HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 1 April 1980

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

VICTORIA SQUARE (INTERNATIONAL HOTEL) BILL

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

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PETITION: RETAIL TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 309 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose the Bill to extend trading hours for retail food stores until 6 p.m. on Saturdays was presented by Mr. Langley.

Petition received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 41 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by Mr. Blacker.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard:* Nos. 585, 600, 683, 699, 702, 705, 706, 716, 719, 755, 762, 766, 768, 777, 780, 785, 839, 856, 857, 870, and 871.

LIVESTOCK FACILITIES

In reply to **Mr. PETERSON** (20 February).

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Department of Marine and Harbors is considering changes to sheep-handling arrangements at Outer Harbor, but the two projects referred to by the honourable member (upgrading of No. 3 berth and extension of land reclamation scheme) are not directly related. Because of the ever-increasing size of sheep-handling vessels, the arrangements for transferring sheep directly from trains to the vessel no longer provide adequate loading rates and a number of alternative arrangements are being discussed with the exporters involved. As an interim measure to cope with immediate requirements, it is proposed to provide temporary holding pens at the rear of No. 3 berth.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: INTEREST RATES

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Last week in this House I was asked whether I had approved or received a request for approval in respect of new Savings Bank and State Bank interest rates. At that time I pointed out that I had been in consultation with the two banks concerned, and further that it was likely that there would be some developments this week. The developments since that time are as follows:

The Savings Bank of South Australia today announced rises in its interest rates. Information I have received from the bank's General Manager, Mr. Wilton, indicates the bank is increasing the rate paid on deposit stock savings investment accounts, by ·5 per cent per annum to 8·5 per cent per annum, with a corresponding rise in rates for owner-occupied housing. The new rate for loans up to $35 000 will be 10 per cent per annum. Larger loans will be at 10·5 per cent per annum. The increased rates will apply to all new loans approved from today, 1 April, and will be applied to existing loans from 1 May. Investment rate increases will apply from 1 May.

The rate for deposit stock fixed terms of three months to less than six months will also increase by ·5 per cent per annum to 8·5 per cent per annum. Rates for terms from six months to less than 12 months at 8·75 per cent per annum and 12 months to 48 months at 9 per cent per annum will remain unchanged. The General Manager said recent industry moves had caused the Savings Bank to review its competitive position. The bank wished to maintain the margin it paid for investment savings funds. They accounted for a big proportion of the bank's funds and were, therefore, important to Savings Bank of South Australia's ability to lend.

With respect to the State Bank, it has sought and received the concurrence of the Reserve Bank to raise the interest rate it offers on investment accounts (that is, deposits subject to withdrawal on one month's notice) by ·5 per cent per annum to 8·25 per cent per annum as from 1 May 1980. It found this necessary in order to maintain a reasonable share in the flow of such deposits in a competitive situation when interest rates upon savings, deposits and investments have risen considerably. In particular, rates upon Commonwealth bonds and semi-government loans have risen by about 2·5 per cent per annum over the past 12 months. Building society deposits were last July increased by ·5 per cent per annum. Commonwealth savings bonds increased by ·5 per cent per annum at the beginning of March 1980 and, latterly, the Commonwealth Savings Bank and most of the private savings banks have announced increases of ·5 per cent per annum upon their investment accounts.

As a consequence, it has been found unavoidable by the State Bank, in common with the other banks concerned, to seek Reserve Bank concurrence to increasing its lending rate for ordinary owner-occupied housing by ·5 per cent per annum as such housing loans are supported substantially from deposits in savings and investment accounts. The interest rate charged by banks upon owner-occupied housing loans has remained at 9·5 per cent per annum since the beginning of 1979, notwithstanding increases in all other rates. The new standard rate for owner-occupied housing loans will be 10 per cent per annum, which will apply forthwith for new advances and from 1 May 1980 upon existing loans.

I point out, however, that the very great majority of loans made by the State Bank for owner-occupied housing are made at concession rates through the Home Builders Account and the Advances for Homes Account. These are financed out of advances from the Commonwealth and State Treasuries, and from a measure of supplementary borrowing by the bank from other sources. These concession rate loans will not be affected by the present interest rate changes. They are presently made available at starting rates of 5·75 per cent per annum, 6·75 per cent per annum, and 7·5 per cent per annum, according to the income of eligible applicants. These rates are ordinarily increased by ·5 per cent per annum in each subsequent year until they reach normal interest rates, unless the borrower can demonstrate hardship.

I would add that, following the revision approved by the Government of the maximum loan under concession conditions up to $33 000, the abandonment of the earlier arrangement for two-part first and second mortgages in favour of a simple first mortgage, and certain other measures to liberalise eligibility conditions, there has been considerable evidence during the past two months of reviving demand for concessional housing loans from eligible applicants.

This followed a period of at least 12 months when there was a remarkable reluctance by people qualifying for concession-rate loans to undertake the financial obligations involved in home purchase. The bank is now receiving a flow of applications such that it has been able to resume lending at a rate of at least 55 loans a week, which was the rate prevailing before the extraordinary fall in demand.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: STATE'S FINANCES

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: On Wednesday 26 March the Leader of the Opposition asked a question about the State's finances. It seems from the wording of the question that there could be some confusion about two things: first, the state of the combined Budget at the end of February, and, secondly, the run of payments from Loan Account this year as compared with last year. The following information will make the position clearer. First, the comparison of the situation on Revenue and Loan Accounts for the eight months ended 28 June 1979 and 29 February 1980 is as I will explain.

As at February 1979 Revenue Account had a cumulative deficit of $14 400 000 compared with a cumulative surplus of $15 300 000 at February 1980—a considerable improvement this year on last year. With respect to Loan Account, the cumulative surplus at February last year was $8 300 000 compared with a cumulative surplus this year of $13 200 000. On the combined accounts, there was a cumulative deficit in February last year of $6 100 000 compared with a cumulative surplus this year of $28 500 000—a total difference over 12 months of $34 600 000.

These figures show that the major part of the improvement for the first eight months of this financial year compared with the corresponding period of last financial year was on Revenue Account. A smaller part was on Loan Account. For Loan Account the cumulative position for the eight months as shown by the figures is $4 900 000 better than last year. Lump sum advances to statutory authorities, etc., are normally made towards the end of the year and will affect the final result considerably. In comparing payments from Loan Account this year with payments from Loan Account last year, they will be seen to be down. The Budget presented to Parliament in October last gave an estimate that payments from Loan Account would be about $14 000 000 less than last year. Any savings will form a very useful reserve towards the forthcoming commitments for infrastructure for Redcliff, Roxby Downs, and a number of other projects.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1975—Amendments to General Laws—Manchester Unity Independent Order of Oddfellows Friendly Society in South Australia.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. W. E. Chapman)—

Pursuant to Statute—

South Australian Meat Corporation—Review of the Structure and Operation, 1976-77 to 1978-79.

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. W. E. Chapman)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Woods and Forests Department—Report, 1978-79.

By the Minister of Environment (Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute—

District Council of Kadina—By-laws—

I. No. 1—Hoardings.
II. No. 3—Noisy trades.
III. No. 5—Proceedings of council.
IV. No. 6—Slaughterhouses.
V. No. 7—Traffic.
VI. No. 8—Height of fences, hedges and hoardings.
VII. No. 9—Wrapping of bread.
VIII. No. 10—Cellars.
IX. No. 11—Fires.
X. No. 12—Flags and flagpoles.
XI. No. 14—Newspapers and merchandise.
XII. No. 15—Public health.
XIII. No. 16—Restaurants and fish shops.
XIV. No. 17—Signboards.
XV. No. 20—Advertisements.
XVI. No. 21—Bees.
XVII. No. 22—Driving cattle and horses through streets.
XVIII. No. 23—Garbage bins.
XIX. No. 24—Inflammable undergrowth.
XX. No. 27—Nuisances.
XXI. No. 29—Water reserves.
XXII. No. 30—Firebreaks.
XXIII. No. 31—Keeping of dogs.
XXIV. District Council of Strathalbyn—By-law No. 19—Control of caravans.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Road Traffic Act, 1961-1979—Regulations—Accident damage.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Adoption of Children Act, 1966-1978—Regulations—Various amendments.
II. Commissioner for Consumer Affairs—Report, 1979.
III. South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1978—Mount Gambier Hospital—By-laws—Control of grounds.

MEMBERS' REMARKS

The SPEAKER: In answer to a point of order raised by the honourable member for Elizabeth on Thursday last, I undertook that, after completing investigations which I had in hand, I would give a ruling on Standing Order 154. Standing Order 154 states:

> No member shall digress from the subject matter of any question under discussion: and all imputations of improper motives, and all personal reflections on members shall be considered highly disorderly.

I point out that the honourable member for Elizabeth, when quoting this particular Standing Order on that occasion, selectively quoted by deleting the words "and all personal reflections". Members will appreciate that these words are an extremely important facet of that Standing Order.

The honourable member approached me immediately after the matter was raised in the House, and asked if I would also consider Standing Order 153, which states:

> No member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House.

Of my own volition, I have also included a consideration of Standing Order 151, which states:

> No member shall use offensive words against either House of Parliament, or, unless moving for its repeal, against any Statute.

More particularly, of course, I refer to the first part thereof. Before addressing myself to the point of order, I make the point that the Speaker is responsible for ensuring to all members their overriding right that they may be heard, subject to their compliance with the Standing Orders and practice of the House.

It is essential however, that the Standing Orders be recognised in their entirety and that, whilst rulings will be invited on individual Standing Orders, it is essential that we acknowledge the interrelationship which exists between all of them and practice of the House. In some circumstances it is necessary to have regard to the requirements of our first Standing Order, which states:

> In all cases not provided for hereinafter, or by sessional or other orders, resort shall be had to the rules, forms, and practice of the Commons House of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which shall be followed as far as they can be applied to the proceedings of this House.

To do this, we give due consideration to other sources of Parliamentary practice and procedure, particularly Erskine May. It is interesting to note that, in regard to this subject, Erskine May states:

> Parliamentary language is never more desirable than when a member is canvassing the opinions and conduct of his opponents in debate.

Having made these comments, we should recognise that, first and foremost, in the proper conduct of the House, common sense must prevail and in this regard a commonsense approach be followed by all members of the Parliament.

Secondly, I would make the point that, by practice and desire, it should not be necessary for the Speaker to be constantly involved in the debate to the point that he is being more frequently recorded than are all the other members of the House who are collectively charged with the responsibility of presenting balanced views and counter views on the affairs at issue.

I would not suggest that the Speaker abdicate his responsibility by refusing to enter the debate as may be necessary, but that, when he does, he maintain due procedure and decorum, and further, that when called upon by a member who either takes exception to, or who is aggrieved by, the utterances of another, he adjudicate as required.

Thirdly, I think it will have become apparent by my attitude, expressed above, and which I have certainly made known to members privately on a number of occasions when called on to rule or comment on points of order, that the Speaker is tied in great measure to the tenor of debate which has become the accepted standard or practice of the House. In stating this view, I would not want it to be inferred that I condone the present standard of contributions.

Turning now to the point of order raised by the honourable member for Elizabeth last Thursday, a quick review of recent proceedings in this House shows that this Standing Order has been canvassed three times: twice on 12 March (*Hansard* pages 1589 and 1592), and on Thursday 27 March (at a page yet to be determined when the new *Hansard* becomes available), and there have been other not so recent occasions, for example, from the member for Mitchell on 30 October 1979 (page 499), and from the member for Elizabeth on 6 November 1979 (*Hansard* page 728).

A quick perusal of recent pages of *Hansard* shows the following contributions which I feel were inappropriate:

The Minister of Industrial Affairs, on 4 March (*Hansard* page 1376), used the phrase "so-called Deputy Leader of the Opposition".

The honourable member for Elizabeth, on 12 March (*Hansard* page 1583), referred to "pig-headed obstruction".

The member for Stuart, on 12 March (*Hansard* page 1582), used the term "probably a good eye doctor".

The Deputy Premier, on 12 March (*Hansard* page 1607), talked of members being "weak", "left-wing", and talking "nonsense".

The member for Florey, on 4 March (*Hansard* page 1384), referring to the member for Henley Beach suggested that he "get the seaweed out of his ears and the sand out of his eyes".

The member for Stuart, on 4 March (*Hansard* page 1403), referred to "the degree to which this discussion has deteriorated when one listens to the member for Hanson".

The member for Playford, on 4 March (*Hansard* page 1405), spoke of an "arrogant Minister".

The member for Napier, on 4 March (*Hansard* page 1420), used the term "twit" when referring to another member.

The member for Glenelg, on 4 March (*Hansard* page 1419), suggested the House had been "subjected to a load of codswallop from the member for Mitchell".

The Deputy Premier, on 6 March (*Hansard* page 1524), talked of a member being a "hypocrite" and further suggested that "members opposite seem to be deaf".

The Deputy Premier, on 27 March (*Hansard* at a page to be determined), referred to the member for Elizabeth as " 'honourable' in quotes".

Whilst not wanting to embarrass the member for Elizabeth, who has raised this point of order, I draw to his attention, when he complains of the words "filthy tactics" and takes umbrage at them, that just two days previously he made in the one speech all of the following references in relation to the honourable Minister of Health:

"Ruthless and manipulating moves";

"Paragon of virtue";

"Nothing short of hypocritical act at its worst";

"The Minister's administrative bungle";

"Medical mafia";
"One of the most insidious knife jobs we have seen";
"An example of a very devious and deceptive mind at work"; and
"The Minister is calling her a lady, not me".

That we as a House appear to have lowered ourselves to these standards I find deplorable. However, I am unable to deal with it effectively without constant interruption of the debate. This I can do but, as I have indicated previously, I would, with the support of all members, have no need for such action if their individual personal conduct within the House was such as to ensure that they did not transgress even if only what to them may seem a minor way. The heat of the moment will sometimes cause a member to say things which, in all other circumstances, he would not say. However, I reiterate that it is the responsibility of each individual member to conduct himself in the best traditions of Parliamentary practice.

I therefore indicate that I intend to interpret Standing Orders 154, 153 and 151 in such a way that, where remarks made by a member are clearly unparliamentary, the Chair will call the member to order and demand their withdrawal. If they are not withdrawn to the Chair's satisfaction, whatever further action is necessary will be taken.

Where the words are not clearly unparliamentary, I will leave it to the member who feels himself impugned by some word or reference to raise a point of order. I will then request the offending member to withdraw the remarks complained of. However, it should be recognised that it is in that member's hands as to whether or not he wishes to withdraw them. I would hope that all members' sense of responsibility to other members, and particularly to the institution of Parliament, will impel them to withdraw any words about which complaints have been raised.

In regard to the action to be taken by the Chair, however, I would ask members to accept that we, also, are human and we may from time to time miss the impact of certain words, particularly when our attention is otherwise temporarily diverted.

Whilst addressing myself to this question, I want to refer now to the offers of assistance profferred to the Chair by members who see themselves as Assistant Speakers or Chairmen. Whenever the Chair calls a member to order it is very much in the hands of individual members to counter this lack of respect for the Chair and this institution. Involvement in such practice is clearly a reflection upon the member himself.

A similar lack of respect by some members when moving in or out of the Chamber, and who fail to recognise the Chair, or failure to recognise the Mace when it is being carried by the Sergeant-at-Arms, is a like reflection to which no member should subscribe. This is not an exhaustive list, but these are extensions of the principle on which I have been required to rule.

Members are at perfect liberty to debate this whole issue by way of substantive motion so that the House, the ultimate arbitrator on these matters, can determine its own destiny, but in the interim I want it to be clearly understood that I do not want to see any deterioration in the standards of this House.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. BANNON: Before commencing Question Time, Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to request that Standing Orders be so far suspended as to allow a further 10 minutes for questions, in view of the importance of your statement, which has taken some time in Question Time?

