LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 7 March 1989

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Anne Levy) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m.

The Clerk (Mr C.H. Mertin) read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the following answers to Questions on Notice, as detailed in the schedule which I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 37, 38, 40 to 42, and 44.

YOUTH SUICIDES

37. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. Of the 380 youth suicides in Australia in 1988, how many were recorded in South Australia and how many young South Australians attempted suicide?

2. How do these figures compare with previous years?

3. What statistics, if any, are recorded on youth suicides and attempted suicides according to age, gender, locality and occupational status?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The replies are as follows:

1. Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) preliminary suicide numbers for people aged 20 or less in 1988 are 25 boys and 4 girls. The ABS does not collect attempted suicide information.

2. Corresponding figures for the years 1985 to 1987 are:

	Boys	Girls
1985	13	4
1986	15	4
1987	19	4

3. ABS collect date of birth, date of death, place of death, usual residence address, age, occupation, gender, birthplace, length of residence in Australia, marital status, Aboriginality, and parent's occupation for deaths identified as suicide.

LESLEY DADLEFF

38. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. In addition to the unfortunate death of Lesley 'Dee' Dadleff in December (*Advertiser* 25.1.89), is it correct that over the past 13 months at least four other young girls have taken their own life due to an overdose, or died as an indirect consequence of alcohol, while they have been in the care of the Director-General of Community Welfare, as ordered by the Children's Court?

2. If so, what were the circumstances in each case?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The replies are as follows:

1. To the best of the department's knowledge this is not the case.

2. One 16 year old under the control of the Director-General died by self-immolation in the first quarter of financial year 1988-89.

HACC PROGRAM

40. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: Which local councils have appointed community care and aged care workers under the HACC program and in each instance what funds have been allocated under the program for the appointment of these officers?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The reply is as follows:

Local Government Area	CCW's FTE	HACC Funding $
Adelaide	1.0	13 900
Brighton	1.0	10 500
Burnside	1.0	9 800
East Torrens	0.5	7 900
Elizabeth	1.0	12 900
Enfield	2.0	33 000
Gawler	1.0	17 300
Hindmarsh	1.0	18 700
Kensington and Norwood	1.0	28 100
Marion	2.5	44 300
Mitcham	1.0	17 800
Murray Bridge	1.0	9 800
Noarlunga	1.0	14 200
Payneham	1.0	7 000
Port Adelaide	1.0	14 500
Port Pirie	1.0	13 100
Prospect	1.0	17 200
St. Peters	0.8	13 500
Salisbury	1.0	16 10(
Tea Tree Gully	1.0	17 200
Unley	2.0	27 200
Walkerville	0.5	6 800
West Torrens	1.0	10 900
Willunga	0.5	8 400
Woodville	1.0	18 900
	26.8	$398 500

TASK FORCE ON THE AGEING

41. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (on notice) asked the Attorney-General: Further to the report in the *Advertiser* of 11 January 1989, what are the names of the organisations that the Task Force on the Ageing proposes to target?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The task force is unaware of the alleged 35 elderly organisations to be targeted. The task force's brief is to research the problems facing all senior citizens in South Australia. As part of this process, wide consultation will be part of this process.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

42. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (on notice) asked the Attorney-General: Does the South Australian Government agree with the resolution relating to immigration policy passed unanimously at the Greek Orthodox Church's Sixth Clergy-Laity Congress (Melbourne 1.2.89)... 'that the selection criteria are discriminatory against South European settlers generally, and specifically against Greek migrants, even in the question of family reunions, where the Greek tradition of the extended family is not considered'?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The South Australian Government is aware of concerns among ethnic communities that the present immigration policy can be a barrier to extended family migration. However, the migration selection criteria are not designed to discriminate on the basis of racial or national origin, but on the basis of skills. Selection criteria favour migrants who are skilled, well educated and young. In countries such as Greece such persons have considerably higher life and employment opportunities than a decade or so ago. They have opportunities both in their own country and in other countries of the European community which are considerably closer to home than Australia.

Since the major migration of persons from Greece in the 1950s and 1960s, our economy has changed considerably. There has been considerable restructuring of our industrial base and our need is now for a skilled workforce. This is reflected in the lower levels of unemployment among skilled workers, including newly arrived migrants, than among the unskilled or semi-skilled workers.

If the Commonwealth Government were to ease migration criteria in line with the proposals of the Greek Orthodox Church's Sixth Clergy-Laity congress, the number of potential applicants from all parts of the world would rise to hundreds of thousands per year. The Commonwealth Government would have to impose national quotas and queues (waiting periods of several years), as the United States has had to do. This approach has been rightly rejected by the Commonwealth Government. In our present economic circumstances, immigration policy has to be integrated into our national economic and employment strategies. Our need now is for a skilled workforce, and this is something that both the Commonwealth Government and the Federal Opposition agree on. In fact, the Federal Opposition has criticised the Commonwealth Government for being too soft on family migration.

DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITY WELFARE

44. **The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: Who has been appointed to fill the position of Deputy Chief Executive Officer of the Department for Community Welfare vacated last December by Ms R. Wighton?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Mr Lange Powell has been appointed temporarily to this position.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Botanic Gardens of Adelaide and State Herbarium—Report, 1987-88.
Trade Standards Act 1979—Report, 1987-88.
Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981—Regulations—Declared Vocation.
Summary Offences Act 1953—Regulations—
Seat Belt Infringements.
Overloading Infringements.

By the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act 1973—Regulations—
Small Business Exemption (Amendment).
Returns.
Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—Liquor Consumption—Adelaide.

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

Carrick Hill Trust—Report, 1987-88.
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report, 1987-88.
State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1987-88.
Forestry Act 1950—Proclamation—Hundred of Nangwarry—County of Grey.
Education Act 1972—Regulations—Salary Deductions.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

The Parks Community Centre—Report, 1987-88.
Local Government Finance Authority Act 1983—Regulations—Prescribed Bodies.
Corporation By-laws—
Burnside—No. 13—Library Services.
Port Adelaide—
No. 8—Bees.
No. 7—Caravans.
No. 9—Dogs.
No. 10—Animals and Birds.
No. 11—Restaurants and Fish Shops.
Port Lincoln—
No. 4—Tents.
No. 8—Streets and Footways.
Woodville—No. 1—Repeal of By-laws.
Meningie—No. 28—Dogs.
Millicent—
No. 6—Caravans.
No. 7—Animals and Birds.
No. 8—Dogs.
No. 9—Bees.
No. 10—Repeal of By-laws.
Waikerie—No. 60—Pigeons.

