact, some 10 years of *Hansard* could be incorporated on one single CD ROM disc—some 300 megabytes of material would easily fit with associated key word indexes on one CD ROM disc.

The cost of publishing these is approximately \$25 000 for the first disc and about \$5 or \$10 for each subsequent disc. Once the factory is operational in Melbourne they will no longer have to be imported from overseas, and I expect the cost to drop significantly. The *Government Gazette* could also be incorporated in that kind of publication and that would mean that this material was for the first time in history accessible and usable not only by members of Parliament but by the general public.

Those few people who presently receive subscriptions would be more than interested in changing to electronic publications, given the availability of low cost and high speed laser printers that could be used in this Chamber and also in the Government Sales Centre and in any other strategic locations such as Government departments where they might be needed.

So, for the first time in our parliamentary history we could use *Hansard* and statutory materials and have access to fully updated copies of regulations and case material for use in our debates in this place; the endless hours and fruitless hours of searching for that material would be over. Also, an important and added side benefit is that the Government would be able to save hundreds of thousands of dollars a year once the initial start-up costs had been covered. I commend that suggestion to the Government, that it investigates closely the benefits of electronic publishing, for not only on-line material but also CD ROM material, so that this House can benefit from that technology and so that we will not be the only people not to have access to it, through economic constraints imposed by the Government.

Motion carried.

At 6.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 20 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 19 August 1986

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

14. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: To which department or agency does Government motor vehicle UQC-672 belong and, on the morning of Saturday 15 February at approximately 10.30 a.m. in the Kurralta Park K-Mart car park, were the driver and passenger utilising that vehicle for official purposes?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Government vehicle UQC-672 is on permanent allocation to the Senior Schools Security Officer in the Education Department. On 15 February, the officer used the vehicle to travel from his home to that of the Assistant Security Officer to collect a master set of school security keys and other necessary equipment, preparatory to his on-call roster for that weekend and the following week. On arrival at the Assistant Security Officer's home, the officer was advised that his wife had telephoned to advise that the family car had broken down and had requested that he pick her up on his return journey. He duly did so, incurring a deviation of approximately one-half of a kilometre from his planned route, and then continued to his home. The officer has been reminded regarding the use of Government vehicles for transporting persons not associated with official business.

TRAFFIC SURVEY

33. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What was the purpose of conducting a traffic survey on or about 12 June 1986 in the vicinity of Eagle on the Hill on the Mount Barker Road?

2. What questions were asked?

3. What information has been gained from the survey and what use will be made of that information?

4. How many people were questioned and was that number a true random sample, bearing in mind the number of people using the road at the time and, if so, how was the number determined?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. To provide the Government's consultant with data which he will use in conjunction with traffic count information to construct a model of present and projected future travel demand as part of his study into the road connection between Crafrers and the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The survey was also carried out on Greenhill Road and Upper Sturt Road.

2. The type of vehicle and number of occupants, the driver's origin and destination, purpose of the trip and, in the case of goods vehicles, the commodity carried.

Drivers were also given a post-free questionnaire covering the frequency they use the road and for what purposes, frequency of delays encountered and their apparent cause, their assessment of the need for upgrading access between Crafrers and Adelaide, their suburb of residence, nature of household and occupation of its primary income earner.

3. See 1. and 2.

4. 1 615 (Mount Barker Road), 551 (Greenhill Road) and 532 (Upper Sturt Road)—Total = 2 698.

Drivers were interviewed by intercepting groups of vehicles from the traffic stream throughout the day, which is standard procedure for achieving a representative sample of the entire traffic stream.

The number of vehicles stopped was governed by the roadside space available at the survey locations, and the duration of the survey which covered all daylight hours.

VALUER GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

52. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands: How many objections were lodged to the valuations of land and property made by the Valuer General's Department for the years ended 30 June 1985 and 1986, how many were successful, how many proceeded to litigation and what was the outcome of the appeals to the court?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

1. For the year ending 30.6.85:

Objections	
Number of objections received	445
Valuations unaltered	181
Valuations reduced	254
Valuations increased	4
Objections outstanding	6
Court Appeals	
Number of appeals carried over from 30.6.84	6
Number of appeals received to 30.6.85	1
Valuations reduced on appeal	1
Number of appeals outstanding	6

2. For the year ending 30.6.86:

Objections	
Number of objections carried forward	6
Number of objections received to 30.6.86	384
Total	390
Valuations unaltered	182
Valuations reduced	201
Valuations increased	1
Objections outstanding as at 30.6.86	6
Court Appeals	
Number of appeals carried forward from 30.6.85	6
Number of appeals received to 30.6.86	4
Valuations reduced on appeal	1
Valuations unaltered	5
Court Appeals outstanding as at 30.6.86	4

PRODUCTION LOSSES

61. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister for the Arts: During the year 1985-86, what productions at the Festival Theatre and the Playhouse incurred a loss, what was the total loss on each production and what funds were made available by the Government to cover any deficit?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: During 1985-86 two subsidised arts organisations, namely, the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and the State Theatre Company, staged productions in the Festival Theatre and the Playhouse. Looking at each organisation individually:

(a) Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—

	Deficit	
	\$	\$
Festival Theatre		
Uncanny X-Men	2 829	
Boys of the Lough	5 091	
Concert Classics (2)	22 802	
Rita Hunter	5 415	
Marion Martin	7 100	43 237
Playhouse		
Rents	17 483	
Sydney Dance Company	57 327	
Sunday Recital	3 728	78 538
Total—Adelaide Festival		\$1 271 775

These deficits were funded from within the Trust's recurrent allocation of \$150 000 provided for programming activities. It should also be noted that the abovementioned list does not include productions presented by other entrepreneurs for which the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust received rental income.

(b) State Theatre Company

The State Theatre Company is the resident theatre company in the Playhouse and during 1985-86 staged 162 performances of 8 main productions. The deficits incurred on these productions were as follows:

Fixed Costs:			
Salaries, wages and related expenses (for ensemble of actors and production staff)			\$1 105 000
Variable Costs: (deficits shown are net of box office income)			
Production	Deficit		
	\$		\$
Big and Little	20 302		
Muse of Fire	35 002		
On the Razzle	21 964		
Touch of Silk	23 238		
Theatre on Film	7 665		
Peter Pan	50 273		
Dreams in an Empty City	13 934		
The Recruiting Officer	24 312		
The Real Thing	surplus	(298)	196 392
Total—State Theatre Company			<u>\$1 301 392</u>

These deficits were funded from within the Company's 1985-86 operating allocation of \$1 562 000. It should also be noted that included within the variable costs for each production mentioned above is the cost of renting the Playhouse from the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. In 1985-86 the State Theatre Company paid \$218 439 to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust for theatre rental.

PATAWALONGA

95. **Mr OSWALD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Marine: Has the Patawalonga Lake between the lock and the King Street Bridge ever been controlled by the Minister under section 67 of the Harbors Act 1936 and, if so, when and, if it is not currently under such control, when did it cease to be?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: No.

DISMISSAL CLAIMS

103. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Labour: How many claims for unfair dismissal have been lodged with the Industrial Commission since the amendment to section 31 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972 was proclaimed and how many claims were lodged with the Court under the previous provisions in the preceding year?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Since the amendment to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972 in May 1984 there have been 959 claims. During the period (May 1983-May 1984) preceding the amendment there were 319 claims.