The SPEAKER: That is not a matter that is in the hands of the Chair, but the request will be noted. It is important to note that, when the Chair is asked to rule upon a point of order, it will take the time of the House, whether it be for 10 minutes, half an hour, or whatever. That situation is in the hands of another person.

Mr. BANNON: The length or importance of your report was not in question, Sir. I was simply making a request.

INTEREST RATES

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier say, in the light of his statement to this House, whether he approved the interest rate increases made by the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank of South Australia and, if so, when? Will he also indicate whether his reply to my question last Thursday misled the House? The Premier today made a statement in which he confirmed newspaper announcements of increased interest rates by the Savings Bank of South Australia, and, I understand, further increases by the State Bank of South Australia. Last Thursday, two working days prior to today, in reply to a question from me, the Premier informed the House that the bank, meaning the Savings Bank of South Australia would review interest rates during the coming fortnight. Later in his answer, the Premier said:

> In spite of the cautious approach exhibited by both the Savings Bank and State Bank, housing mortgage loans will not be increased at this stage.

Later in that statement he said that he hoped that it would not be necessary for these banks to raise their interest rates for home ownership mortgage loans, but that it still had to be considered a possibility at some time in the future. In view of the fact that notification must be made of these interest rates, that Government approval must be sought, that close to 150 suburban and country branch managers of the Savings Bank of South Australia alone have to be notified, will the Premier say whether his answer misled the House at the time it was given?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader's concern is quite appreciated and I do not in any way wish to put him down, but he would know, of course, that the boards of the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank of South Australia, in deciding these interest rates, are very much autonomous bodies. The Chairman of one board and the Acting Chairman of the other board have been in close consultation with me for a number of days now. The information I was given, which I in turn gave to this House last week, was accurate at the time and, indeed, it is strictly accurate if one considers it now.

The matter was considered during the next fortnight as from that time. It has come on very early and the reason for it is because of the pressure that has come from the general public, including officers of the Savings Bank itself, to know exactly what the situation is, so that they can inform their depositors and people borrowing. There is no question at all of having misled the House. Nobody regrets more than I that interest rates have had to go up, but I think it has been done responsibly and after a great deal of thought by the boards of the two banks concerned.

BUILDING COSTS

Mr. SCHMIDT: Can the Premier say whether his attention has been drawn to the most recent figures

relating to construction costs in both the housing and non-housing sectors, and can he say whether those figures confirm the encouraging trends he outlined to the House on 28 February, in answer to a question from the member for Rocky River?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, I did tell the member for Rocky River that the comparison between South Australian costs and those of the rest of the nation in both the housing and non-housing sectors showed a considerable narrowing since September of last year. I am able to say now that the same trend has been accelerated in the last month for which figures have now become available; they were released last week from the Bureau of Statistics. In the housing building sector the monthly increase in the price of building materials for South Australia in the month of February was lower than was the corresponding increase in every other State except Tasmania, and it was 37 per cent lower than the national average. In the non-house-building sector the monthly increase in South Australia was also lower than in three other States, and 15 per cent lower than the national average.

If honourable members refer to my answer given to the member for Rocky River on 28 February, they will see that the latest set of figures confirms that South Australia's rate of price increase is now in its most favourable position for many years.

GOVERNMENT DOCKET

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier direct the Minister of Transport to tender an apology to the House and to the member for Hartley for the manner in which the Minister used a Government docket to misrepresent the views of the former Premier and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, I will not. If the Deputy Leader casts his mind back to the debate in question, he will find that the Minister of Transport deliberately refrained from quoting from other than very small portions of a docket which subsequently he was forced to table, on the motion of the member for Elizabeth. Having asked for the document to be tabled, the Minister then read from that docket matters which were pertinent to the subject before the Chair at the time. Since the note was in such words as one might have expected to have been dictated by the former Premier—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Oh, come on!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The memorandum said so, and I do not think anyone could in any way be taken in by the former Premier's remarks that he had not initialled or signed that memo. Honourable members opposite ought to know by now (they have had some time in Government and I am sure it is not so long ago that they cannot remember) that a memorandum such as that, which is to be held for a little time, although it originates from the person who dictates it, is not necessarily signed until it is meant to go forward.

Clearly, the thought that the proposal should not go forward because of possible adverse reaction, and that it might perhaps be better left until after an election, was simply a matter of timing. The honourable Minister of Transport was entirely within his rights in quoting from that docket, which has since been tabled. The comments made at that time, although not formally initiated into action by the former Premier by initialling, were quite obviously the thoughts of the Premier of the day.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Dr. BILLARD: Has the Minister of Health been able to investigate further the claims made recently about the staffing levels at Modbury Hospital to assure herself, first, that the funding and total staff resources are adequate to service properly a hospital of the size and work load of Modbury, and, secondly, that the staff available are being deployed in a way that allows adequate coverage of each sector of the hospital's operations, especially those areas which have been the subject of recent complaints?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, I have had investigated the further claims about staffing levels at Modbury Hospital, and I know of the honourable member's concern. I am aware that some of his constituents have expressed concern, as have patients of the hospital, by letter to me as Minister of Health. The issue to which the honourable member refers arose out of claims made in a letter to the local paper, which is distributed in the north-eastern suburbs, that the level of staffing at Modbury Hospital was insufficient.

I had those claims investigated, and I replied in the form of a letter to the editor of that paper, giving staffing level details which were subsequently challenged by constituents of the member for Newland. I again had those allegations investigated. In both cases, I have found that the information which I provided was accurate. I have been assured by the Health Commission that staffing levels at Modbury Hospital are quite sufficient to maintain standards of patient care. By comparison, the level of staffing at Modbury is at least as high as, if not higher than, staff patient ratios in other hospitals. At the time the inquiries were made, 308 nurses were employed. On 28 March, 305·8 nurses were employed at that hospital.

I can only assume that the patients who complained about staff levels may have been in the 32-bed wards, and may not have been aware that there were two nursing stations in such wards. They may have seen only one nursing station, and consequently may have based their calculations on the number of staff they could see at that nursing station. But, in general terms, there is no evidence whatsoever of a critical staffing shortage, or indeed a staffing shortage, at Modbury Hospital. The Health Commission is satisfied that levels are comparable with those of other hospitals. I should add that the board of management and the administration of the hospital are continuing to keep staffing levels under review. They have made comparisons with hospitals of similar size and function in other States and have found that interstate staffing levels are lower than are those at Modbury.

MOTOR REGISTRATIONS

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Does the Premier still stand by his reply last Wednesday when he said, in quoting February 1980 new motor vehicle registrations in South Australia:

> There is a general upturn in the number of new motor vehicle registrations.

He went on to say:

> The future of the car industry in South Australia is extremely good.

The *Advertiser* last Saturday reported that a long-established new car dealership, Bryson Industries, had closed its doors, and that the large South Australian Ford dealer, Bowden Ford, had been put into receivership. The *Advertiser* reporter, Mr. Brian Hale, states:

> The difficult trading conditions struck by Don Bowden hit home in December, January and February and the first week of March, three bad months for the industry.

Don Bowden is reported as having said, in the same article:

> They really fixed me.

Brian Hale commented:

> The worrying aspect is that the same three months also "fixed" a number of other Adelaide companies, some of them wellknown companies.

Motor vehicle production figures just released indicate a 9·5 per cent fall in the three months ended February 1980 compared with the three months ended November 1979 on seasonally adjusted terms.

The Hon D. O. TONKIN: I still stand by that, and I refer the honourable member yet again to the figures for new motor vehicle registrations, which show an extremely encouraging picture for South Australia. The future for the car industry in South Australia is good, in my opinion. It will take a lot of work and restructuring, but I believe that the attitude taken by the Minister of Industrial Affairs and, I may say, by the representatives of the seven unions particularly concerned with the motor vehicle industry has been a most responsible one. They have had worthwhile discussions with the Federal Minister and, indeed, are still engaged in discussions on the future of the industry. They and, I think, everyone in the community are showing a proper concern.

Concerning the individual cases that the honourable member has quoted, I believe that in relation to the major closedown he referred to the proprietor concerned has made two very good points: first, that there is a move in this State towards Japanese cars. Japanese cars are smaller, with a smaller engine capacity, and because of the general attitude of the public at present there has been a decided move towards these cars. Therefore, it is necessary to have a mix, including Japanese small cars, if one is to be successful. Unfortunately, Ford, unlike the other two major firms, General Motors and Chrysler, does not have such a car available, and to some extent that has been the problem with Bowden Ford. The other reason that was given is one of health. If the honourable member has not been aware of this, he should now learn that Mr. Bowden has retired also because of his health. As far as Bryson's is concerned, its difficulties can be traced back particularly to the problems of British Leyland. It is a long established firm, certainly, but the problems of British Leyland have impinged quite significantly on Bryson's operations.

There will be individual cases such as these where companies may decide to close down. It is inevitable that this will happen not only in the motor vehicle industry and in retail trade but also in other instances. However, that must not in any way be taken as an indicator of what is happening generally. In those particular circumstances, the closure has been quite explainable and understandable. I still believe that the future for South Australia in the car industry generally can be extremely good, and it will be so because everyone concerned with the industry wants to get on with the job of making it work. I have been very encouraged by the attitude shown by everyone associated with the industry in recent months.

STATE EMBLEM

Mr. RANDALL: Has the Minister of Environment seen a statement in today's press calling for the freckled duck to be used as a replacement for the piping shrike as our State emblem? Before explaining the question, I point out that the explanation has no bearing on yesterday's activities at the Adelaide Oval: it is related to this afternoon's press (1 April 1980), under the heading "Stone the Shrike!" and it states that "Mr. C. Gull", probably from the Adelaide Oval area of the city, claims that the freckled duck is not appropriate for various reasons. However, the freckled duck question is a matter of serious concern to many people in this State. Knowing the Minister's genuine and sincere interest in conservation, I am sure that the Minister's action regarding the recent disastrous events at Bool Lagoon would be of interest to us all.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I thank the honourable member for his question. It may have something to do with the fact that today is April Fool's Day. I have not had the pleasure of meeting Mr. C. Gull up to this point of time, although I think the press release suggests that he is Secretary of the Ornithological Society (I do not know whether the society would be very pleased about that or not).

However, the question gives me the opportunity to say something about the freckled duck. It is all very well for us to have a bit of a laugh about the question but I think that it is time that we now looked at this matter seriously. The matter of the freckled duck is one of concern in this State, and it is widely recognised that the freckled duck is among the least common of all Australian ducks and, we are told, it is one of the rarest waterfowl in the world.

I believe there is a need for further investigations to be carried out in relation to this species of duck. In fact, I have directed that the question of the status of the freckled duck be introduced as an agenda item at the next meeting of the Australian Council of Nature Conservation Ministers, with a view to having an urgent national study of the species commenced. The next meeting of the council's standing committee is to be held in Adelaide in May this year, and that will give me an opportunity to discuss the matter. Also, as a part of the overall study, the Department for the Environment will be financing an investigation into the status of the freckled duck in South Australia.

It is important that I inform the House about discussions I have had with the Field and Game Association. The matters that we have discussed include the restriction of shooting hours to daylight hours (that in itself will ensure better identification of waterfowl); the question of the appointment of honorary wardens to monitor the behaviour of shooters; an improved education programme, including the issuing of pamphlets in several languages; and the possibility of introducing a proficiency test for shooters to ensure that their knowledge of waterfowl is better in the future.

Clearly, we need to look at new management programmes in relation to this matter to ensure that there is not a repetition of the events that took place on the opening day at Bool Lagoon. We are seeking the co-operation of conservation groups, the Field and Game Association, and ornithological bodies generally. I am very pleased with the co-operation we have received so far and I am sure that it will continue.

GOVERNMENT INQUIRIES

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As Parliament will rise tomorrow for two months, will the Premier make every effort to release by tomorrow the numerous reports and results of inquiries that he and Ministers have promised since coming to office, so that some immediate Parliamentary and public scrutiny may be given to them before the recess?

A wide range of reports is outstanding, ranging from an inquiry into the South Australian Land Commission to an

investigation of why ticket blocks were produced in advance of State Transport Authority fare rises. While these matters cover a wide variety of issues, they share the common fate of being overdue.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am sure the member for Baudin would not want the Government to release reports that are not fully complete, but I can assure him that the reports on matters such as the South Australian Land Commission and perhaps on other interesting matters, such as Monarto and other disasters of the previous Administration, will be released in good time. I should have thought that the honourable member might realise that it is not necessary for Parliament to be sitting when these matters are reported upon.

Cabinet will be considering them from time to time as they come forward, and they will be made available for public comment. Once they come to public notice, I imagine, they will draw forth a good deal of public comment on the circumstances leading to the situations that have arisen in the first place. I am surprised that members opposite want to draw attention to many of these matters.

ILLEGAL PRAWN FISHING

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Fisheries say why the Department of Fisheries has not launched prosecutions against a Mr. Milton, whom the department has accused of illegal fishing for prawns in the waters adjacent to Venus Bay? The Minister would be aware that it is some time since the department seized fish taken by the gentleman to whom I have referred. As this has happened on a number of occasions, concern has been expressed that the department appears to be unwilling to proceed with prosecution, and it has been suggested that this is unsatisfactory to the department, to the fishing industry, and particularly to Mr. Milton. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether he can inform the House of the reason for the delay, because many people believe that justice will not be done until the matter is before the court so that Mr. Milton can be successfully prosecuted or prove his innocence.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: My understanding of this matter is that it is *sub judice*. It is being investigated by the Federal Ombudsman, so I do not want to say more than that.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable Minister is asking for a ruling, it is not *sub judice* if it is in the hands of the Federal Ombudsman, which is a jurisdiction outside this Parliament. If it is not already before the court by way of action, it is not *sub judice* in this Parliament as a State matter, but that can be carried further later.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I will take up this matter with the department, but I understand that it lies with the Federal Ombudsman at this stage.

GOVERNMENT FILES

Mr. TRAINER: I link my question to the reply given by the Premier to the member for Baudin, and it relates to a specific report. For the third time in four weeks, I ask the Chief Secretary whether he can tell the House whether the report of the police investigation into the alleged theft of files from the State Transport Authority has been completed and, if it has been, will he tell the House the result of that investigation? On Thursday 7 February, the Premier told reporters that the police had, the week before, investigated the theft of S.T.A. files relating to proposed public transport fare rises. He said that the police had found no evidence of theft. However, he said that he had ordered the police to resume their investigations, in the light of the Leader of the Opposition's claims of increased bus fares. The Premier told reporters that the Opposition's information regarding the bus fares appeared to be based on a document allegedly stolen from the office of the General Manager of the S.T.A. on the previous Friday, and returned on the Monday. On Wednesday 5 March, I raised this matter during Question Time, at which time the Chief Secretary replied, as follows:

> I will obtain a report for him.

This clearly indicated an undertaking to provide me with such a report. On Wednesday 26 March, I asked the Chief Secretary:

> Has he yet obtained that report and when will it be made public?

His reply, admirable for its brevity, in view of replies given by other Ministers, stated:

> The report is not yet available.

For the third time in four weeks, I again ask whether the report has been completed and, if so, what has been the result of the police investigation.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: For the third time, I point out that the report is not yet to hand.

CONSTITUTIONAL MUSEUM

Mr. ASHENDEN: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs please advise the House on the current progress of work on the Constitutional Museum, and can he say when the building will be ready for occupation by the Museum trust?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am pleased to be able to say that a major portion of the Constitutional Museum is today being handed over from the Public Buildings Department to the trust. Although certain other portions have already been handed over to the trust, the main part will be handed over today.