QUESTIONS

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL CAR PARK

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Health a question about the Royal Adelaide Hospital car park.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: A press release from the Premier (Mr Bannon) and the then Minister of Health (Hon. Dr Cornwall) on 5 July last year indicated that agreement had been reached in relation to car parking and that it would be only a short time before a car park of 577 spaces would be constructed on land owned by the Adelaide City Council on the southern side of the Budget Rent A Car premises bordered by Frome Street and Vaughan Place. It indicated at that stage that stage 2 would involve the construction of a car park in the northern precinct of the Royal Adelaide Hospital to provide spaces for 728 cars. The only problem was that it would be 1997 before that was done.

At that stage Dr Cornwall and Mr Bannon paid a tribute to the Adelaide City Council, the institutions and the staff associations which had been involved in the negotiations for the return of the parklands. One presumes that, following that announcement, all the neccessary negotiations would have taken place and that the matter would have been resolved before any such announcement was made. It has now been made clear to me that such negotiations were not complete. I have a copy of a letter to the council dated 24 January, from a senior projects officer in the Premier's Department, which admits that before the Premier's announcement 'no formal position had been previously taken by the council'—the Adelaide City Council—'in July last year'.

It has been suggested to me that the Government should have reached full agreement with the council before the Premier made his announcement. As it is, following Mr Bannon's announcement, the Government was forced to go back to the Adelaide City Council to clarify what commitments the council was prepared to enter into for the car park project to succeed. It is little wonder that the unions representing the Royal Adelaide Hospital staff last week accused the Government of vacillation, procrastination and deliberate time wasting.

In February last year I said that we would support a car park on the SAIT side of Frome Road, which is now full of cars. At present, staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital have to park in the northern car park and, if anybody had anything to do with it or heard from those who have to park there, they would know the problems facing those using that land. It has been said to me that the sooner that situation is resolved the better and that, if the car park was built on the SAIT side, the northern parklands could be

returned forthwith to the parklands. There would be no need for the 10-year delay before that occurred.

My questions to the Minister representing the Minister of Health are as follows: as the promise by the Premier in July 1988 to build a car park for the Royal Adelaide Hospital staff on land owned by the city council was made before the council had made any decision about the use of the land for this purpose, does the Minister representing the Minister of Health believe that he should accept responsibility for the continuing delays to this project? Also does she support criticism of the Government in a statement by unions last Thursday regarding time wasting, procrastination and vacillation, and will the Minister of Health indicate through her that the Government will not proceed to build a car park on the southern side of North Terrace in the Vaughan Place site unless the Government purchases the land not on the basis proposed at the moment, as there has been some indication, on a 30-year lease?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: As I indicated to the honourable member last time that we sat, this matter has been more complicated than it may appear on the surface and some people who previously reached agreement have subsequently not continued with them. However, I understand that negotiations are still taking place and hopefully some resolution to the matter can be found very soon. In the meantime, I will refer the question to the Minister of Health and bring back a reply.

ARTS FUNDING

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts a question about arts funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: As you, Madam President, would know, significant funding for the arts in South Australia is received each year from the Australia Council. I have examined the annual reports of the Australia Council for the financial years 1982-83 and 1987-88 and discovered that there has been a severe fall in the share of Australia Council funding to the States received by South Australia in the period 1982-83 to 1987-88. As the Minister will know, South Australia is described in tourism literature as the Festival State, and our motor vehicle number plates also promote the Festival State. In the 1970s and the early 1980s South Australia enjoyed strong arts funding support from the Australia Council.

In 1982-83, in a year which straddled both the Tonkin Liberal Government and the incoming Bannon Labor Government, although South Australia had little more than 8.5 per cent of the nation's population, we received 11.1 per cent of the Australia Council grants—well in excess of our per capita quota. However, by 1987-88 our share of Australia Council funding had slumped from 11.1 per cent to only 9.4 per cent. This slump was across the board. Our share of money for the performing arts fell from 10.4 per cent in 1982-83 to 8.4 per cent in 1987-88; visual arts and craft fell from 11.8 per cent to 11.1 per cent; Aboriginal arts had a massive fall from 14.4 per cent to only 6.6 per cent; and community arts also fell, from 15.9 per cent to 13.6 per cent.

In fact, over that six-year period—the period of the Bannon Labor Government—the only gain made by the arts was in the area of literature where we had a small improvement from 5.9 per cent to 7.7 per cent in Australia Council grants. My questions are:

1. Is the Government aware of this slump in Australia Council support for the arts in South Australia?
2. Will the Minister explain why this slump has occurred?
3. Does the Minister agree that these figures demonstrate that, under six years of Labor Government, the strength of and support for the arts in the Festival State has sadly diminished?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The part of the equation that the honourable member chooses to ignore in his comments about arts funding in this State is that for very many years the South Australian Government, dating back to the Dunstan years, has funded the arts in this State way above the per capita level of funding of any other State in Australia. That is still the case—

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: —although there has been some reorganisation of the funding arrangements during the past couple of budget cycles in South Australia. One of the reasons why South Australia has enjoyed such a high level of funding from the Commonwealth is that we have proven that we have a commitment to the arts in this State which goes way beyond anything that exists anywhere else in the Commonwealth. As I understand it, the fact is that the Commonwealth Government, increasingly in many areas of its operations, is moving to a situation whereby formulas are being devised which bring funding for the States much closer to per capita funding.

Even though this is so, the South Australian arts community is certainly able to attract better than average funding for the arts programs. The South Australian Department for the Arts has spent quite considerable time during the past couple of years talking to and negotiating with the Arts Council about funding for various arts programs in this State, and it is certainly working to maximise the funding that can be attracted to various arts pursuits in South Australia. It will continue to do so. In the area of the arts, as in many other areas of funding in Australia at present, there has been some need for restraint, and the arts has to share portion of the burden. The arts certainly has not been singled out in any way.