At this stage it is on schedule, although the industrial protection barriers around the outside of the museum will not be taken down until just before the opening. It is expected that the museum will open, as anticipated, on 28 July this year. I think the Premier is officiating on that occasion.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

Mr. CRAFTER: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether it is true that, following negotiations by Mr. J. Minogue, of the Department of Mines and Energy, and Messrs. P. Clarke and J. Fitch, of the Health Commission, the Department of Mines and Energy has leased an area of land, apparently from the Pastoral Board, near Radium Hill, which will be used as a repository for radioactive waste now being deposited at Wingfield dump? If so, what kind of other waste will be deposited there?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There have been some discussions with the Minister of Health relating to disposal of radioactive material from hospitals, and the like. I do not think there is any proposal to change those arrangements at the present time.

AUSSIE POOLS

Mr. EVANS: Is the Minister of Recreation and Sport aware of a new form of sporting pools competition, similar

to the soccer pools and based on this State's Australian rules football competition, that is being advertised in this State? An advertisement which appeared in the *Advertiser* of Wednesday 19 March for agents to distribute and collect entry forms for the so-called Aussie Pools being run by a company called Pro-Win (Australia) Pty. Ltd., states:

> Here is a way to increase the floor traffic through your business premises and benefit. All types of business proprietors may apply for selection as an exclusive agent for Aussie Pools in each area, newsagents, chemists, convenience stores, etc.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: In answer to the first part of the question, I am aware of it. No application was made to the Department of Recreation and Sport (or to any other agency of government) by the firm Aussie Pools for permission to run such a competition in South Australia. However, the advertisement was brought to my notice and I made some investigations.

As the honourable member has said, the company running Aussie Pools is named Pro-Win. So far as I can ascertain from the information I have, the Pro-Win organisation does not expect the public to pay a fee to lodge a coupon in its Australian football pools. It intends to charge agents $89 to join the organisation. The agents are asked, in addition, to pay approximately $19·50 a week, which entitles the agent to 500 coupons. The agent can then hand those coupons to members of the public. Obviously, the agent is supposed to be reimbursed by an increase in customer traffic. I cannot say, at this stage, whether the operation contravenes any Act of the South Australian Parliament, but I have had the question referred to my colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs for a report.

BEACH POLLUTION

Mr. PETERSON: Will the Minister of Environment say whether officers of the Coast Protection Board met overseas experts on coastal engineering who recently visited Adelaide as consultants to the North Haven Trust? If they did meet, were the beach pollution problems in the District of Semaphore discussed, were any solutions found, and, if so, when will remedial action commence?

Recently Mr. James R. Walker, an expert in coastal engineering employed by the firm of Moffit and Nichol, of California and Hawaii, was brought to Adelaide by the North Haven Trust for consultation upon their marina development scheme.

As I believe the Coast Protection Board was well aware of this visit and, as the Minister is aware of the problems that make several of our northern metropolitan beaches practically unuseable, it is hoped that full advantage was taken of this opportunity to obtain a further opinion and, hopefully, restore to the people of the district and the State the use of their beaches.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am aware that that person came to Adelaide but I do not know whether a meeting took place. I know the concern of the member for Semaphore in relation to the beaches in that area. In fact, he has asked questions about the matter previously and I have brought down answers. If the honourable member wants an up-to-date report on the present situation, I will be pleased to bring it down for him. I appreciate the concern the honourable member shows in this regard.

PALMDALE INSURANCE LIMITED

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether the Government has any proposals to alleviate the hardship being caused to many small businesses in this State following the collapse of Palmdale Insurance Limited, which was an underwriter of workers compensation insurance in South Australia?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I thank the member for Glenelg for that particular question, because many people have asked what action the Government has taken and what situation employers face when they have been insured with Palmdale Insurance Limited now that that company is in liquidation. I can assure the member for Glenelg that the Government is aware of the situation and has started investigations. I started negotiations with the Insurance Council of Australia eight or nine weeks ago and I have also started negotiations with the insurance brokers in South Australia.

There appears to be a total liability in terms of the outstanding claims on workers compensation from that company of about $2 100 000 in South Australia. The situation is that employers who were insured with Palmdale Insurance Limited, now that the company is in liquidation, would find themselves totally exposed for any claims under workers compensation made against that employer. My advice is that those employers should make sure that other workers compensation cover is obtained immediately, and they should therefore obviously insure with another company.

I will be holding further discussions with the Insurance Council of Australia on Thursday. Immediately following that meeting, I will have further discussions with the employer bodies in this State so that we can work out as quickly as possible what action should be taken to help to try to protect the employers who are exposed to the new risk and also their employees who could suffer if the employer was forced into liquidation or receivership because of the large claims which could be made against the employer under workers compensation.

The member for Glenelg will know that an employer could be liable for up to about $25 000 on one claim under workers compensation. I think that highlights the extent to which some small businesses (and they are the main ones at risk in this) could be exposed to high claims being made against them. The Government would like to protect these small businesses and their employees as quickly as possible, but technical difficulties are involved. We are looking at all the possibilities, including the possibility of some form of legislation, to ensure that these employers and employees are protected.

THREE MILE ISLAND

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether he stands by his extraordinary statement, published in a Government pamphlet, that the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant incident was not a disaster in terms of risk to the population living near the plant and that safety mechanisms associated with the plant ultimately operated as they were designed to do? In answering that question could the Minister explain how he reached conclusions different from President Carter's Commission of Inquiry into the incident, which found that, following a minor pump failure, an ensuing series of mechanical malfunctions and operator errors turned an incident into a potential disaster?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was indeed a potential disaster, but it was not a disaster. If the honourable member has read the report of President Carter's Commission, as I have, and read the chronicle of any actual medical damage, he will know that the damage was psychological. If the honourable member has read the

report, he could not refer to the incident as a disaster. It was a potential disaster. If, in fact, the safety systems had completely failed and radioactive material had been spilt out into the countryside in great quantitites, it would then have been a disaster. It was not a disaster of the magnitude of disasters that happen in coal mines around the world with disturbing frequency.

DRY-LAND FARMING

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Agriculture release any details of South Australia's involvement in or commitment to a briefly reported international congress on dry-land farming, apparently to be held in South Australia? I am aware of South Australia's involvement in other countries of the world and would appreciate any information the Minister might have in view of the Government's announced policy of consolidation in respect of inter-country commitment.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The subject to which the honourable member refers is indeed most welcome in this State. An international congress on dry-land farming will be conducted in South Australia from 25 August to 5 September this year. The Government in South Australia is delighted that 650 delegates from around the world have chosen to come to this State to conduct, attend and contribute to an international-standard congress of this type for the first time in Australia's history. We have never had a dry-land farming congress of this type in Australia, and at the Festival Theatre, where those people are to congregate, our Department of Agriculture will be involved. Officers of my department have been assisting in the planning and lead-up to this congress for some months.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Brian Chatterton—

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The continued reference to Brian Chatterton from the other side of the House might simply be answered by my saying that I have consistently recognised the efforts of my predecessor in office with respect to his role in agriculture in this State and his involvement in dry-land farming in other countries of the world in particular. I believe that there is no justification at all for continued interjections generally or on that subject in particular.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I'll interject as I like.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The honourable member also raised in his question the matter of South Australian involvement in other countries of the world with respect to dry-land farming, as we call it. I mention that because internationally and at United Nations level that practice is referred to as rain-fed farming, which is distinct from irrigation farming. They are the terms used in other places in the world. I believe, after having had the two references drawn to my attention recently, that they are more appropriate terms than are the ones we use, in particular our reference to dry-land farming. Dry-land farming has a connotation that refers to a less valuable farming practice than is the real case.

I believe that the use of that term, as it is internationally recognised, could well be adopted in this country. Rain-fed farming or dry-land farming, as we call it in this State, is not in its trial stages in South Australia. We are not still experimenting on how to farm our dry-land areas in this driest State in the driest continent in the world. We are skilled at it, and those skills have been recognised across the world. We are not only in a position to assist, to guide, and to instruct in those pursuits, but we are being widely sought after for our expertise, which is being exchanged and purchased by a number of other countries, particularly in the Middle East. In Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, and Iraq, we are currently contracted to supply services, and our expertise is being extended.

In return, in recognition of the knowledge that we are dispersing to those other countries, the internal congress organisers have chosen South Australia as the site for the congress. I am proud to reply to the honourable member on behalf of the people of this State, and to give due recognition to the previous Government for any involvement it may have had in the project. I encourage any agricultural people who are interested in this practice to keep in step with the lectures and addresses designed and planned to be delivered during that period. I repeat that I am proud that the venue is the Festival Centre in Adelaide, and that South Australia has been recognised at this international level.

RAILCARS

Mr. HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Transport say why the State Transport Authority apparently has embarked on a policy of running as few railcars as possible on Adelaide suburban lines? Why does the Minister think that a joint working party, involving the authority and the Australian Railways Union, is necessary in view of the obvious need for more carriages? The Minister has informed me, in reply to my Question on Notice No. 543, that the State Transport Authority has enough railcars to cater for traffic demands in peak periods. Apparently there is sufficient rolling stock to allow some cars to be leased to Victoria. If this is the case, it is difficult to understand why there has been so much overcrowding on suburban lines. Yesterday, I took a reporter from the *News* to talk to rail staff and see for himself what was going on. A report published today says most of what I think the House should know. Today, the Minister appears to have offered railway staff a joint working party.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now starting to comment. I draw his attention to the proximity of the closure of Question Time.

Mr. HAMILTON: Is there any need for a further inquiry, in view of the statistics which showed, to give one instance, that last month a single 400-class car from Outer Harbor, with 84 seats, had on board a load of 135 passengers? Perhaps the Minister could explain the reason behind the present policy and say why the authority has decided no longer to provide to the public up-to-date time tables.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: There are really two questions to which the member for Albert Park addresses himself. One, of course, is the overcrowding, and one is the passenger loading standards of the authority. It is true that the authority, in an effort to be more efficient, made certain alterations to consists. It is true also that, in the past few weeks, there have been reports of overcrowding in the trains. I am informed by the authority that this is due in no small way to the Festival of Arts and, before that, to the threatened fuel shortage to which the public was subjected at that stage.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: POLICE REPORT

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. BANNON: During Question Time, a question was asked of the Chief Secretary by my colleague, the member for Ascot Park, concerning a report that the Chief Secretary was awaiting from the police. The subject matter of this report involves an allegation made by the Premier that I was involved in the theft of a document owned by the State Transport Authority. The Chief Secretary has constantly told this House that he is not able to report on the matter, and I was hoping it could have been cleared up before Parliament rises. It has been reported in this House that, at the time the allegation was first made, I contacted the Commissioner of Police directly and said that I and my staff would be available to assist with any inquiries that should be made in pursuance of the matter.

In the light of that, and the Chief Secretary's replies to the two questions earlier and in view of Parliament's rising within the next day or so, I rang the Police Commissioner today to ask him whether he was able to give any assistance in terms of the progress of the inquiry, why neither he nor any of his officers had contacted myself or my staff on the matter, whether or not the report had gone to the Chief Secretary, and when it would do so.

The Police Commissioner was somewhat bemused by my inquiry. He said that, as he understood it, the matter had been reported to the Government, at its request, some time previously. In fact, he said that that had been a matter of weeks ago, and his memory of the report which he did not have before him so that he obviously could not comment on the document itself, was that the police had advised that there was absolutely no point in pursuing their inquiries. I feel, because my own personal integrity was severely questioned in this matter in a very public way by the Premier at the time, that the Minister owed it to me to clear up this matter and to have placed before us this report, which apparently is in existence, and which he says has never come to his attention. I would like to report to the Parliament that my inquiries, my offer of assistance to the Police Commissioner, and his response to me today, all indicate that there is absolutely no basis in the allegation made by the Premier.

VICTORIA SQUARE (INTERNATIONAL HOTEL) BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act relating to the establishment of a hotel of international standard on land abutting upon Victoria Square, Adelaide. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to facilitate the establishment of a hotel of international standard abutting the southern corner of Grote Street and Victoria Square.

In introducing the Bill, the Government is honouring undertakings made by the previous Government. In 1971, the previous Government invited interested parties to submit proposals for an international hotel in Victoria Square. Of the many individuals and groups who made submissions a group known as Adelaide International Hotel Consortium was chosen by the previous Government as being the only one which showed any real prospects of being able to undertake and complete the project. The consortium was given the exclusive right to place before the Government detailed proposals for the hotel. The exclusive right was initially due to expire on 30 September 1979, but on 15 August 1979, the then Premier extended this exclusive right up to and including 31 December 1979. For this purpose, and to undertake the development of the site, the consortium incorporated a company named Victoria Square International Hotel Pty. Ltd.

To provide incentives for the establishment of a suitable hotel, the previous Government promised the consortium that exemptions from water and sewerage rates, land tax, pay-roll tax, and stamp duty would be granted for a limited period.

That Government also promised to give what assistance it could to make available the necessary land. The present Government is not acquiring land, but financial assistance not exceeding $500 000 will be made available to the Adelaide City Council for the purpose of acquiring the privately owned land shown in the schedule to the Bill and marked "B".

On the basis of undertakings made by the previous Government the consortium has made a substantial commitment in the preparation and presentation of general and detailed proposals, the obtaining of suitable finance for a project that, at the current estimate, will cost approximately $37 000 000, and in detailed negotiations with all the parties involved in the project. More than $200 000 has been spent on this initial work.

In order to meet the deadline of 31 December 1979, the developer, namely, Victoria Square International Hotel Pty. Ltd., called a conference of all parties involved on 27 December 1979 for the purpose of discussing and determining heads of agreement. Present at the conference were representatives from the Victoria Square International Hotel Pty. Ltd., Fricker Bros. Pty. Ltd. (the builder), the Corporation of the City of Adelaide, Hilton Hotels of Australia Pty. Ltd. (the proposed operator of the hotel), the Commonwealth Superannuation Fund Investment Trust (the financier of the project), and the South Australian Government. As a result of that conference, heads of agreement were drawn up and signed by all parties present except the Government. The document was "served" on the Government on Saturday 29 December 1979. That document proposed the construction of a hotel of 19 levels (plus basement) containing, amongst other things, convention facilities and 400 guest suites.

The parties involved in the project are named in the definition of "contracting parties" in clause 3 of the Bill. As I have already mentioned, Victoria Square International Hotel Pty. Ltd. is the developer; Fricker Bros. Pty. Ltd. is the builder; it is proposed that Hilton Hotels of Australia Pty. Ltd. will run the hotel; and the Commonwealth Superannuation Fund Investment Trust is the financier. The Government would have preferred agreement to be reached between the parties before introducing legislation of this sort. In the circumstances that have arisen, however, the Government believes that it is unreasonable to insist on this. It is not proposed that Parliament sit again until June and, therefore, if the Bill is not passed in the next two days, it will not be dealt with for two months. Exemptions promised by the previous Government are vital to the project, and it cannot proceed until legislation authorising those exemptions has been passed. The resulting delay would mean an increase in establishment costs of about $400 000 and would be likely to jeopardise the entire project. The Bill, once passed, will not come into operation, however, until proclaimed, and this will not be done before agreement, with which the Government is satisfied, has been reached.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act by proclamation. The Act will not be brought into force before the contracting parties have entered into an agreement approved by the Government. Clause 3 provides for the interpretation of certain terms used in the Bill. These are self-explanatory. Clause 4 empowers the Governor, by proclamation, to grant exemptions from the charges and taxes imposed by the Acts specified in the clause. Subclause (1) provides that the exemptions granted must be in accordance with the agreement between the contracting parties. Subclause (2) ensures that exemptions from the Waterworks Act, 1932-1978, the Sewerage Act, 1929-1977, and the Pay-roll Tax Act, 1971-1979, shall not operate for more than five years. Subclause (3) provides that exemptions from the Land Tax Act, 1936-1979, shall not operate for more than 12 years: that is, two years of preparation and 10 years of operation of the project. Subclause (4) ensures that exemptions from the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1979, apply only to documents specified in the agreement between the parties.

Clause 5 empowers the Governor, by proclamation, to close the part of Page Street that runs south from Grote Street. This provision will enable the developer to take possession of the site as soon as possible and thus keep increases in costs to a minimum. Clause 6 provides that compensation payable in respect of the acquisition of the private land will be assessed on the basis that Page Street had not been closed. The reason for this is to avoid any unfair reduction in the amount of compensation because of the closure of the street. Clause 7 empowers the Treasurer to contribute the sum of $500 000 from General Revenue towards the cost of acquiring private land. Clause 8 is included to ensure that Hilton Hotels of Australia Pty. Ltd. can be registered in South Australia as a foreign company and that it may conduct the business of a hotel on the site under the name "Hilton International Adelaide".

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CERTAIN LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES IN THE NORTH OF THE STATE

A message was received from the Legislative Council requesting the concurrence of the House of Assembly in the address recommended by the Select Committee on Certain Local Government Boundaries in the North of the State.

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

That the address be agreed to.

On 13 November 1979 the Legislative Council appointed a Select Committee comprising the Hon. C. M. Hill, M.L.C., Minister of Local Government (Chairman), the Hons. G. L. Bruce, M.L.C., J. A. Carnie, M.L.C., C. W. Creedon, M.L.C., J. E. Dunford, M.L.C., and R. J. Ritson M.L.C. to prepare an address to His Excellency the Governor praying that—

1. The boundaries of the City of Port Augusta be altered to annex areas of the District Councils of Wilmington, Kanyaka-Quorn and Port Germein, and certain areas presently unincorporated to include the proposed Redcliff petrochemical project, the airstrip, and the area on the western side of Spencer Gulf.

2. Any other consequential changes be made to the boundaries of adjoining or nearby local authorities. In preparing the address the Select Committee should—

(1) consider the impact of the proposed boundaries on the District Councils of Kanyaka-Quorn and Wilmington, and if it deems necessary recommend they be joined in full or in part with any other district councils, or each other;

(2) take note of the report of the Local Government Advisory Commission (No. 28) 24 July 1979 on recommended boundary changes in the Port Augusta and Redcliff area; and

(3) consider consequential changes to wards, employees of councils, the adjustment of assets and liabilities, and any other related matters deemed necessary by the Select Committee.

The interim report of that Select Committee and a joint address have been tabled in this House, concurrent with the transmission of a message from the Legislative Council conveying its agreement to the address and requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly thereto.

The Select Committee's primary responsibility was to prepare the Address to His Excellency the Governor praying that the boundaries of the City of Port Augusta be extended. The committee had the associated responsibility of ascertaining whether due to any such extensions consequential changes would be made to other councils' boundaries. The interim report points out that some consequential changes have been resolved but that the Select Committee has been given further time to consider the position in regard to the boundaries of the District Councils of Hawker and Kanyaka-Quorn.

The background of this motion relates to the need to bring all the areas involved in the planned Redcliff development within the care, control, and management of a single local authority. This need was recognised by the previous Government, and moves had already been instituted to bring about the changes now being placed before the House. It was decided that the best method of dealing with the definition of boundaries and consequential changes to council membership, the protection of employees, and the adjustments of assets and liabilities could best be done by adopting the procedure of preparing a joint address of both Houses of Parliament to the Governor under the relevant section of the Local Government Act.

It is clear from the report and the agreements that have been reached that the use of this procedure has meant that all interested parties have had an opportunity to place their views before the Select Committee. Advertisements were placed in the *Advertiser*, the *News*, the *Sunday Mail* and, in the North of the State, the *Transcontinental*, the *Recorder*, and the *Review Times Record*. The committee met some 16 times and also sat at Port Augusta so that local residents would have adequate opportunity to give evidence. As well, the Select Committee took note of a prior report of the Local Government Advisory Commission and also requested that commission to provide a further report on consequential changes to wards, employees of councils, the adjustment of assets and liabilities and other related matters.

Following the careful consideration of the committee, the address requests that the boundaries of the city of Port Augusta should be extended to include land at the top and on the western side of Spencer Gulf, containing the airstrip and shack sites, land which at the moment is not included in any local government area, and also to extend the boundaries of Port Augusta down the eastern side of Spencer Gulf to include what is known as the Redcliff site. Consequent on this change, it is recommended that the remainder of the District Council of Wilmington be united

with the remainder of the area of the District Council of Port Germein to form a new council to be known as the District Council of Mount Remarkable. The balance of Kanyaka-Quorn, it is proposed, will remain for the time being at least a separate council area.

The joint address includes, among other things, the severance of portion of the District Council of Kanyaka-Quorn, that is, the portion known as the township of Stirling North, that will be joined with the city of Port Augusta. The address nominates a person to be the new councillor for the new Pichi Richi ward of the new council of Kanyaka-Quorn. It also recommends the severance of those portions of the councils of Port Germein and Wilmington, which are the coastal portions and which would form the Redcliff site and the associated industrial complex sites. It was on the strong joint submission of the District Councils of Wilmington and Port Germein that the decision that the balance of these two councils be joined into a new council to be known as the District Council of Mount Remarkable was based. The constructive and co-operative approach of the two councils is warmly commended.

The address abolishes all existing wards in the municipality of Port Augusta, divides the new Port Augusta into six new wards, and nominates the new councillors for each of those wards. One of the councillors nominated is a present sitting councillor for Stirling North on both Kanyaka-Quorn and Wilmington councils. Similarly, for the new council of Mount Remarkable there will be 10 councillors, and the address names them, the Chairman, and the Clerk. The names involved are those recommended jointly by the two councils and have their full agreement.

Because of these changes, the committee recommends that during 1980 there shall be no local government elections in the municipality of Port Augusta, in the existing districts of Wilmington and Port Germein, or in the Pichi Richi ward of the district of Kanyaka-Quorn. Again, this arrangement has the full agreement of the affected councils.

The report of the Select Committee and the joint address to His Excellency the Governor represent a major part of the task essential to proper planning in this region to meet the challenges of the proposed industrial development. The Government seeks the passage of this motion in this sitting in order that the new councils can come into being on 1 July 1980.

Mr. HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

BOATING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 4 (clause 5)—Leave out "Director" and insert "Minister".

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

I have had discussions with the officers of the relevant department and there is power in section 7 of the principal Act for the Minister to delegate his authority to the Director. That seems to meet the requirements that were expressed fairly strongly by the Opposition in this and in the other place, and the Government accepts the amendment.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: First, I make a minor protest about the way this Bill has been brought on. I have had no opportunity to look at it, and I do not have my material with me. I was not consulted, and I was not aware that the Minister would accept the amendment. As I am not sure whether it is consistent with what I proposed in the first place, I would like an assurance from the Minister to this effect.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: I think it does. I thought you would have been very happy to do that.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In the first instance, I was concerned about deleting "Director" and inserting "Minister", and I am not quite sure whether this is the amendment I moved. Will the Minister indicate whether or not it is the same amendment? If it is, the Opposition has no complaint. However, I think that this amendment has been brought on with undue haste, which has not afforded the Opposition any time to look at it. We were not informed that it was to be brought on today, let alone immediately after Question Time. The amendment appears to be similar in content to the amendment I moved in the first place, but I should like an assurance from the Minister.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I give that assurance to the Deputy Leader and I apologise to him. I did tell his Whip. The amendment is identical to that moved by the Deputy Leader. There are powers of delegation in section 7 of the Boating Act. I think the amendment meets all the delegations and all the authorities that the Deputy Leader wanted.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have checked the amendment now, and I realise that it is in the same terms as my amendment. I congratulate and commend the Legislative Council and I do not often commend that august body, as you would be aware, Mr. Chairman. On this occasion, the other place has looked at the amendment moved in this Chamber. Also, I thank the Minister for reconsidering the position; at this late stage he could have forced a conference, but common sense has prevailed, and it is good to win one occasionally.

Motion carried.

ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 March. Page 1752.)

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): A series of Bills before the House today (the Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill, the Health Act Amendment Bill, the Local Government Act Amendment Bill, and the South Australian Meat Corporation Act Amendment Bill) relates to the passage of the meat hygiene legislation last week. Therefore, I do not intend to speak at any length on any one of Bills, except the South Australian Meat Corporation Act Amendment Bill.

This Bill is relatively formal being consequent on the Meat Hygiene Bill. One of its principal aims is to protect the Port Pirie Abattoirs Board, which would summarily have ceased to exist had this particular protection not been placed in the Bill.

However, there is one other brief comment I will make relating to the manner in which a provision has been transferred from the Abattoirs Act to the Meat Hygiene Bill, namely, the provision relating to penalties for an offence. Section 53 of the Abattoirs Act, which has now been deleted, provides in part:

First offence, $20; second offence, $50; and each subsequent offence, $100.

The penalties relate to offences committed after the date specified in the notice, and provide that while such

abattoir is available for slaughtering stock no person within the abattoir area shall slaughter or sell meat, or dress carcases under pain of those penalties. This matter is covered under clause 9 of the Bill. Translated into the Meat Hygiene Bill, clause 20(3) provides for a penalty of $3 000, a massive increase from the previous $20 for a first offence. Is this substantial increase because officers of the department believe that the penalties they can impose are inadequate and have not deterred people from offending against this provision in the Act? Are figures available on the number of people who have been charged under this provision and who continue to offend, or have the inspectors been loath to charge offenders, given the minimal sum of the previous penalties? At the very least, the increase is a 30-fold increase, and at the very most it is a 150-fold increase. This Bill is consequential on another Bill that we passed last week.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the honourable member for Stuart, I think I owe it to honourable members, particularly to the new members, to indicate to them that, where in a Bill a provision is to be repealed, they may not canvass the detail of the repealed section. Opportunity was given to the honourable member, in the absence of immediate access to the Bill, to proceed. I ask all honourable members to refer only to those matters contained in the Bill, and not to those contained in any area that is to be repealed.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I understand that the Port Pirie Abattoirs Board is to continue to exist. My contribution to the debate will simply be to ask the Minister whether he could—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Can't it be done in Committee?

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes, but I thought that if I did it in the second reading debate the Minister would be able to answer my query, so that there would be no need to delay the Committee debate.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I do not wish to deny the honourable member the opportunity to refer to the point he is raising but it may well fit in in Committee. His point is unrelated to the Bill. We are dealing with a Bill which, I believe, contains no area embracing the Port Pirie activities. The Port Pirie Abattoirs Act is something quite separate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I ask the honourable member for Stuart to relate his comments to the Bill before the House.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Bill before the House relates to an Act to amend the Abattoirs Act, 1911-1973, Bill No. 59, as laid on the table and read a first time on 26 March 1980. I quote from the Minister's second reading explanation, as follows:

> The principal Act, the Abattoirs Act, 1911-1973, empowers the establishment of local boards to either operate or supervise the operation of abattoirs within areas proclaimed under the Act. At present, only the Port Pirie Abattoirs Board owns and operates an abattoir. All the other abattoirs boards essentially supervise the inspection of meat and fix slaughtering fees.
>
> This Bill, therefore, is designed to enable the Port Pirie Abattoirs Board to continue to operate the Port Pirie abattoir and to remove from the principal Act all provisions that do not relate to the establishment and operation of abattoirs by abattoirs boards but relate to hygiene or the inspection of meat.

I am at a loss, first, to understand the reason for the point of order taken by the Minister and, secondly, to understand why the point of order was upheld, and, in saying that, I do not wish to reflect on the decision of the Chair. If I am unable to refer to this matter, I am forbidden from speaking. Mr. Deputy Speaker, will you reject the point of order and consider whether or not the matter should be subject to another ruling?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must keep to the content of the Bill. I will be listening intently to what he has to say.

Mr. KENEALLY: I understand by that that I am able to continue along the line that I was adopting before the point of order was taken. Had that been so, I would have completed my contribution to the debate by now. As the member for the area, I point out that the Port Pirie abattoir (as the member for Rocky River, in whose district the abattoir is situated, will bear out) is in a peculiar situation, which has necessitated this provision in the Bill. I take it, from matters raised in the debate on the Meat Hygiene Bill and canvassed in this Bill, that other country abattoirs, such as the Port Augusta abattoir, will cease to exist, the reason being, I have been told, that there will no longer be abattoirs areas.

I am canvassing this matter because the Minister's second reading explanation is brief and technical, and because I am not as familiar with the legislation as are those members of the Select Committee who considered it. I have not had that advantage. Will the Minister, when replying, explain the situation with regard to Port Pirie? If he does not feel inclined to do so, I will ask him the same question in Committee.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I appreciate the brevity of the Opposition's remarks on this subject. This Bill is consequential on another Bill that passed through the House last week. In reply to the member for Salisbury, I point out that, although the fee structure proposed in the meat hygiene legislation for South Australia is substantially higher than that which applied previously, it is seen to be essential that not only does the Act cover the practices of slaughtering of meat in both licensed abattoirs and slaughterhouses in South Australia, but that it ensures that the meat be processed and delivered in such a way as to protect the consumers' interests in relation to hygiene.

That is the principal object of the legislation before us. In order to ensure that that is done, the Bill is designed to be workable and is subject to being effectively policed. In order for that practice to continue, we believe the authorities responsible for implementation of this legislation should have some weight. I do not agree that the penalties are harsh, but they are steep and, indeed, appropriate. I hope that they will have the desired effect of causing people to not flout the law regarding the processing and supplying of meat and that, hopefully, they will never have to be used.

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

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 March. Page 1752.)

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): This is the second in a series of Bills that are consequential upon the Meat Hygiene Bill having been passed last week. Again, its provisions are reasonably formal. It removes from the principal Act all aspects relating to hygiene and sanitation

of abattoirs and slaughterhouses and their monitoring and enforcement, as those matters are now covered under the Meat Hygiene Bill. This, therefore, enables this important area of the hygiene and sanitation of slaughtering works to be removed from the Central Board of Health and put under the control of the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority.

The point ought to be made here that it does not mean that officers of the Central Board of Health, through the local board, will be devoid of any responsibility under the operation of the amended Act, because it is anticipated that local government health inspectors, or local Board of Health inspectors, will continue to play an important role, particularly regarding slaughterhouses. However, it is also required that they now come under the direct authority of the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority, which will therefore be able to control the manner in which they undertake their duties. This has been the finding of the committee, and is a quite important one.

I believe that it releases the appropriate inspectors, and the meat industry generally, from what might be considered certain lessening circumstances provided for in section 149 of the Health Act, which enable a local Board of Health to make "in addition, all such regulations not repugnant thereto as it may deem useful or necessary." Those regulations relate to the Central Board of Health model regulations, in this aspect, regarding hygiene and sanitation of slaughtering works. To take that area out, to insist that the Meat Hygiene Authority be the one supervisory authority, and to not allow that sort of possibility of variation in regulations between slaughtering works is a positive move, and I believe it must be supported by this House. Therefore, I support the passage of this Bill.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 26 March. Page 1752.)