As far as the State Government is concerned, we would be keen to encourage the Arts Council to maintain levels of funding to South Australia and, as I have indicated, discussions have taken place along those lines and as much pressure as possible is exerted to see that funding is maintained in those areas.

BUILDERS LICENSING

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about builders licensing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: A Mr Peter J. Daniels is seeking justice in relation to defective building work at his premises at 155 Waymouth Street, Adelaide. Those premises comprise office accommodation, a restaurant and residential accommodation. The builder involved was Sabemo (SA) Pty Ltd. Mr Daniels complained to the Builders Licensing Board about defective work on his premises. The work started in April 1985 and was to be finished in October 1985. That target was not achieved. In August 1986 the board resolved, as a result of complaints by Mr Daniels, to conduct an investigation under the Builders Licensing Act. On 12 December 1986 the board made a formal order under section 18 of the Builders Licensing Act ordering that remedial work be carried out, and 73 items were listed for action. I table a copy of the order.

The failure to comply with the order was an offence and, under the old Builders Licensing Act, was cause for disciplinary action. The repair work was not undertaken and in March 1987 the board decided to take no further action. That decision was taken on the basis of a statement by Sabemo that Mr Daniels would not allow access to his property to do remedial work—an allegation that Mr Daniels denies vehemently. What is strange is that the decision was made without hearing any evidence from Mr Daniels or in any way consulting him. In a letter to the board, after finding out what it had done, he rejected the claim and complained that he should have been consulted before the board took a unilateral decision to close the file. He requested the board to pursue the rectification of all faults. The board did not do so.

Getting no satisfaction there, Mr Daniels turned to arbitration, which found that of 141 complaints of faulty workmanship the majority had substance and must be rectified. This has not been complied with. Mr Daniels discussed his problems with officers of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs, and letters have been sent to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. All that has resulted from this is a lame-duck response that the board is no longer in existence, so whatever the merits of the decision, it cannot be reopened. In a letter dated 13 January 1989 the Acting Minister said:

> It may be possible for Mr Daniels to take disciplinary action against Sabemo before the Commercial Tribunal.

That tribunal has replaced the Builders Appellate and Disciplinary Tribunal. Madam President, there is no offer of assistance and, in effect, Mr Daniels is on his own. Understandably, he is not at all happy about getting what to him appears to be a brush-off. He has spent about $45 000 himself on legal fees to get some justice, and he is expecting that somewhere in the system of regulation of builders he might get some assistance to bring this matter to a head. My questions are as follows:

1. Will the Minister of Consumer Affairs investigate why the Builders Licensing Board unilaterally resolved to take no further action--with the emphasis on the unilateral action?

2. Will the Minister request his departmental officers to take action under the new Builders Licensing Act in order that this matter may be resolved once and for all as one small way by which Mr Daniels may be given support to have his significant problems redressed?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member has made a number of assertions in his question, but I am not in a position to indicate whether or not they are substantiated. The Builders Licensing Board, as is the Commercial Tribunal, is an independent body established by statute for the purpose of adjudicating in relation to disputes of that kind. They are not boards or bodies over which the Government has any control. That is the first thing that needs to be said, and I would have expected the honourable member to have known that. Whether I am able to investigate whether the Builders Licensing Board acted properly in 1987, I am not sure.

Certainly, I can make some inquiries and see whether information will be forthcoming. However, I repeat that the Builders Licensing Board and the Commercial Tribunal are independent statutory authorities. I am not sure whether any further assistance in this matter can be given to Mr Daniels. However, I will take the honourable member's question on notice and bring back a reply.

INFORMATION EXCHANGE

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, as head of the Government in this Council, a question about personal information exchange between State and Federal departments.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: I have received a number of complaints about forms required by various Government departments to be signed for reasons of substantiation, whereby the State department can go to the Department of Social Security to check certain information. The Housing Trust has been involved in this practice for some months. Apparently, the Gas Company is also involved, and there is some suggestion of ETSA and others being involved. At this stage, computer tapes apparently are sent to social security for cross-checking, and there has been some question whether or not that is even legal under Federal privacy legislation. The people who have contacted me have not objected to the need for substantiation. Their objection has been on the basis that it was setting a precedent, and that social security does not even sight the forms which are signed by the individuals.

They fear that the information exchange may be unnecessary and that here in South Australia, at least, we have no legislative guarantees on privacy. They suggest that there are other mechanisms for substantiation. For example, for some 18 months the Department of Social Security has been providing vouchers, on a quarterly basis, to people entitled to Telecom concessions. The question that has been asked of me is, if social security can do that with Telecom, why can it not do a similar thing for State Government departments which need verification that these people are recipients of social security?

Will the Minister explore the possibility that such a voucher system could be used? It still removes the risk of fraud in relation to State Government departments and involves no greater costs because, instead of exchanging computer tapes and the need for cross-matching, we simply have the supply of vouchers.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: On the question of the protection of individuals' privacy as far as information obtained about them by the State Government is concerned, I have addressed that matter in the Council on a number of occasions. The honourable member is aware that privacy principles have been promulgated by the South Australian Government and will be overseen by a privacy committee.

Those privacy principles involve people having access to records held on them by the Government, and obviously, the capacity for people to correct any inaccuracies in that material. The honourable member makes a point about it not being backed by legislation, and that is true, but the reality is that they are decisions of Government, taken at Cabinet level and they are enforceable in the sense that anyone who complains that the privacy principles are not being adhered to can go to the Ombudsman.

The Hon. M.J. Elliott: You could change the rules tomorrow.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: We could change the rules tomorrow and, if the rules are changed tomorrow, no doubt the honourable member is in a position to complain about that change. The fact is that the principles that have been established are those which have generally been accepted through the OECD and through the Australian Law Reform Commission. They are generally accepted privacy principles which have been promulgated by the Government.

As has been indicated, the whole scheme will operate from 1 July this year, and those principles, although not in legislation, do have the backing of the Government. People who are aggrieved by a decision under those principles have access to the Ombudsman to complain about such a grievance. So, whether or not legislation is in place is not of great significance. The reality is that the principles are there. They bind the Government and they can be investigated by the Ombudsman if there is a breach or potential breach. I just put that on the record. With respect to the specific matter raised by the honourable member, I will have some inquiries made and bring back a reply.