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): This is the third in the series of Bills that are consequential upon the Meat Hygiene Bill having been passed. This Bill provides for all aspects of function of the proposed South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority to come under the care of the Meat Hygiene Authority rather than under the Local Government Act. Comments have been made about the role of local government. The role of local government in this area is to be ensured in its own right but, nevertheless, under the authority of the Meat Hygiene Authority. There are certain aspects of the inspection system referred to in these amending Bills transferring that inspectorial system to the meat hygiene legislation and the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority. One could give notice at this stage that, when the Government has reached agreement with the other States about reinspection fees, in particular, we expect that amendments will be forthcoming. We support the Bill.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I respect the recommendation of the honourable member about the need to have this interstate agreement confirmed before we fix a date in this State. I hope the honourable member's colleagues in another place also hold that view. As this is an amendment to the Local Government Act as it applies to the meat legislation, I take the opportunity to place on record the involvement that is expected by local government in the implementation of the South Australian Meat Hygiene Bill. It is intended that local government play an important role in the application of duty and control, particularly with respect to the construction standards applicable to existing slaughterhouses and/or the siting and construction of new slaughterhouses that may be proposed for South Australia.

It is expected, following a request by the Local Government Association of South Australia, that local government will be involved in the inspectorial functions in those licensed slaughterhouses. It is envisaged that inspectors will be required on an *ad hoc* basis at slaughterhouse level and that those inspectors will come from staff employed by local government, where it is expected and convenient for local government to accept that responsibility. It is intended that the responsibility in those circumstances will be delegated to local government by the South Australian Meat Authority and if, in fact, local government fails in its duty after accepting the responsibility of delegation, it is still the responsibility of the South Australian Meat Authority to ensure that that work is carried out with respect to the construction standards, codes of practice, and the inspectorial requirements.

In areas of the State where there are no local government authorities, it is envisaged that the South Australian Meat Authority will seek the co-operation of the Outer Areas Community Development Trust and its Chairman who, incidentally, came before our Select Committee on this subject. In those areas, wherever practicable the powers of the authority will be delegated accordingly.

I conclude on the note that it is with respect that I refer to local government in general and, in particular, in this instance; where its involvement will be required, that has so far been offered. We welcome that and we welcome also the Local Government Association's support for this Bill.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 26 March. Page 1752.)

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): This is the last in the series of Bills consequential upon the Meat Hygiene Bill that was passed last week and, accordingly, the legislation continues to receive the support of the Opposition. I have not had a change of heart about the metropolitan meat inspection fees, which were commented on by the Minister a few moments ago, but this House has made its decision at this stage and you never know what might happen in the time ahead and I do not wish to presume it or what might be happening in another place.

The Potter Report, from which this particular Bill, perhaps more than the other four, derives, was referred to quite amicably last week. It makes many recommendations about the South Australian Meat Corporation and about the proposed changes to the legislation that were needed. This particular Bill provides for one of the recommendations made by that report. Therefore, it is important that members of this House have informed

themselves about the content of that report, its recommendations, and the way it affected the Select Committee in its findings. I was therefore concerned that, in the debate last week about the Potter Report, various suggestions were made about whether I had read it. I can remember being the butt of some disparaging remarks on that occasion and it was suggested that maybe my report had been lost, burnt, or thrown away, or that I might have done various other things with it. I can satisfy the Minister that that is not the case. It is here.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not allowed to display it.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I will resist displaying the document, even though a similar document was flourished by the Minister during the debate last week. It was then suggested that I had not done my homework, and I should lift my game because it was getting a bit poor—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: He can flourish it, but he cannot display it.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: It was suggested that I was starting to get my game in a big mess.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I do hope the honourable member will confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I am going to confine my remarks to the Bill because the Bill is a consequence of the Potter Report, which makes important recommendations on the basis of important information. It was suggested that that information that I sought from the Minister last week in relation to the Meat Hygiene Bill was contained in the Potter Report. Ample as the Potter Report is, it does not contain all the information I sought. Such a big display and such a performance was put on about this matter that I was inclined to believe that I had overlooked certain matters in the report in my reading, and I had missed out the information that I was seeking from the Minister.

Never one to unnecessarily expand anything, I chose not to follow that up at the particular time and instead to do my homework at another time and check whether I was correct. I have closely perused the Potter Report. I have gone closely through every page and I have even looked carefully at the pages displayed, under the counter, so to speak, in this House last week. The information contained in those pages, or indeed anywhere in the Potter Report, does not adequately answer the points that I raised.

This matter is related to the Meat Corporation, reinspection and inspection and all those matters covered by this Bill. I remind the House and the Minister of what questions I asked on that occasion. The information I sought was about the transport and trade of meat from abattoirs interstate into South Australia. The Minister is perfectly correct in saying that in broad terms that information is covered in the Potter Report. I do not deny it, and I did not deny it then. However, the Minister should have listened carefully to what I was saying. I remember that at the time I asked him whether he was listening, because he spent some time discussing matters with members on that side while I was speaking. I understand how he did not listen to what I was saying. What I wanted to know at that time, following a comment he made about the possibility of meat coming from New South Wales and Queensland, was what quantities came from New South Wales as a State and as a separate total, what quantities came from Queensland as a State, as a separate figure, and what quantities came from Victoria, isolated from the other States and as a separate figure. I further went on to ask:

> What were the monthly tallies of trade from interstate into this State?

In other words, I wanted to know the quantities that came in January from the other States into this State, or in February or March, again broken up on a State-by-State basis, so that we could quickly and easily find out how much meat came in last year, for example, in March from Victoria, or how much came from Queensland or New South Wales in that month. I felt that that was to be pertinent, because it had an effect on our trading figures from this State to the other States. If it became quite clear that interstate trade was meshing in with South Australian producers, that the interstate trade predominantly came to this State in times of shortage of supply from local suppliers here, then the argument that the abolition of reinspection fees would undermine South Australian suppliers and producers would not have been valid.

If, however, the figures were to the contrary and showed that surpluses interstate were coming to this State at the same times as surpluses were available here, there could well have been some kind of argument that this House would have looked closely at. That information was very important and it remains important. I hope that at some stage the Minister will see his way clear to provide that. Just so that members are not unaware of the information contained in the Potter Report, because not many of us have eye sight so acute that we can see across the Chamber and inspect the pages not officially shown to us. I seek leave to have a table from the report which is of a purely statistical nature inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

TABLE 1

Quantities of meat entering the Adelaide Metropolitan Abattoirs area (000's kg) and percentage contribution to total

Year	1969-70		1970-71		1971-72		1972-73		1973-74	
	kg	Per Cent	kg	Per Cent	kg	Per Cent	kg	Per Cent	kg	Per Cent
Category										
A	52 706·7	81·01	57 517·9	83·41	57 597·0	81·97	56 980·4	82·12	47 410·4	76·13
B	6 101·5	9·38	6·680·9	9·69	8·161·4	11·62	7 348·9	10·59	8 457·1	13·59
C	6 246·6	9·61	4 757·1	6·91	4 495·0	6·41	5 052·6	7·29	6 393·9	10·28

Year	1974-75		1975-76		1976-77		1977-78	
	kg	Per Cent	kg	Per Cent	kg	Per Cent	kg	Per Cent
Category								
A	45 433·8	65·42	51 613·1	66·22	41 786·1	57·90	35 164·0	47·68
B	12 570·6	18·11	14 610·6	18·75	11 704·1	16·22	9 772·2	13·24
C	11 439·5	16·47	11 709·9	15·03	18 672·3	25·88	28 817·5	39·08

Note:

Categories: A = meat from animals slaughtered at Gepps Cross.
B = meat from animals slaughtered at intrastate export abattoirs allowed entry under permit.
C = meat from animals slaughtered at interstate abattoirs allowed entry under section 77.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: The table includes the breakdown of the figures in three categories: A, meat from animals slaughtered at Gepps Cross; B, meat from animals slaughtered at intrastate export abattoirs allowed entry under permit, which becomes irrelevant under proposals being made under this series of legislation; and C, meat from animals slaughtered at interstate abattoirs allowed entry under section 77.

That information, contained in tabular form, is displayed on the facing page in the Potter Report in graphic form, for those who prefer graphics rather than figures. Regardless of whichever way we like the information, whichever way members wish to read it, and whichever way it is inserted in *Hansard*, it does not supply specific answers to specific questions I asked in the House last week. These figures, which the Minister has already seen and which other members can see in *Hansard*, list category C as one figure in each of the years from 1969-1970, to 1977-1978. For example, the 1977-78 figure is some 28 817 000 kilograms as an annual total.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: The annual totals do not reflect seasonal conditions.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister seems to have accepted the point I am making; that does not reflect a monthly or seasonal variation throughout the year, nor does it take into account the variations between the States of Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. Likewise, the graphics on the facing page also fail to do so. Fearing that I had again not looked through the report closely enough, I went on to read from cover to cover, other information in the Potter Report, bearing in mind that the Minister had said that, if it was not contained in the body of the report, it would be contained in the appendix, a one-page sheet within the document. It is headed solely and entirely "List of submissions". I do not know whether the Minister anticipates that within that list is a source of information, whether he was anticipating that I should turn to one of the people who made a submission to the Potter Report and ask them that question. There is quite a variety, anything from W. Angliss and Company to the Mount Schank Meat Company, to the Victorian Meat Works Association. I suppose the Victorian Meat Works Association submission would contain that information, but it was not readily available from reading the Potter Report, or from reading the proceedings before the Select Committee.

Therefore, I believe that the Minister has not clearly understood the question I asked, and his comments about my work on that committee and my work in perusing all the evidence before it were inaccurate and, consequently, do need that correction today, because that information is important. Any attempt to over ride or hide it will not achieve proper consideration of the matter presently before this House. At some stage, we will need to know that information about seasonal variation in trade. We will also need to know the relative importance of Victoria *vis-a-vis* New South Wales and Queensland. We will need to know whether we are possibly buying into a ball game whereby Queensland will increase its meat trade to this State in much the same way as market gardeners in Queensland have increased their trade to this State with those items, and we will need to know the effect that will have on local suppliers. Unless we have that information, and unless the Minister is at some stage prepared to answer the questions I raised, the House will not be able to make the considered judgment the matter deserves.

The South Australian Meat Corporation Bill enacts some of the principles and recommendations of the Potter Report. For example, recommendation 1.1 of the report is that all quantitative restrictions on meat entering the Adelaide metropolitan area be removed. Recommendation 1.4 states that the lifting of quantitative restrictions removes the justification for a service fee on meat of interstate origin entering the metropolitan area. It is recommended that this fee be discontinued, which has been done by the abolition of the intrastate fee.

Likewise, recommendation 1.6 is implicitly covered within the South Australian Meat Corporation Bill. That refers to the extension of the Adelaide metropolitan abattoirs area. While the working party considers it inappropriate to make a recommendation because the issue could be regarded as being not within terms of regulations, it is of the opinion that the Adelaide metropolitan area should be extended to at least encompass the Adelaide statistical division. In a sense, the Bill certainly does that. The extension is in fact somewhat broader than the Adelaide statistical division and goes to the South Australian statistical division.

The Hon. W. E.Chapman: You are quoting the Samcor Act.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: That is the one I am referring to. There are other recommendations from the Potter Report that obviously the Minister or his department proposes to cover at other stages, or that may not be the subject of legislation at all. One for example, covers the aspects of the service works capacity or the service works function of the South Australian Meat Corporation at its works at Gepps Cross, and the cost structure that Samcor has to bear in relation to that service capacity.

That is not covered at all in the present amendment. It may, of course, be covered at a later time. Likewise, the situation of excess, or possible excess, abattoir capacity within this State is also not dealt with at all in the Bill. Indeed, it is deliberately not dealt with, because the question of excess capacity was considered by the joint committee, and it was felt not to be within the realm of that committee to make recommendations for this Parliament to seek to control the spread of abattoir or slaughterhouse capacity throughout the State. It was felt that that could certainly be done by regulations organised under the South Australian Meat Hygiene Authority and would implicitly be done by other amendments to this and related measures.

Coming back to the point I initially made, I regret the comments made last week about the manner in which I proceeded with evidence before the Select Committee upon which I believe I worked very hard. I believe that, on a reinspection (to use a current word) of the Potter Report, I am vindicated regarding the questions I asked, and I believe that the answers to them are still as important as ever, and that the Minister should not have dealt with those questions in the way in which he chose to deal with them on that occasion.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): The matter raised by the member for Salisbury is, I think, relevant and one that deserves a reply. Indeed, the graphic reference in the Potter Report explained the annual movements of meat from interstate into South Australia and did not reflect the details of month-by-month movements which apparently he was seeking. I am grateful that on this occasion he has translated the graphic material into a statistical report that has been inserted in *Hansard* this afternoon. With respect to his inquiry relating to the monthly and/or seasonal movements of meat between the States, if that information is available to my department I will ensure that it supplies such information to the honourable member. Although I appreciate the importance of that information if one seriously wants to study such movements, I do not believe

that it is relevant to the subject before the Chairman or to whether or not the Meat Hygiene Bill should be supported. It may have some remote connection with the subject that he raised in the House last week but, as I have mentioned already a couple of times today, what was mentioned last week is history. We are well on the way to completing the five Bills that are principal and consequential to this subject, and I do not think there is any more that I need to say about that.

There is one matter, however, that may be directly related to this Bill, and that is a matter raised in a press release last week and reported in a number of country newspapers. I have in my possession a statement set out on Legislative Council paper (Parliament House, Adelaide, 6 March 1980) and headed "Opposition View," stating among other things:

> The new Liberal legislation on meat hygiene was almost indentical with the Bill introduced by Labor last year, Labor's rural affairs spokesman, Mr. Brian Chatterton, M.L.C., said today.

This Bill and, indeed, all the other related Bills on this subject of meat hygiene are identical in so far as they deal with the need for upgrading hygiene in meat-processing premises in this State. But, other than that basic principle, all the details of this Bill are significantly different from those introduced by the Labor Government last year.

I do not want to labour that point, because I think, again, that that is history. However, I draw attention to another reference in that same press release which was made allegedly by Mr. Brian Chatterton, M.L.C., on 6 March, namely:

> Legislation following the lines of the recommendations of the joint committee would mean:
>
> 1. More paperwork for slaughterhouse owners.

That is clearly not correct. The paperwork required of slaughterhouse owners in South Australia following the passage of this and the accompanying Bills will, in fact, be consistent with that which has been required of slaughterhouse licensees in the past. They have been required to identify the throughput of meat for human consumption and they will be required to continue that practice. The second point allegedly made in the press release was as follows:

> 2. Withdrawal of their right to sell meat in shops other than their own.

Again, that is clearly incorrect, because the joint committee in its report to this Parliament made it patently clear that a ceiling of throughput was to be placed on slaughterhouse owners by the impending meat authority, and a guideline was given to that authority and cited in the report with respect to the number of sheep equivalent units per annum to apply. It was also stated in that report that the authority had flexibility with respect to fixing a throughput ceiling for a slaughterhouse, that it did not necessarily need to be a consistent figure amongst slaughterhouses across the State, and that it may vary from one to another.

The whole principle was that slaughterhouses would be able to preserve the *status quo* in respect of the movements of meat; they would be able to continue to supply their own butcher shops continuing to supply their own outlets within their respective or prescribed local areas. Indeed, the Bill, without making reference to the 5 000 sheep equivalent unit guide figure in the report, allows the authority to apply common sense and to permit slaughterhouses to continue in operation, certainly with no intention to destroy them. The whole object of the Bill with respect to slaughterhouses is to provide conditions and requirements with which slaughterhouse proprietors shall comply in order to lift the hygiene standards at those premises. The third point raised in the press release was as follows:

> 3. Local Government losing the right to control slaughterhouses in their regions.

Mr. Olsen: Rubbish!