TANDANYA PROJECT

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism a question about the Tandanya project on Kangaroo Island.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: There is great sensitivity and concern on Kangaroo Island over reports that the Tandanya project will involve Japanese investment. The Minister would appreciate that this is a particularly sensitive issue, with the many soldier settlers still living on the island. I have been informed that the principal negotiator for this project is a Mr Stitt, described by the Minister here on 1 December last year as 'a person quite close to me'. I understand that Mr Stitt was previously unsuccessful in putting forward a proposal for a development within the Flinders Chase National Park. The rights to the development within the park are now held by another company and, ultimately, the Government must decide if it is to proceed.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: Would you repeat the first part of that sentence?

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I would suggest that you listen to the question. However, there is mounting speculation on Kangaroo Island that the Government will scrap these plans in favour of the proposed development outside the park. My questions to the Minister are: has the Government been made aware of the source of funding for the Tandanya motel venture near Flinders Chase on Kangaroo Island? Does any member of the Cabinet have any direct or indirect interest in this development and how will it affect previously announced proposals for a tourist development within the Flinders Chase National Park?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I presume that this is part of the ongoing campaign on the part of members of the Opposition to raise what I term 'sleazebag' questions and personal attacks in this place on individual members of the Cabinet. All of the questions that have been raised in recent times about individual Ministers or things that may be related to them or individuals who may have some association with them have been shown to be without foundation and based on no relevant information whatsoever.

I guess that this is another one of those attempts to somehow suggest that a Minister in this Government is, in some way, behaving inappropriately or has some inappropriate involvement with some activity that may be going on in this State. If the honourable member would care to do a little research on the matter to which he is referring, he would find that there is absolutely no reason whatosever for any questions of any kind to be raised in this Chamber about this other than to attempt by implication and smear tactics to suggest that somehow or other that I, or anyone close to me, is behaving improperly or gaining some sort of advantage by being associated with me.

I state that clearly and categorically in this Chamber because I anticipate that more questions of this kind will be asked during the course of this year about Mr Jim Stitt and his association with me. These people have nothing at all on which to criticise the Government in terms of policy issues, but they will attempt to pursue this line of personal attack and abuse. Mr Jim Stitt is very careful about the sort of business with which he becomes involved in South Australia because of his association with me. In fact, if anything could be said, it would be that Mr Jim Stitt's business suffers extensively because of his association with me, as there are many things that he otherwise might be qualified to apply for or become involved with, but he will not do so because it may be viewed in the sort of way that the honourable member is viewing his own association with the Tandanya development. For that reason he will not become involved in a whole range of activities in which he could become involved or be qualified to become involved with because we want to avoid the sort of personal abuse and attack with which the honourable member is joining some of his colleagues in pursuing here.

I have no idea about the funding arrangements for the proposed development outside the Flinders Chase National Park. That is not a matter of concern to the Government in the sense that it is not directly involved with that development. I suggest to the honourable member that, if he is concerned about Japanese investment on Kangaroo Island, or in the particular development to which he refers, he should contact the people who are associated with that development, and ask them about their funding arrangements. It is quite improper that the honourable member should raise these sorts of questions here.

As to whether or not members of the Cabinet have direct or indirect interests in that project, that is not a matter on which I can answer. I do not know what the direct or indirect relationships of my Cabinet colleagues are. I am prepared to make inquiries about that if the honourable member feels concerned about it. I understand that was a sentence in the honourable member's explanation which I did not quite catch. I think he was suggesting that Mr Stitt had been involved at some stage or other with the development inside the national park. To my knowledge that is not so. Mr Stitt has never had any involvement with any proposed development inside the national park. The only development with which I understand he has had any involvement is the one outside the national park. If the honourable member has concerns about the nature of his involvement, I suggest that he raises those concerns with the individual involved, and not come into this Chamber and try to smear my reputation by these sleazy questions that are based on nothing whatsoever other than a desire to attempt to denigrate my reputation.

ROXBY DOWNS EMPLOYEES

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister representing the Minister of Mines and Energy a question relating to workers compensation for employees at Roxby Downs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Members will realise that employees working in the Roxby Downs uranium mine will be covered by the normal processes of WorkCover. However, it is important to reflect on the history of the asbestos mining at Wittenoom in Western Australia and the quite horrendous projections of developing cancers as a result of working in those conditions some 10 to 15 years ago and the projection that its effects will become apparent for the next 20 to 30 years. The comparison is valid in that radia-

tion related effects on the human body take many years to reveal themselves, and the genetic effects may take more than one specific generation to be clearly proven.

In the time and in the uncertainty of possible demand for uranium in the future, it is reasonable to contemplate that the Roxby mine may well be closed and Roxby Management Services dissolved. In those circumstances, it has been put to me from within the United Trades and Labor Council that the Government will be liable for employee compensation and liable at law if sued. That opinion is the basis of the question which I will refer to the Minister of Mines and Energy.

First, does the Government believe that adequate allowance has been made for the potential long-term costs in worker compensation for radiation-related sickness at Roxby Downs, particularly in the calculations, if any, made by WorkCover? Secondly, in the potential scenario outlined in which Roxby Management Services no longer exists, does the Government believe that a former mine worker suffering work-related ill health will have the option of claiming against the Government and, if so, has it any plans for, or estimates of, funds available to meet those potentially quite extraordinarily large claims?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will refer that matter to the appropriate Minister and bring back a reply.

YOUTH TRAINING CENTRE

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government and Minister of Youth Affairs a question with respect to the youth training centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: On two occasions in the past six months—in August last year and again last month—the Enfield council rejected a proposal by the Department for Community Welfare to build a secure centre for young offenders at Gilles Plains. The site in question is a six hectare block of Government-owned land between Sudholz, Blacks and Grand Junction Roads. The plan is to house a maximum of 36 young offenders aged 10 to possibly 18 years. The project is estimated to cost about $8 million.

In addition to the opposition registered by the council, the proposal has been attacked fiercely this week by the principal, students and parents of St Paul's College. They, like the council, argue that it is inappropriate to house such a unit adjacent to the school on a common boundary. The policy and practice of that school is to place a high emphasis on instilling discipline and standards of responsibility in children. There is another adjacent site nearby, at Yatala, which the Government also owns.

The Department for Community Welfare seems hell bent on proceeding with this proposal at Gilles Plains, and the council, local residents and staff and pupils of St Paul's College are most concerned that the Government may ignore local government's rejection of this proposal for the centre because the council has no legal planning authority over Government institutions. Therefore, I ask the Minister: is she aware of Enfield council's rejection of this proposal, initially in principle and then the application? Is she prepared to stand by the council in its rejection of this proposal, or is she prepared to endorse DCW's overriding of council's rejection of this proposal?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: This is not a matter that has been brought to my attention in my capacity as either Minister of Local Government or Minister of Youth Affairs, so I am unable to comment on it. However, I will seek a report on it and bring back a reply.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question relating to local government elections.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: The South Australian *Gazette* of 23 February records that local government elections have been suspended pending the outcome of reports from the Local Government Advisory Commission. The suspension affects nine councils in the Mid North, and the Minister has told us that the commission is looking at a number of other submissions covering a variety of proposals and affecting a reasonably large number of councils, mainly metropolitan or outer metropolitan councils.

Will the Minister say whether there is likely to be another batch of councils having suspended elections? Also, when is the absolute cut-off date for the Minister to suspend those elections, and will the Minister find a common date to hold elections following the resolve of the commission's deliberations on the matters before it?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: There will not be other councils for whom elections will be suspended over and above the nine councils whose names have already been gazetted, even though a number of applications are still before the Local Government Advisory Commission to vary the boundaries of a number of councils, particularly in the metropolitan area. This matter was raised with me by at least one outer metropolitan council which is currently the subject of a proposal before the commission. A request was made to me that the elections for that council area be suspended pending the outcome of the review and decisions being made. I am not in a position, where proposals affect councils of that kind, to suspend elections because, under the terms of the Local Government Act, council elections may be suspended only where an amalgamation proposal is before the Local Government Advisory Commission.

In view of the circumstances that have arisen with other proposals where there is the suggestion of quite substantial boundary change, even though it does not involve amalgamation, there could in fact be a good case for having a provision within the Local Government Act for council elections to be suspended in those circumstances so that the council is not subject to enormous costs in running two council elections within reasonably close proximity and so that electors are not required to go to the polls on too many occasions.

I am currently reviewing that matter, but I shall consult local government on it before I take any action. However, it seems to me that there is merit in the proposal that there should be power to suspend council elections where a substantial variation of boundaries is proposed and the matter has not been resolved by the closing time for nominations for council elections.

YOUTH PROGRAMS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: My question to the Minister of Youth Affairs is: what is the Bannon Government's policy in relation to the concept of a youth offer or youth guarantee?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: The Bannon Government believes that it would be of considerable benefit to young

people in South Australia if it were possible to offer a package which would enable young people, at least within a particular age group, to be given some form of education, training or employment. Schemes of this kind have been instituted in other parts of Australia and other parts of the world with some success.

Last year we had a pilot project operating in the northern suburbs around Elizabeth. It has certainly shown considerable results. We have been able to get various education and training institutions to work more closely together in providing programs for young people in their own areas. That has made it a much greater possibility that young people in the Elizabeth area will consider again the question whether or not to return to school, if they have left, or whether or not there might be some other training or employment opportunities available to them.

Based on that experience, I certainly advocate the view that, if at all possible, the Government should be attempting to build on that scheme in other areas of the State and to provide suitable opportunities for young people in education, training and employment.

This matter is currently under discussion within the Government, together with a number of other ideas for providing adequate opportunities for young people in South Australia. I hope that as we lead up to the next budget cycle the discussions which are taking place will lead to the preparation and implementation of a much broader youth offer than the sort of arrangement that we have been able to offer so far in limited areas of the State.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I should like to put a supplementary question. In the discussions that have so far taken place on the youth offer, what has been the range of the estimated cost to the Government of the extension of the youth offer? Do I take it from the Minister's response that it is unlikely that we shall see an expansion of the program prior to the next budget round of discussions at the start of the next financial year?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not in a position to indicate what an expanded youth offer might cost. As I indicated, discussions are at an early stage. It will depend very much on what age group was involved and which areas of the State were considered desirable to provide such a scheme. There is much work to be done on that.

I should not like to leave the honourable member with the impression that no work in this area is likely to occur before the next budget cycle. In fact, building on the work that has already been undertaken, there has been a considerable achievement in various parts of the metropolitan area and in some country areas in drawing together the various institutions which have some responsibility in the areas of education, employment and training, and improvements have been made in the way that the service is delivered to young people within the existing resources of those agencies.

It has been a matter of managing existing resources in a more effective way to provide a better service to young people. There has already been considerable work and achievement in those areas, and I hope that we shall be able to build on that work. If it requires additional resources, I hope that it might be possible for those additional resources to be made available. Of course, that depends entirely on the agencies involved and the budget process, which will take place during the next few months.

PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION FUND

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, a question on the topic of the Public Service Superannuation Fund.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: On 6 November 1986, at page 1897 of *Hansard*, I pointed out that State public servants receive no notice or statement about their contributions to their superannuation fund or about the management of that fund. I suggested at that time that that was important because for many public servants the superannuation would be the principal contribution towards their provision for retirement. I mentioned that Commonwealth public servants do receive a notice setting out their entitlement and something about the management of the fund.

On 16 January 1987, I received a reply from the Treasurer, which, *inter alia*, said: 'I agree that there is value in members of the State superannuation scheme receiving annual notices setting out their entitlements and also receiving information on the management of the superannuation fund.' The reply went on to suggest that the Commonwealth scheme was not adequate. Then it said: 'The programming for these more extensive policies is complex, but has been substantially completed. I expect the first notices to be issued within a few months.' That was in January 1987. It is now 25 months later.

I raised the question again on 18 August 1987, at page 242 of *Hansard*, and again, speaking to a Superannuation Bill, at page 3610. Public servants have told me, as recently as today, that still no notices are received. I have made some inquiries of other public servants and all confirm that still no notices are issued. This is important to the public servants because it is often their main provision for their retirement. My question is: when will the Treasurer comply with his promise to send out the notices in question 'within a few months'?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I agree with the sentiments expressed by the honourable member. As I understood it, it was certainly the intention of the Superannuation Board to issue such statements. I will ascertain the present position and bring back a reply.