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Indeed. The member for Rocky River and every other member on the joint committee will recall the importance that was placed on the role of local government regarding this legislation. The member for Rocky River, in particular, I recall, was adamant that the local government submission should be seriously considered. Indeed, it was substantially adopted, and the honourable member was adamant also that local government be recognised by the authority as being the appropriate body to which power for control over slaughterhouses should be delegated. For the honourable member in another place to be responsible for such statements in that release means that he either has taken leave of his memory or is setting out unnecessarily, unreasonably and improperly to stir the pot.

It can have no effect other than that reported to me, namely, that slaughterhouse proprietors, having read this statement in their local newspapers (particularly those in the Barossa Valley), have become very distressed. Many of them have read the report themselves and have spoken to members on the Select Committee, from both Houses of Parliament. They believed that they had understood the position with regard to the role of local government, as it was intended, namely, that the opportunity would be given for them to sell meat from their respective slaughterhouses, as is the practice now. They have become confused after reading the statement in the papers by the honourable gentleman from the other place. I can understand their distress after having read that.

The final matter I want to raise involves that point. The press release that I have referred to happened to find its way into No. 5 position in a small booklet containing some 14 or 15 pages. Not only does it contain that press release bearing the words, "Opposition view—rural spokesman for the Labor Party", etc., dated 6 March, but it contains also a number of press releases under my name, as Minister of Agriculture, and they are dated 6 March as well. They deal with the recommended free trade area for abattoirs meat, and the future of Port Lincoln Samcor works (a matter that was raised by the member for Flinders a week or two ago). The booklet contains a number of pages incorporating details from the Joint Committee on Meat Hygiene Legislation.

The material is printed in a reduced quarto size and stapled together, and the pamphlets have been circulated within this State. Mysterious as it might sound, it is still a mystery to me and my department. It certainly did not come from us, and I can assure the House that, if we were in the practice of circulating our own press releases, we would not incorporate in them a press release by the spokesman for the Labor Party. I can appreciate that, at least on the surface, it would be highly unlikely that the Labor Party would produce such a booklet and incorporate press releases from the Department of Agriculture expressing the Government's point of view. There is quite a mystery about it; nevertheless, the contents in the Legislative Council based report in that booklet have appeared in local newspapers in this State and have had the effect of unnecessarily stirring up some existing licensed slaughterhouse proprietors. I hope that subsequent releases churned out by the Deputy Premier and me this week will allay those people's fears and clarify the position, conveying the facts surrounding this legislation.

This is the last of a series of Bills accompanying and

consequential on the Meat Hygiene Bill which passed through this House last week. With Opposition members, I support the objectives and the details in the multiple Bills. I hope that this Bill will have a speedy passage through the other place so that it may be proclaimed, and so that the regulations required, the appointment of the authority and other members involved in the consultative committee, and so on may proceed as quickly as possible, enabling the meat industry in this State to set off on a new plane, knowing precisely where it is going in relation to slaughterhouse and abattoir requirements and inspectorial needs, leading ultimately to a product that is processed in premises with the hygiene standards which the consumers of this State deserve.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Can the Minister say what is the proposed date of proclamation for this Bill and for the other Bills relating to legislation consequent upon the Meat Hygiene Bill passed in this place last week?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am unable to give a precise date. I understand that, in the meantime, there is homework to be done. The member for Salisbury would appreciate that I am in a position only to appoint immediately the Chairman of the proposed authority. The Minister of Health and the Local Government Association are invited, within the terms of the legislation, to nominate their representatives on the authority, and that action will take some time to perform. I think it would be presumptuous of me to give a date at this stage.

I assure the member for Salisbury, however, that the red meat portion of the Meat Hygiene Bill and the consequential amending and/or repealing of Acts will be done simultaneously, so that there is no hiatus period between their proclamation and what would otherwise be the quota conclusion applying to abattoirs in this State. I think the member for Salisbury (even if others do not) would appreciate the point that I am making here, namely, that a number of licensed abattoirs in South Australia are operating within their own regions and that they have a percentage of throughput access to the metropolitan (or, as it is now known, the Samcor) area.

One must be careful not to have the quota allocation expire outside a period of proclamation, or, indeed, before the proclamation, otherwise those suppliers would be technically and legally without a quota, yet not able to proceed to supply without restriction: factors of that nature have to be taken into account. It is desirable to get on with this and have it passed through both Houses by tomorrow, so that the regulations and the various authority and consultative committee appointments can be made. At that stage we can get on with the job of preparing the regulations, with the co-operation and advice of the people so appointed.

Clause passed.

Clauses 3 to 27 passed.

Clause 28—"Service of notices, etc., upon corporation."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: This clause relates to the role of local government in the legislation. We have had some discussion about that this afternoon, and we have endorsed its role, subject to regulation and/or control by the authority. In that light, I record officially that I regret that I have only just this minute received a submission from the Local Government Association about the general series of Bills that has been before the House, and the association has suggested certain amendments it believes should be moved. The submission makes suggestions and comments on the Bill, and the association wanted those to be considered in relation to all of the clauses in all of the Bills we have considered, but that will not be possible now. It is a pity that the association did not try to get this information to us earlier.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I, too, have received a letter from the Local Government Association. The indication by its Secretary hitherto had been that it had no problems with the Bill. On quickly reading the correspondence received, it would appear, to use the association's terms, that there are a number of omissions and anomalies in the Bill which the association believes could be easily rectified. On a quick perusal of those points, they are indeed minor, as I see it. In any event, I assure the Committee that I will take this letter to my colleague in another place, who proposes to jockey this Bill along its course this afternoon or this evening, to see whether the matters as put by the association can be taken on board. I see nothing in the correspondence that cannot be covered in regulations and/or with minor adjustments which do not interfere with the principles of the Bill, but only with the machinery of it.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: If the Minister proposes that these matters may be covered by amendments in another place, I take it that any amendments accepted by the other place come back here for review so that we have a chance to examine them.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 29 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 February. Page 1293.)

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): In addressing myself to the measure, I first thank the Leader of the House for accommodating the Opposition in relation to this matter in bringing it on at this time. It is a non-controversial measure. The Opposition supports the content of the Bill and, indeed, this and another Bill are measures which I approved for drafting and legislation during the time of the Labor Government.

As it is a little while since these matters came before us, I direct the House to the content of the Bill. Clause 2, which relates to the appointment of the teaching service in section 15 of the Act, amends that section as it relates to persons on probation. The effect of the measure before us is to allow the probationary teachers to have an appeal to the Teachers Appeal Board against dismissal of such a person. This has been the subject of a good deal of discussion and consultation between Governments and the Institute of Teachers for some time. Initially, Government was reluctant to concede this measure, on the grounds that it seemed to break down the distinction between officers on probation and officers who have permanency with the Education Department. The present system is that a person is employed, as a matter of course, by the department on probation where he has come straight out of college, say, and after a period that probation ends, and he is taken on as permanent teaching staff. When a person has his probation terminated, in the sense that he leaves the employ of the department, under the present position there is no right of appeal against that happening.

The effect of the amendment is to give that right of appeal. As I have said, this was a matter of some discussion, because it was believed that there seemed little

point in there being a term of probation if the probationers had the same rights of appeal as apply to people on the permanent teaching staff. However, the position as put to me was that the individual had certain rights in law, in any event, which he could take up through the normal process of the courts, and it was therefore much better that the Act be amended in such a way as to provide that these matters could be argued where they really should be argued, namely, at the proper tribunal for these things, rather than in other courts. An amendment like this in no way prevents the matter from proceeding through the courts if the litigant is determined to so carry the matter. On balance, it seemed to me, when I was Minister, to be sensible to allow this amendment to occur, even though it does to a certain extent break down the division between those on probation and those on permanency. Nonetheless, some distinction remains, and it is a distinction that should stay. Obviously, the present Minister has been similarly persuaded by the same arguments, and we have the matter before us now.

The other amendment is set out in clause 3, in relation to retirements during the year. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation, the present state of the Act relates to an earlier period when it was a great tragedy to lose anyone from the teaching service at any stage during the year; how could he be replaced?

The labour market for teachers was drastically different in 1972, when the present Education Act was passed by Parliament. The labour market, for good or ill, has now changed and present conditions are likely to be with us for some time. It therefore seems sensible that, where a person in the teaching service wishes to exercise this option to retire on his or her 65th birthday, that person must do so. The Bill requires that that should happen. The effect of that is to create a vacancy in the teaching service which, under present administrative arrangements, would be filled by a contract appointment until the end of that particular teaching year. In all, the Opposition supports both of these amendments. Neither of them, I believe, opens up vast areas of debate, and we will expedite the passage of this measure through this place.

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

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjournment debate on second reading.
(Continued from 27 February. Page 1294.)

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): This Bill refers to the minimum price of grapes, and to various regulations empowering the Government to restrict breaches of that minimum price in contracts of sale. This measure has passed through another place and has come to us for consideration. I indicate that the Opposition supports the amendment and will support the Bill through all stages.

To provide some information for members in the Chamber as to the purpose of the Bill, I mention that it is to provide some form of protection to grapegrowers in this State from the marketing effects of certain over-supply situations. A situation occurred last year where a grower and a winemaker were able to enter into a transaction that subverted, undermined, the provisions of the Prices Act and enabled grapes to be sold for a price lower than the minimum set price.

These provisions endeavour to get around that type of event. On that occasion the transaction was framed in such a way as to enable it not to be considered a contract for sale or supply of grapes. Indeed, the winemaker was interpreting his function as being that of a service works in which he was providing a service to the grapegrower to turn the grapes into wine and, in fact, the grapegrower was paying a service fee as opposed to the selling of his grapes to the winemaker. This incident was clearly an attempt to subvert the Act. There was, in reality, a sale, even if, in the strict legal definition, there was not.

Obviously, there are certain instances where winemakers provide a service or service works and do not undertake a contract of sale, but they are co-operatives. The winemakers co-operatives that take grapes from their members and turn those grapes into wine are quite clearly in a position, legally and ethically, where they can charge a service fee for production of wine from grapes supplied, but in every other instance that could not be countenanced.

Another instance where the provisions of the Act have been undermined in the past is by means of the use of a third party; the grapegrower supplies his grapes to a third party, who then supplies them to the winemaker. In the process the requirements of the Act no longer hold effect and, therefore, a price less than the minimum price established by the Commissioner for Public and Consumer Affairs actually holds good. Logically, that ability had to be removed. Why these two areas, and any other areas that can be foreseen that are encompassed within the Act, had to be taken into account is that minimum prices serve the industry well. They have served grapegrowers throughout this State well in an attempt to provide a rational industry that provides us with enough grapes for winemaking, for consumption of wines not only in this State but also interstate.

We know that the wine grapegrowing industry has faced problems over the years, but they are related to matters other than the setting of a minimum price. I understand that not all members in this place agree with that contention and I will return to that in a moment. The setting of minimum prices has, clearly, been to the advantage of grapegrowers in this State. For that reason the previous Government, at all times, resisted any move to change the minimum pricing concept for wine grapes. Therefore, we are pleased to see this amendment today, which not only continues that opinion by the present Government but also seeks to remove any anomalies that allowed subversion of the Act to take place.

I am concerned that, when this matter is being discussed during the second reading debate or in Committee, certain members of the House may speak against the provisions of this Bill. I have this concern because I know that the member for Mallee, at an earlier stage in the session, indicated during the Address in Reply debate that he was not in support of the concept of mininum pricing for wine grapes. He indicated that that aspect of the law, that particular facility available to the Commissioner, had been the cause of the over-supply of grapes within this State and, as a consequence, the cause of all the problems that the wine grapegrowers in this State were facing. He was blithely ignorant of the effect, for example, of the brandy excise. That, for him, apparently played little or no part in the present glut being faced by wine grapegrowers in this State, whereas minimum pricing was to blame for all aspects.

I think he indicated to this House on that occasion that he was a free marketeer (not a muskateer). He said that he supported those principles at all times and that he felt that government had no role to play in the regulation of industries of this type. If that is the member's attitude, doubtless he will be addressing the House about this Bill today because he has expressed an opinion before, and he will wish to re-express that opinion and tell us, yet again,

how he objects to the amendments proposed today, because he clearly objects to the principal Act in this regard.

I look forward to hearing his comments at a later stage. I notice he is not in the Chamber at the moment but doubtless he is listening on the speaker in his office, is aware of his opportunity to be called, and he will come down and address the House on this matter.

Mr. Keneally: He seems to be an objectionable chap.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, one may say that. He will have many interesting things to say. Certainly, they will be disappointing things in terms of the wine grapegrowers in his own District of Mallee, and I know the wine grapegrowers in my area will not be happy to see the abolition of the minimum price concept.

Certain problems relate to the supply of grapes and the present pricing system and doubtless they will need attention in the times ahead. The Minister and his department, I hope, will be looking at this matter and in the times ahead we may see other ways by which the wine grapegrowers can be protected.

At this particular time one of the problems of the Bill and the principal Act is that the burden of the over-supply of wine grapes is not shared equitably by all wine grapegrowers; it is shared inequitably more so by some than by others. This matter has been under discussion in the industry for some time and various solutions have been suggested, one of which is the creation of a marketing board. It has been suggested that, much in the same way as we have the Wheat Marketing Board, the Barley Marketing Board, the Egg Marketing Board, and quite a few others, likewise there could be a wine grape marketing board.

However, I do not believe that that would be a feasible approach to the subject, because of the wide variety of grapes that are available and that are in fact produced in this State alone. The variety of grapes is a wide one internationally, but even in this State if we were to count all the varieties grown by all the grapegrowers we would have a large number. Therefore, as a consequence, it would be necessary to establish some form of marketing control for each of the varieties and we would end up with such masses of regulations and paperwork that the industry would not be well served and that lack of service would be undertaken at quite a great deal of cost and administration.

Perhaps a preferable way of trying to deal with the question of over-supply of wine grapes in the industry and the sharing of the burden of that could be by a levy method. This particular proposal has been raised by a member in another place and I would re-endorse that proposal in this Chamber, because I believe all members should at least consider it. Already wine grapegrowers do pay a levy upon delivery of grapes to a winemaker, so it would not be beyond the realms of possibility for that levy to be extended or supplemented by a further levy that would be for the creation of some form of compensation fund to enable the losses by some growers on the over-supply of grapes to be cushioned, to enable the effect of over-supply to be shared not unfairly but amongst all grapegrowers in the industry.

That is something to which we will need to pay attention in future, because unless protection is offered to wine grape producers, unless they are given some form of cushioning from the effects of over-supply that they at this stage have to bear individually, they will continue to try to find ways to subvert and undermine the provisions of the Act in regard to the setting of minimum prices. That is understandably so, because, if they are not given some form of compensation for the over-supply and the minimum price is maintained, they will attempt to recoup the losses by other means that would in this case be illegal means, and that cannot be countenanced by this Parliament.

Therefore, the amendments being made today should come in concert with similar decisions to try to amend the way in which wine grapegrowers' surplusses and their financial losses are recouped amongst the whole industry. It is important that those two things be taken in concert. I hope the Minister of Agriculture—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would draw the attention of the member for Salisbury to the fact that the passage of this Bill in this House is, in fact, in the hands of the Minister of Health, who represents the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I am sorry for that: I was unaware of it. The Prices Act does come under the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and the Commissioner for Public and Consumer Affairs comes under that Minister. In many ways the aspects I am talking about, the provision of a compensation fund funded by a levy, would ultimately come under the Minister of Agriculture and it would require close liaison between the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place, so I would appreciate it if the Minister of Health would communicate these comments to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and to the Minister of Agriculture, who is also I believe vitally affected by it.