NATIONAL COMPANIES AND SECURITIES COMMISSION

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the National Companies and Securities Commission.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Last week it was reported that the Ministerial Council on Companies and Securities approved a substantial increase in funding for the National Companies and Securities Commission to undertake its work effectively under the respective companies, securities industries and futures industries codes. Presumably, half that funding was provided by the Commonwealth and the balance by the States under the pre-existing formula.

The increase in funding for the NCSC would inevitably result in additional work for the South Australian Corporate Affairs Commission as agent for the National Companies and Securities Commission, but there is no information, as far as I am aware, as to how the Minister of Corporate Affairs proposes to deal with that increased workload that will be experienced by the State Corporate Affairs Commission. What provision has been made for the State Corporate Affairs Commission to meet the additional workload that will result in the additional level of work at the National Companies and Securities Commission level?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not accept the premise on which the honourable member's question is based. I do not accept that there will be any additional work for the Corporate Affairs Commissions in the States. In fact, there may well be less work because of the work that will be done by the National Companies and Securities Commission. If it turns out that additional work is imposed on the local Corporate Affairs Commission then that will be dealt with as part of the budget in the normal way.

When approval was given for this increase in resources it was not envisaged that there would be any great additional workload on the Corporate Affairs Commissions in the States. I should take this opportunity to correct one obvious misconception that the honourable member has about the increase in resources to the National Companies and Securities Commission—that is, the method of funding. The decision was to increase the number of employees in the NCSC by 40 over a period of two years, and the funding for those positions will be raised by, in effect, a user pays imposition on the activities of the NCSC. A charge will be levied in certain circumstances for rulings sought of the commission. There will be a levy on the lodging of prospectuses and other—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Done at the State level?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Done at the State level, but the money will be made available to fund the additional positions that have been agreed to—they are additional positions to the National Companies and Securities Commission, not to State commissions. The funding will come from—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: The States?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Not from the States in accordance with the proportion under the formal agreement, but it will come as a result of certain measures. Some will be collected by the NCSC directly where there are rulings sought of it and, as I understand it, others will be collected at the State level. But it will be essentially done on the basis of the use that is made of the Corporate Affairs Commissions and the NCSC and, in particular, by the large companies whose activities and requests on the commission are not covered by the costs that they pay. Essentially, it will not be funded in accordance with the normal arrangements under the formal agreement, but moneys will be raised as a result of the measures I have indicated to the Council.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 February. Page 1874.)

The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT: This Bill has been before us for some time largely because I have been waiting for the Government to come up with a substantial reason why it should be passed. I have given the Government an enormous amount of time, and there has been no substantial response. First, I place on record my attitude towards Government enterprises. I do not agree with the Liberal Party on this matter, as I have not agreed with it on a number of other occasions. I have no problems with Government-run enterprises, but I think each needs to be argued on its own merits.

In this case an existing industry supplies what it is proposed the Metropolitan Fire Service will provide, and it does not offer a new service to the public, nor does it, on the arguments so far put forward, offer to improve services. If it could do that then I might have been persuaded, but that really is not the case.

The arguments that have been put forward have been largely spurious. The amendment is very open ended and allows the Minster the right to assign any other function he or she wishes to assign. I suggest that the expectation that such a clause would be agreed to in this Council would be foolhardy. I understand that the Metropolitan Fire Service might already be acting outside the Act in relation to some of the services that it now provides, and I would have tolerated them as they already exist. I would support legislation that guaranteed that the service continue its current services and not try to expand. As the Metropolitan Fire Service is now well entrenched in the service industry, I would not be seeking to have it removed from that.

However, this Bill goes beyond that and seeks to make the service a major supplier of equipment and, as I said previously, there has been no substantial reason from the Government why that should be the case. It is worthwhile to separate the important role that the Metropolitan Fire Service may play, judicially almost, in ensuring that standards are being set, and then in being involved in the marketplace. Those two roles clearly need to be separate. Unless the Government, in the dying stages of this second reading debate, comes up with something far more substantial than what has been raised in this Chamber or in the Lower House, then the Democrats will be opposing the Bill.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 February. Page 2125.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: My colleague, the Hon. Mr Dunn, has already spoken at length on this Bill and has raised one of the issues which causes me concern. I want to reinforce the concern I have about one part of the Bill which relates particularly to proposed section 97a (1) *(c)* which provides that a person other than a member of the armed forces or a spouse or a dependant of a member of the armed forces may drive a vehicle in a State pursuant to an interstate licence or a foreign licence if that person last entered this State less than three months before driving the vehicle.

That suggests to me that technically, if a person drives in South Australia on an interstate licence, having last entered South Australia more than three months prior to the relevant driving time, that driver is then deemed to be unlicensed. There may be provisions in the principal Act which overcome that difficulty but, in relation to comprehensive motor vehicle insurance and third party bodily injury insurance, one of the conditions is that in order to be properly covered the driver must hold a valid licence.

If that person has been in South Australia for more than three months and has either not been aware of the need to change, or has not got around to changing, the interstate licence for a South Australian licence (in most instances, the result of inadvertence), there may be a breach of the policies of insurance. That has significant consequences, whether it is comprehensive insurance or third party bodily injury insurance. If it is comprehensive insurance, if the driver runs into a Mercedes, the cost might be $10 000 or

$20 000 to repair, plus loss of use, a considerable claim which, if the driver's own comprehensive insurance has been voided for breach of condition, will make the driver liable for a substantial burden.

Similarly, with third party bodily injury insurance, if the driver is deemed to be unlicensed, then the insurer—SGIC, being the sole insurer—may take action to recover from the driver the whole of any payment made out to some person who may be injured as a result of an accident. Again, that is a significant impost and might well send the driver bankrupt. I am concerned that that may be the consequence of the passing of this paragraph. As I said earlier, it may be that there is some answer to this problem in a saving provision in the principal Act, but I have not been able to find that.

Certainly, on my interpretation in the set of circumstances to which I have referred it does at least raise the question of a person being inadvertently unlicensed and therefore having to face the prospect of substantial damages if involved in an accident. I do not suppose that that was the Government's intention in preparing this provision but, if it is an unintended consequence, I hope that the Government has a remedy to put that question beyond doubt. Subject to that matter of significant importance, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: A number of questions have been raised to which I will need to seek replies.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PRISONERS (INTERSTATE TRANSFER) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 February. Page 2053.)

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I support the second reading of the Bill, which is largely technical and semantic. Its purpose, as explained by the Attorney, is to give effect to an agreement between the States, the Commonwealth and the Northern Territory to provide a transfer mechanism for those persons imprisoned for Commonwealth offences or joint Commonwealth-State offences. The model provisions have been agreed, as I have said, between the States, the Commonwealth and the Northern Territory and have already been enacted in Queensland, Tasmania, Western Australia and New South Wales. This Bill substantially follows the model, with some minor variations to comply with other State laws.

The Bill provides new definitions, including rules for determining at what point a sentence of imprisonment has been completed. That is obviously necessary when one is talking about a transfer mechanism. The remaining clauses deal with all the amendments consequential upon the necessity to refer to the territories and Commonwealth as well as the participating States. New sections 8, 16a and 21 make clear that State orders made in relation to joint prisoners have no effect unless a corresponding Commonwealth order is in existence.

Madam President, the Bill is simply to give effect to an agreement that has been made between the States, the Commonwealth and the Northern Territory. I have examined it to see whether I can find whether anyone, including prisoners, can be disadvantaged by the Bill, but I cannot see that that can happen. I have undertaken some consultation in this regard. The Bill appears to be sensible and I am happy to support the second reading and the Bill.

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 February. Page 2054.)

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I support the second reading of this Bill, which is designed to correct anomalies in regard to the concessions which apply to first home buyers under section 71c of the Stamp Duties Act. I support the Bill because it assists people on low incomes who wish to purchase their own homes, and I suppose that shelter is the major item of expenditure of most people, and certainly of low income earners.

Two schemes currently are operated by the Housing Trust to assist such people. The first is the Government's Home Ownership Made Easier program, which is a rental-purchase scheme. Under section 71c at present, people who purchase their homes under that scheme do not have the advantage of the first home buyers concession because the property is not transferred to them. There is no conveyance. Section 71c at present makes the conveyance the point at which the concession is attracted. This Bill, therefore, will make the concession available to those people. The second scheme operating in the Housing Trust is the HOME trust shared ownership scheme, whereby the purchase is made in stages and, because the first stage usually does not require a payment which would fill up the full amount of the concession, people who purchase under that scheme also do not receive the full advantage of the concession.

So, I completely agree with helping people on low incomes who aspire to home ownership—as I think almost everyone in Australia does—and giving them a concession which is already available to other people. Only one thing mystified me to a certain extent when I read the Bill initially, and that was the fact that the concession is retrospective to the first day of February 1988. I wondered why that was the case. I note that that matter was raised in the other place but that the Minister there did not address it during the second reading reply. The Minister in this place (the Attorney-General) did address it—doubtless because it had been raised by the Opposition in the other place. At page 2054 of *Hansard* he is reported as saying:

> Such an amendment would be effective from the first day of February 1988, in order to rectify the status of applications rejected since this time.

I certainly accept that. I think that everyone in this Chamber knows that the Liberal Party, generally speaking, looks askance at retrospective legislation. More particularly, where legislation makes an act which is lawful retrospectively unlawful or retrospectively attract a penalty, generally speaking we are opposed to legislation of that kind. This legislation is designed to give a benefit retrospectively to people whom we think ought to benefit from the provision. Now that the explanation has been given in this place, we thank the Minister for it and can see no objection to that course. I support the Bill.

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

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 February. Page 2055.)

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The Opposition supports this Bill, which makes a series of amendments to the Superannuation Act of 1988. Members would recollect that that Act was the end product of an inquiry into the public sector superannuation scheme in South Australia. It put into effect many of the recommendations of the Agars committee of inquiry into the South Australian public sector scheme and brought it into line with its private sector equivalents. Many shortcomings in the superannuation provisions in the public sector had existed since the inception of the scheme in 1974.

In fact, it is interesting to reflect that in 1988, when the Superannuation Bill was before us in this Chamber, the second reading explanation admitted:

> A majority of the committee [that is, the Agars committee] expressed concern that, whilst the State scheme only attracted 30 per cent of eligible employees as members it was amongst the most generous public sector schemes in Australia. Whilst it was originally envisaged that the fund would meet 28 per cent of the total cost of benefits the Agars committee reported that the fund was currently only able to support 17.5 per cent of the cost of benefits. The Government was therefore having to support 82.5 per cent of the cost of total benefits.

Some members will recollect that the Government was forced to examine the public sector scheme in South Australia following a private member's motion I moved, demanding that such inquiry be set up. It was to the Government's credit that it recognised there was a problem—not just for the Government of the day but for future generations of South Australians who would have to bear the burden of the increasing cost of public sector superannuation in South Australia.

Indeed, the Agars committee was modest, because I could not find another superannuation scheme in the world, serving a large number of employees, that was more generous than the public sector scheme in South Australia. Indeed, it could truly be said that it was the most generous superannuation scheme in the world.

Notwithstanding its generosity, it still had some severe disadvantages. It had a lack of flexibility which discouraged younger people from entering the scheme. That is reflected in the fact that only 30 per cent of eligible employees were members. That is because they were required to pay some 6 per cent of their salary or wage into the scheme and were then obliged to stay in that scheme for a long period of time to become eligible for the benefits of the scheme. So, after the Agars committee of inquiry—which, I must say, included some people with financial skill and knowledge of superannuation—the Government moved to totally restructure the superannuation scheme for public servants in South Australia. The old scheme was frozen as at, I think, May 1986, and the new scheme was put in place as from 1 July last year.

This new scheme is certainly a generous one, but it is much more in line with private sector schemes. It provides flexibility so that members can choose the rate of contribution that they wish to pay into the fund, ranging from 1.5 per cent, 3 per cent, 4.5 per cent, 6 per cent, 7.5 per cent, right through to 9 per cent. It provides much more incentive for women to join the scheme which, of course, was one of the criticisms levelled at the old scheme by the Agars committee. The new scheme provides flexibility on resignation so that if persons resign before the age of 55 they can preserve their accrued benefits, which will continue to accrue until the age of 55, when it becomes payable. In certain circumstances the benefits that accrue under the scheme will be portable to another superannuation scheme and, if members of the fund decide to withdraw their contributions on resignation they will receive the employee component only.