As I have mentioned, we do not have objection to the Bill. We do support it, despite the fact we think other things should be looked at as soon as possible, but in other areas and in other Bills. We think this is a good move. It protects the minimum pricing concept, which has served the industry well to date. We believe it will serve it better as a result of these particular provisions being introduced.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I thank the honourable member for his contribution and for the support he has expressed for this Bill. In response to his comments about the general problems facing growers as a result of over-supply of grapes, the honourable member may not be aware that an interdepartmental committee is currently addressing itself to this question. I feel sure that the Department of Agriculture has a voice on that committee and I have no doubt that the matters raised by the honourable member are under consideration by the committee.

I assure the honourable member that the Government has that matter in hand. It is aware of the problems and in due course I believe solutions will be found for these problems. Whilst it is related, it is separate and distinct from the matter of evasion of a minimum grape price, which is the subject of this Bill. I assure the honourable member that these other questions are being dealt with by the Government, and the Parliament will be advised in due course of the legislative solutions that are proposed.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I wish to speak briefly and express my regret, given the comments made in this House earlier about this particular provision for the setting of minimum prices for grapes, that the House has not debated the matter at greater length, especially in regard

to the member who made the comment at that time, since these amendments do affect the matters he raised.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 March. Page 1382.)

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): This Bill has two main purposes, which were outlined by the Minister in his second reading explanation. However, it is some time since this matter was before the House, during which the Minister probably had an enjoyable time at a conference in New Zealand. The first purpose of the Bill is to resolve a problem that occurs when planning regulations and interim control apply in a council area. There has been a number of court decisions. The Minister gave examples of one or two that made quite clear that, in the court's opinion, both interim development control and planning regulations cannot apply at the same time in a council area. Clause 2 of the Bill, as I read it, will clearly meet this difficulty and set out for the future, should the Bill pass this and the other House, quite clearly that that position can apply. Quite clearly, clause 17(*a*) states, on my reading, that the operation of planning regulations is not suspended by reason of the fact that the same land to which those planning regulations will apply is subject to interim development control.

In 17(*b*) there is a clear statement that zoning regulations shall operate after the commencement of the Planning and Development Act Amendment Act to displace interim development control within the zones to which they apply, thus establishing the primacy needed in the area. Clause 17(*c*) takes care of detail with respect to those two clauses by, in effect, defining what zoning regulations are in respect of planning regulations. I trust that the hopes of the Minister and the House, which are clearly and unequivocally set forth, for the operation of planning regulations in the future will be met.

The wording to which I have just referred seems to clearly state what will be needed in that area, but in the future there may be a challenge again in respect of this section of the Planning and Development Act, an Act which seems over the years to have been subjected to a few challenges; I am sure the Minister will agree with that.

The second purpose of this Bill is to extend the time over which interim development control can apply in respect of the land for which the regulation has been made. The Minister has pointed out that progression from interim development control to planning regulations can be costly and time consuming. He said that the process could take from 18 months to five years to complete. I take it he put this forward in support of the argument that there was a need for a greater period, that is, the 10 years in total for which interim development control can apply in respect of a given area.

Notwithstanding the present position, where the Minister has stated that something like 80 councils are involved in respect of interim development control whereas 16 councils are presently in a situation where, if the relevant provisions in the Act were not altered, they would be running out of time, I can only suggest that perhaps the Minister has overlooked other information from the Planning Appeal Board. I understand that the board has found on more than one occasion that the Act, by its very nature, and the progression procedure that applies throughout the whole of the Act, not only envisages a transition from interim development control to planning regulations for an area, but requires that this occur.

For that reason, I indicate to the Minister unequivocal support for the first purpose to which I have referred; that is, to clarify the area with respect to planning regulations and interim development control where there have been collisions, as it were, in the past. However, in the second area, to which I now speak, the Opposition supports this at the second reading stage, but during Committee we will take the opportunity to reduce the period which the Minister seeks in the Bill to a lesser period.

There is reason behind the Opposition's approach. Clearly, the Planning Appeal Board has made known its view of the Act as a whole with respect to interim development control and planning regulations, and in its view that the Act requires this transition to occur. It seems to me the one way in which the Minister can endeavour to achieve this happy state is by not extending the period throughout which interim development control can apply any longer than is absolutely necessary, otherwise, Parliament is being asked to pass a legislative measure that is in direct conflict with findings already made and publicly known from the body that adjudicates on matters contained in this legislation, namely, the Planning Appeal Board.

That is my understanding of the matter. I discussed this question with Mr. Mant, the then head of the Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs, as it was then known, who made known to me his view on this matter, when I first became the Minister when the Labor Government was in office last year. I am not arguing vehemently to the Minister that he is at fault in this matter in any way. I am simply attempting, on the Opposition's behalf, to draw to his attention the fact that this may not have figured in his thinking in bringing this part of the Bill before the House. Planning regulations and interim development control have gone to a stage where real action is needed by whoever is in office. It so happens that at the moment it is the Government of which the Minister is a member that has this task. In the second reading explanation the Hart Report is mentioned, the inquiry into private development. I think that report was tabled in June or July 1978.

It will shortly be two years since that time. In my time in the department, with respect to this Act and this very area of interim development control, the report had been publicly issued. Comment was being sought from local government and other interested persons throughout the State. In fact, I think Mr. Hart is still engaged on aspects of planning and development arising from his report and is currently working to provide further information to the Minister and to the department on this very matter.

There is nothing capricious about the way in which we wish to make the period less than that which is proposed in the Bill. One only has to peruse the 1978-79 Annual Report of the State Planning Authority to see at page 31 the list of various council areas in the State showing the respective situations in those areas involving planning regulations and interim development control. I mentioned earlier the need to correct the position that had arisen in respect of the operation of both planning regulations and interim development control in a given area. About a dozen lines in the report indicate supplementary development plans in the District Council of Meadows area, including the restriction of building within a prescribed distance of roads and planning regulations, amendments that have been gazetted, interim development control over an unzoned area, planning regulations applying in another, and so on.

One can only feel sorry for the developer, for example, who wishes to carry out development in such an area, and sympathise with the position in which that developer must find himself in trying to plough through the plethora of planning requirements that can apply within a given council area. This question of interim development control that we are asked to consider here, of course, does not provide the solution to all of that problem, but it is proposed at least to provide a further period for the operation of interim development control to apply in delegated areas from the State Planning Authority, so that presumably more of those council bodies can proceed to obtain planning regulations. The proposal I am putting is that the only way that we will ever get any action in this area, bearing in mind that Mr. Hart first reported in 1978, is by putting some sort of pressure on everybody concerned to get weaving. Mr. Hart's report recommends an integrated system of development control which would take account of those councils that have gone to the trouble, for example, of providing zoning regulations. On page 20 of the Report of Inquiry into the Control of Private Development, which is a fairly large mouthful and probably why we say the Hart Report, there is a recommendation under the heading "First State control principles," as follows:

> These principles should be derived from the development plans publicly exhibited and authorised under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1978.

Under the heading "First local principles", the report states:

> The first local principles should comprise the zoning maps, zoning charts, use group tables and zone descriptions contained in zoning regulations prepared by some councils under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1978.

There is a direct reference in the report to matters that the Government of which I was a member and the present Government have had available to them for almost two years, and there is the clear statement in those recommendations also that councils should be proceeding to enforce planning regulations in their areas. What the Minister is proposing would allow for a further period to occur during which no action could occur when obviously there was a need for action. The Minister, when he replies, may be able to add to what he said in his second reading explanation, which is fairly brief, and he may have reasons other than he has stated there. I look forward to hearing from him, if possible, any further explanation he has on the matter. At the moment he has simply suggested that, because there are 16 councils that may run out of time, I think he stated within two years, and a total of 80 councils are concerned with interim development control, there is a need to extend this period.

We are not quarrelling that there is some need, obviously, to span as it were, a further period, but the Minister has not told us whether those 16 councils have started to implement regulations, whether they have no interest in them or it is too costly for them, or whether they find that it is contrary to their feelings on this matter. None of that information has been supplied to us at this stage. As I say, if the Minister can supply additional information, there may be a reason for extending the period even further, but on what is before me, in the second reading explanation and from what I have been able to glean from the report that I have mentioned, as well as from the knowledge I gained in the brief period I was Minister of Planning, I believe there is a definite need for action with respect to orderly redevelopment in South Australia. The Minister would probably not quarrel with me on that statement. I think that one way to achieve that would be to put some kind of pressure for things to commence happening.

I look forward also in his reply to any response the Minister may have to my comment on the fact that the Planning Appeal Board has clearly stated more than once (I think in relation to the Murray flood plain, for example, and on another occasion in respect of the Flinders Range) that the Act envisages and requires this progression to occur. If we are going to go on extending these periods during which I.D.C. can apply indefinitely, we are not achieving what the Act sets out to do, and it may well be that any developer or interested body in the community could point the finger at the Government and say "We are required to meet the law which is contained in the Planning and Development Act, and yet the Government itself" (it could be directed at our Government also; I am not being political in this) "is not playing the game, because it is not adhering to what is expressly implied in its own Act."

Opposition members support this Bill generally, although we have some queries and, as indicated by way of the amendment I have referred to briefly, we will have more to say on this matter in Committee.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Planning): I thank the member for Mitchell for his contribution to this debate. As he would appreciate, it is very much a machinery measure. I shall not go into the first section, because I think that there is a consensus of opinion in that area. In relation to the second point that he raised, namely, the extension in relation to the period of two years, and the matter that he raised regarding the Planning Appeal Board, the present Government does not intend (and I believe that it was not the intention of the previous Government) to carry on with I.D.C. on an on-going basis. I believe that the previous Government was in the process of coming forward with positive legislation to overcome the need for an interim measure which, of course, I.D.C. is.

The present Government is reviewing a range of planning and development control matters before determining its long-term approach, and I am sure that the honourable member would appreciate that the Government is not able to act immediately, having been in office for only about six months. Certainly, as the responsible Minister, I do not want to race into making a decision in this regard. At the present time we are looking at two alternatives, namely, introducing completely new legislation, or amending the present Act.

I must admit that I expressed concern when in Opposition, as I believe people generally have done, at the fact that the Planning and Development Act in its present form has appeared to be a series of band-aid measures, and I believe that there is a need for the Government to come down very positively and clearly in the direction of development control in this State. At present, the Government is considering the implications of the Hart inquiry. The member for Mitchell has suggested that Mr. Hart is still involved in that matter, and that is in fact the case. Within the last couple of weeks Mr. Hart has had his contract extended to enable him to continue with the valuable work that he has done, with both the former Government and the present Government.

The Government will also be looking at the draft proposals for the new development control legislation. As was mentioned earlier, the Government will also be looking at the relationship of environmental assessment procedures. That is something that needs to happen, and more will be said about that later. I am sure the honourable member would appreciate that, before the

Government takes on major legislative changes and the future of planning regulations, it needs to have some time to be able to look at such proposals very closely before making a decision.

As far as the period is concerned, and in view of the Government's intended review of its development control strategies, I believe that it would be inappropriate to insist that councils submit considerable resources to the preparation of detailed new zoning regulations, given that the form of development control may change substantially as a result of the review that is in progress and the fact that those regulations may be found inappropriate for a number of councils at present. I took up with my officers the matter relating to the two-year period, and it was suggested to me that that period was adequate; that it was the correct period; and that it would be wrong to suggest that we could do it in less than that time. If it is found that, through new legislation or an amendment to the present Act solving some of the problems that exist, we can do it in less than that two-year period, then all to the good. However, we believe that it is necessary to extend the period for two years, because it is necessary that sufficient time should be available. The introduction of regulations can take anything from 18 months to a number of years, as the honourable member would appreciate, and it will involve councils in committing substantial financial and manpower resources to the preparation of the regulations. We have taken into account the points that the honourable member has made, particularly in relation to the Planning Appeal Board, and the matters that that body has brought forward on a number of occasions.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: On the fact that it says it should be this way?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I think the point the honourable member made earlier, and the matter the board has raised with me, is that it has expressed concern that we are in fact extending the period, and it wants to make sure, as the honourable member has suggested, that we will not merely continue to extend the period; and it certainly is not our intention to do that. We intend, as quickly as possible, to do something positive in the way of either new legislation or bringing about adequate amendments to the Planning and Development Act.

I commend the Bill to the House; it is a machinery Bill, as I mentioned earlier. The previous Government found it necessary to extend the period to eight years. We are asking the House to allow that situation to continue for another two years to enable us to have time to bring down something definite, which we will do in the very near future. The two-year period will provide us with the time that we believe is required to bring down the appropriate measures.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"When land is to be subject to interim development control."

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

> Page 2, lines 11 and 12—Leave out "period of ten years or periods amounting in aggregate to ten years" and insert "period of nine years or periods amounting in aggregate to nine years".

My amendment will mean that the maximum period of interim development control, either by way of aggregation or as a straight period, will be nine years. I have looked in the 1978-79 report from the State Planning Authority that lists all of the council and district council areas throughout South Australia to that date which are subject to interim development control. As far as I can ascertain, 30 June 1980 is the most common date to which those councils listed are currently subject to interim development control. The effect, as I see it, of my amendment would be to ensure that every one of those listed in the report would at least be covered for a further period to 30 June 1981.

I referred in the second reading debate to the need for action to occur in the whole area of orderly development, and the Minister did not disagree when replying to the second reading debate. What he meant with respect to this clause was that he wished to go on with the two-year period but that, if whatever he was proposing (he was cautious about what he was proposing, and I understand that) was able to be done in less than a two-year period, the Government would move to amend it.

One way in which to be sure that one does not over-legislate (and that was a common gibe that was hurled at us when we were on the Government benches) would be to extend it for the nine-year period and, when the need was still there, introduce another Bill to extend it to 10 years. I am sure the Minister would agree that my logic is at least as good as his. In fact, it has the added benefit to the people of South Australia of providing only one year during which they are not being subjected to one more alteration in legislation, whereas the Minister's proposal involves two years. That might be called a points decision in my favour.

I also suggest to the Minister that, irrespective of what has been said thus far, the only way in which to introduce the possible legislation to which he referred is to have the need for it to be coming forward. If one looks back at the history of the Act and why we are discussing this clause today, along with my amendment, one might ask, "How did we get here?" This matter was originally planned to proceed in an orderly way, but that has not been the case. Time does not stop for these things to happen.

The real problems facing us here and in other States were not foreseen, nor was the degree of involvement of people in these matters. There is recognition that the ordinary citizens in an area ought to have strong views on what occurs in their area. In order to cater for all those things and the associated matters contained in Mr. Hart's report, for example, it is obvious that amendments to the Act are needed. The Opposition agrees with the Minister. The Minister realised that we were looking at the same area just prior to losing government. He was fortunate enough to inherit an entire draft that dealt with the complete Act and the matter we are discussing now. That draft was a result of a great deal of work.

The Minister is not bound to accept it in its entirety. I expect that he will need time in which to examine it fully and to discuss it with interested bodies in the community, with the State Planning Authority or anyone who is interested in the matter. What I am putting in respect of my amendment is that 12 months plus is sufficient for that to occur. If the amending legislation is introduced, there is no need for the extension of interim development control, as the Minister has rightly said. If amending legislation to cater for the whole area were introduced, the rest of it would be superfluous. I agree with the point the Minister has made, and suggest to him that there is a great deal of merit in what the Opposition is putting to him. We are really saying that there is almost 15 months of leeway time in which the Government and the Minister can make up their minds about this area, and introduce legislation to take care of the matter. Why is there this great need for any period longer than the nine years proposed in my amendment?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Government cannot accept the amendment. I do not want to go through it all again. I have already said that I have talked this matter over with officers in the department. We have suggested

that it is necessary for us to have the two years. A number of significant metropolitan and outer-metropolitan councils have interim development control that expires in 1980 and 1981, and I will refer to some of them. Interim development control expires in Woodville on 13 December 1981 and in East Torrens on 1 November 1981.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That's the present date?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: Yes. It expires in Millicent on 20 December 1981.