It was interesting to note that members who had been in the fund for only a short period of time under the old scheme received an enormous benefit. They received the employer component of 2.33 times the employee contribution, plus interest. So under the old scheme, if you were employed for less than 10 years—maybe even as little as two or three years—you got 2.33 times the employer contribution plus interest, as well as your own contributions. The new scheme is certainly not as generous as that.

It is interesting and encouraging to note that, although this scheme has been in operation for only eight months, since 1 July last year there have been 1 300 new applications to join it. That compares very favourably with fewer than 300 applications for the corresponding period in the previous year. I am pleased to see, therefore, that the Public Service Association, along with the South Australian Superannuation Fund, has been promoting the benefits of the fund, because if there is one factor which should have bipartisan support it is the adequate provision of income for people in their retirement years. For many years Australia has fallen behind other countries in the recognition of the need to have appropriate schemes operating to provide adequately for people in their retirement.

In fact, it is still true to say, notwithstanding the arrangements made with unions recently, that little more than 50 per cent of the work force has a superannuation benefit. In Australia there is the dilemma of whether we should pay a lump sum as against a pension or a combination of both. Again, Australia is very much out of step with the rest of the world in the sense that we are virtually the only Western country where the majority of persons in private sector schemes—and that figure is well over 90 per cent—take their superannuation by way of lump sum. In turn, that can lead to abuse, double-dipping with people in receipt of quite large sums coming back to claim a pension, having received a superannuation benefit which should have been more than adequate to cover them in their retirement years.

In determining policy—whether we are talking of Federal or State Governments, and in the private sector too—it is important to start with that criterion that superannuation is for people's retirement. It is not to travel around the world X times, to buy holiday shacks or bigger and better cars: it is to provide for their retirement needs. As people retire earlier, and as people live longer, this question becomes more critical. Only 20 years ago in Australia four out of five males in the 60 to 64 year age group were still working. 80 per cent of the male work force was still employed in that age group. Now that figure is little more than 40 per cent. In other words, nearly 60 per cent of the 60 to 64 year old age group has now retired. That means that people are retiring earlier. It is also a demographic fact (and I am sure the Hon. Bob Ritson will agree) that people are living much longer. In the past two or three decades we have seen the spectacle of people retiring earlier and living longer, with the prospect of two decades of retirement, as distinct from a decade of retirement not so long ago.

This matter of superannuation for public servants in South Australia is therefore of great importance. I am pleased that the scheme that has been put in place has attracted the support of public servants. Although it certainly is one of the most generous schemes—and that has been admitted by the Public Service Association—I accept that the generosity of the scheme is in some way compensation for the growing

gap that exists between some Public Service employees and their private sector equivalents. I accept that superannuation must be seen as part of a remuneration package.

Having said that, and speaking generally on the subject of superannuation, I must say that I am not surprised that we have seen a number of so-called technical amendments required to the 1988 Superannuation Act. It was a very complex and detailed Act. Some matters which need correction have come to the attention of the superannuation officers. I refer to the fact that at present there is not sufficient flexibility in the Act to enable an employee under the Government Management and Employment Act to resign and take up employment, for instance, as the second reading states, with the Country Fire Service Board. There is an amendment to rectify that obvious fault. Similarly, there is a lacuna in the Act because it does not cater for school teachers who are under contract on a calendar year basis, where their contract may expire in December and where they then take up another contract for a school year starting a month later in February.

So it is important that they can be given continuity in the superannuation scheme. There are a number of amendments to this Bill. It is a Committee Bill and no doubt there will be some questions at the Committee stage. I am pleased to see that the Superannuation Act, although in its infancy, appears to be working well.

There remains the matter of how much it will cost the taxpayers of South Australia and obviously that will become clearer as the administration of the Act unfolds and we receive the report of its first year's operation some time later in the year. I support the second reading.

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ARTHUR HARDY SANCTUARY (ALTERATION OF BOUNDARY) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 February. Page 2125.)

The Hon. J.C. IRWIN: The Opposition supports this Bill, which has been introduced after consultation between the Botanic Gardens board and the known residual family of the late Mr Arthur Hardy. The form of the proposed management of this land will be much better adjacent to the existing Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens than is the case now in what might be called its unkept form. The provision of approximately 60 car parking spaces will certainly be an intrusion into that area, but I am assured that, like the intrusion which took place into the original Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens, the landscaping will be very delicately undertaken and the improvements will be quite beneficial to the whole area. More particularly, the replanting of the sanctuary with a mixture of local and overseas or exotic species will return the area to a much better condition than has existed for many years.

When it was under the control of the Department of Woods and Forests, *pinus radiata* was introduced into the area, and until that was burnt out in the 1983 fires, a form of forest which was foreign to the whole area intruded into a section immediately adjacent to the Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens. I remind the Council that the descendants of the late Arthur Hardy gave this land in 1939, 13 years before the Mount Lofty gardens were developed as a sanctuary. In his second reading explanation, the Minister stated that the Botanic Gardens board will undertake maintenance and planting of the species which will result in fulfilling the original intention of the area as a bird sanctuary.

We have been made aware by the Director of the Botanic Gardens (Dr Morley) that the board has been more than happy with the endeavours of those of the Hardy family who still exist, and others, to assist in the matter that is before us now. In particular, he has expressed his appreciation of the work undertaken by officers of the Highways Department to assist the Botanic Gardens in aligning the roadway entrance off Summit Road into this area. The aesthetic improvement will be very beneficial to the public and will indirectly assist the Highways Department in the control of traffic in the immediate area. That is a highly desirable situation for this parcel of land which has come to the Government by way of the beneficiaries of Mr Arthur Hardy on behalf of the original Barton family. The Opposition supports the Bill and sincerely hopes that the sanctuary, which was a gift to the State, never again falls into the condition of considerable decay that it is in today.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.58 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 8 March at 2.15 p.m.