The date of expiry of interim development control for Onkaparinga is 1 November 1981. There are many areas where the period of control expires in the latter part of 1981 I believe that this is quite a simple matter. I do not believe that it is one of great importance but, as I have already said, we feel strongly that it is necessary for us to have that two-year period. It is all right for the honourable member opposite to say that we can extend the period, but what we would prefer to do, (and I do not think it will make any difference at all) is extend the period for two years. I think that the Government would prefer to extend the period now for two years; then, if we find that we do not need the two years, all to the good. I would rather that than, at the end of 12 months, find that councils are becoming concerned or confused if we have not been able to do anything positive in that time—and I doubt that we will be able to do anything in that time. There will be more confusion, whereas at least with a two-year period they will know that they have that period, unless the Government introduces some other measure in the meantime. The Government will not accept the amendment and urges the Committee to support the extension of I.D.C. for two years.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think I heard the Minister say that I.D.C. expires in Woodville on a date in 1981. I might have to take this matter up with the State Planning Authority, which states that it expires on 30 June 1980. It shows one cannot always believe the information from which one is operating. The Minister did not really make out a case in this matter. What the Opposition is arguing here is that, certainly, there is a need for an extension, but that what has gone on for so long cannot continue. The Minister agreed that something needed to be done. He is now saying that he needs two years to make up his mind to do something about this matter, and I just cannot follow that.

Mr. Mathwin: He's not saying that at all.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I believe that the Minister is, and I look forward to his disabusing me of that belief. He has agreed that the Government is looking at this area, either by amending the Act, or introducing new legislation. Either of those things, if they were starting from scratch, would require a long period, but we are not starting from scratch here. We have the basis of a report that was compiled on a completely non-political basis, so there is no argument between the two sides there. Mr. Hart's qualifications and background are not disputed, and the report itself apparently raises no quarrel in the public sector. There is a need to change the present Act, and the Minister has stated he needs two years, at a minimum, to do something about this matter. I cannot understand that reasoning, and I ask him to reconsider the matter and see the fairness of my amendment.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I think I need to make one point quite clear: we are spending a lot of time on the possibility of the Government's bringing down new legislation or amendments to the Act. What we need to be looking at is the situation councils find themselves in at this time. That is the matter concerning the Government. As I said during the debate, the introduction of the regulations by councils is a lengthy process, as the honourable member would know, and can take anything from 18 months to a number of years. The preparation involves councils in a series of events involving engaging consultants, implementing extensive surveys, making analyses, consulting with numerous agencies and having plans and policies drawn, etc. There is an inevitable delay while small councils save a little each year towards the costs of preparing those regulations.

The Government (and I believe the Opposition would agree) does not want to see councils stampeded into completing this lengthy (and what I have suggested is a costly) task before being able to assess alterations to procedures stemming from the review of the Planning and Development Act being carried out. I believe that that would be unreasonable, because the Government might decide to introduce a simpler and more flexible development control system, and that is what we said prior to the election we would try to do. I believe that is what the previous Government was trying to do, and it is what this Government is trying to do. Because of the one-year to two-year leeway period required for the preparation of regulations, it is unlikely that councils could introduce regulations before their I.D.C. time expires, even if they had the finance available to cover the cost. As a consequence, these councils could be without development control powers, other than land subdivision control, etc., until the I.D.C. time is extended for this period.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It seems that the Minister has completely misunderstood the import of my amendment, which does not require a council to do anything: it requires the Government to get weaving and to solve the problem in the period we are referring to, so that in a total period of 21 months since coming into office, having included as a plank in its election policy a promise to amend this Act, the Government could introduce something that would take care of I.D.C. inside the time limit proposed by the Opposition. The Minister, I think, has misunderstood what we are advocating. If my amendment is carried, it does not require a council to do anything, but it requires the Government to get moving. That is what we are trying to achieve. We were attempting to do something in this area when we had our period in power curtailed, but that does not remove the need in this State for improvements in planning. As an Opposition, it is our job to see that the Government performs that task. The whole reason and ethos behind this amendment is to make sure the Government does that. I look forward to the Minister's being able to explain why it will take his Government a total of 21 months to do something about an area of legislation about which it made election promises.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: It took the previous Government 10 years but still it did not come up with an answer to this problem. Neither I as Minister nor the Government will be bullied into introducing new legislation, or whatever we are required to do to assist planning and development control in this State, in the period that the honourable member is suggesting, namely, 12 months. We must have adequate time to introduce any measures that may be required regarding planning and development in this State.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Before the dinner adjournment I made the point to the Minister that the amendment does not require councils to do anything. What it does require is that the Government get weaving and do something about the situation with respect to planning and development. The Minister agreed that the term "interim development control" was just that, an

interim form of control. At the present time the maximum period would be eight years. That is a long time for interim control of any form to be in force, but there are reasons for that. The Minister implied that there was some blame attaching to the previous Government and I believe I replied, saying that the previous Government would accept that had been quite a long period of time.

Then, much to my surprise, because until then there had been a reasonable discussion, the Minister said that he was not going to be bullied in this matter. In other words, the Minister is claiming that when the Opposition, fulfilling its role, brings into the House an amendment and speaks to it, under your watchful guise, Mr. Chairman, that is bullying. I am sure that you, Mr. Chairman, would not allow any bullying from either side of the House, and it is not provided for in the Standing Orders, either. What he did only illustrates that the Minister was hard put and hard pressed at that stage to put anything constructive into the discussion, so he resorted to that sort of statement.

The amendment seeks to limit the time to a total period of nine years. It will provide for the Government a reasonable time within which to act. The Government has had six months in office, and the time period which will apply if the amendment is carried will allow at least a further 20 months for it to make up its mind about the Planning and Development Act as a whole and about whether it wants to introduce small changes or a major approach in this area. Surely that amount of time would be sufficient.

I ask the Minister to reconsider the sensible nature of the amendment. We are saying that a reasonable time is provided. If, in the event, it is not sufficient time, in the normal course the Government will still be in office and will be in a position, using its numbers, to introduce a further extension. At that time the Opposition could look at the proposal on that basis and weigh the arguments that were put forward as to what further difficulties had arisen, or the reasons why the Government had decided that there was a need for further time. For the Minister to maintain that the Opposition is attempting to bully the Government is not realistic, because we are in no position to bully, the numbers being what they are.

We are trying to be reasonable about this matter and to tell the Government that what is needed here is some action. The Government will need a period during which it will decide what course to adopt. The time we are speaking of, until 1 December 1981, is not unreasonable in those circumstances and accordingly I ask the Minister to reconsider, drop his arguments about bullying, and so on, be sensible in the matter, and support this amendment.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I do not intend to go over the same ground again, other than to repeat that I believe we are confusing the issue. There are two separate issues in this regard. There is the issue of new legislation and what the Government will do, and the Government will do that in its own good time. We have a fair amount of time to catch up with the record of the previous Government, and we have plenty of time to make our own decisions and bring down what we will in regard to planning development.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Well, 20 months is plenty of time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I have already said that the previous Government had 10 years and still did not bring down adequate legislation. The Bill deals with a totally different situation from new legislation. It deals with an extension of interim development control. It is a machinery Bill. It is all very well for the honourable member opposite to say that the councils do not have to do anything. The fact is that we are allowing time. We are allowing two years for the councils to prepare regulations in their own time, on their own schedule. As I have said, I do not believe that we should expect councils to race into this. I believe that it would be an unfair burden on them, and that was the reason why officers of my department (and I go along with the advice they have given me) advised that we should allow two years for councils to do that.

The other thing is that I do not want to be in a position where we are continuing to bring in legislation. I have suggested that we believe that 12 months would not be adequate. I do not want, in 12 months time, to have to introduce a further amendment to extend it again. It is not our intention to bring further legislation into the Chamber. We are giving the councils a two-year period in which to bring in regulations if they wish, in their own time. The other matters that are being brought up by the Opposition are brought up only to cloud those issues.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is clear that, despite the fact that we have had a dinner break and presumably the Minister has had a decent meal, he has not altered his thinking. He has come in with a fixed idea. He has just demonstrated that there is no logic about his approach. He did not make any points. On previous occasions he was arguing about how difficult, costly and time consuming it is for a council to get involved in regulations. In fact, that is a point in the second reading explanation. Then he says that he wants councils to proceed on that matter and that is why he needs the two years. He is trying to have two bob each way, and he is really admitting that the Government (we should not blame the Minister) does not know which way to turn in this area of planning and development, because it has had pressures in other areas associated with the same Act. How many times does one have to say it? The Minister agrees with me that it is an interim measure, yet the argument is that it must continue to be interim just because the previous Government treated it as interim.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I have not said that.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Well, the Minister said the previous Government had a long time in which to do something about it and it did not do anything. That is not true because it was the previous Government that set up the inquiry into private development, with Mr. Hart, to operate in that field. The previous Government over a period of time realised that there was need for change. There was no argument about that when we began and I do not know why the Minister has decided to try to throw that in. What we are talking about is the same simple matter. I can only assume that the Minister is saying that the Government has no clue, that it needs a very long time in which to make up its mind. The Government already had a major report from the same departmental officers as were available to the previous Government. They have been providing information, advice, papers, and so on.

The Minister is telling us that, notwithstanding all that, we need a long time to make up our minds. I hope that the people of South Australia realise that they have elected a Government that is not willing to take the steps promised during the election campaign. In this case, the Minister was a candidate for election on the basis of the Liberal Party's providing amending legislation of a major nature. It was not proposed that a fiddling measure such as we have before us now would be introduced, although this measure is necessary.

The proposition put to the people was that the Government would rearrange the whole area of planning and development. The Minister is now saying that that statement was merely words because the Government needs a long time to do anything about it. I stress that, in the finality, the Government will resort to the numbers

and oppose the amendment, not because of reason, logic or sensibility, but because that is how the Government wishes to do it at present.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 March. Page 1753.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This is not a major or substantive measure; indeed, the Bill before us indicates the disarray in which the Government's legislative programme has found itself. We are now limping towards the end of a session and are not due to convene again for a further two months. The Notice Paper is stacked with a number of Bills of an extremely minor nature, many of which emanate from another place, as does this Bill. That suggests that, in a desperate attempt to make it seem that there is some legislative activity of importance, the Government has culled through ancient files from the Law Department, among others, and come up with what are known as rats and mice amendments, legislative trivia, to weigh down the Notice Paper without doing anything substantive in the legislative sense.

Of those measures that could be called substantial or involving matters of major policy, most have been either not presented or, if presented, laid on the table pending further consideration or, as in the classic case of the shopping hours Bill, consigned to limbo never to be revived again, as we understand. It seems a pity that we are forced to deal with this load of trivia at present. Nonetheless, this indicates the paucity of the Government's legislative programme and the problems that the Government is having in coping administratively with the task of Government.

That statement leads me directly to this Bill. There seems to be no reason why this measure must be brought in with any haste. It is a matter of convenience. The Bill provides that, if the Public Trustee is absent, an Acting Public Trustee can be appointed, or the powers of the Public Trustee can be delegated to a Deputy Public Trustee. That is fine; it is an administrative matter that should be dealt with. However, there is nothing much more substantial in the Bill in terms of the Public Trustee's function.

The Bill is not about administration and probate in this State. Scant recognition is paid to the major revamping and upgrading of that office under the administration of previous Attorneys-General, namely, the present Chief Justice, the member for Elizabeth, and the Leader of the Opposition in another place. All of these honourable members have been involved in and concerned with upgrading the role of Public Trustee and increasing the capacity of his office to act in the Public Service and on behalf of the public. There is nothing about that in the Bill, apart from the provision to appoint a Deputy Public Trustee.

The only matter of principle contained in the Bill relates not to the Public Trustee as such but to a general principle concerning the role of statutory officers and permanent heads. All honourable members will recall the Corbett inquiry into the Public Service, which was far-reaching and extremely important. Its findings have been discussed not only in this Parliament and in the South Australian Public Service but in Public Services and Parliaments throughout Australia. It has been a pointer to a number of subsequent Public Service inquiries and there are a number of extremely constructive, although not revolutionary, and important administrative changes proposed, some of which were put into train by the previous Government.

One of the recommendations, is the subject of this Bill. That recommendation is contained in paragraph 5.65 of the report and states:

> We recommend that the position of permanent head be offered in the form of a seven-year contract. Appointees should preferably be within the 35 to 50 years age bracket. On termination of the contract, the ex-permanent head should be eligible for reappointment but there should be no prior commitment or guarantee that he or she be returned to the position. Alternative appointments should be made available to ex-permanent heads without demotion or loss of salary and not necessarily carrying the same weight of continuous managerial responsibility. The maintenance of his or her remuneration should be provided for separately.

That was probably one of the most radical proposals contained in the Corbett Report—the very interesting concept of a permanent head's not being permanent in the sense that once appointed he or she is there for life, but permanent in the sense of his having the protection of the Act and permanent in the sense that, irrespective of change of Government, that person should remain as head of that department, but for a limited time. The value of that suggestion could be seen both in terms of the permanent head himself, his application, enthusiasm and ability to tackle the job, and in relation to the health of the Public Service in terms of flexibility and ability to change administrative arrangements and its not being locked into departmental or administrative forms because of people who occupy positions.

This was widely welcomed by students of public administration; it has certainly been discussed within the Commonwealth Public Service as an appropriate way to establish the positions of heads of departments. It is certainly useful in our system of government, where the reigning political Party of the day changes and its policies change. It does not compromise the professionalism of permanent public servants, but allows the Government of the day, over a period of time at recurring intervals, to ensure that there is changeover in the heads of departments. That infuses flexibility, new ideas and a general stimulation, which I think is important in any managerial capacity, whether it be the Public Service or the private sector.

Indeed, in the private sector, one finds that, in large organisations, many of the worst elements of Public Service bureaucracy are perpetuated. It is interesting that in some of the more progressive and dynamic companies this principle of a changing chief executive has been introduced to great effect.

Those remarks simply lead into this Bill, which deletes the provision from the Administration and Probate Act that gives the Public Trustee a fixed term of five years. That provision has not been proclaimed. As I understand it, it was not the intention of the previous Government to proclaim that provision until the time came to appoint a new Public Trustee, but whoever was appointed to that office would have been appointed on a new contractual basis in line with the new provisions.

A period of five years is contained in the Bill, rather than a seven-year period. I do not know why that period was chosen, but I do not think that the number of years is at issue here: it is the question of the principle. It would appear from this somewhat obscure Bill that the Government has decided not to accept the recommendation of the Corbett committee and that it intends to revert to the earlier system regarding permanent heads.

It is of interest that the Minister of Health is handling the Bill in this House. That Minister has already changed permanent heads, as it were, and is in charge of the Health Commission, where legislatively recently the chief executive and permanent head has been changed by Act of Parliament. I think she would probably agree, bearing in mind experience in its short period of existence, that the concept of a fixed permanent head on a contractural basis is something that can be very useful if widespread or sweeping administrative changes are required over a period of time. Nevertheless, it has been decided that this Bill is to be presented to Parliament and that this provision, which has not been proclaimed, be simply deleted and therefore, not be put into operation. We object to that. We oppose its removal because we support in general terms the policy stated in the Corbett Report. However, it is not an issue about which we will make any fuss.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I am pleased that the Opposition supports this Bill, but it appears that the Leader is in a state of some confusion concerning his attitude towards it. On the one hand, he describes the Government as embarking upon a legislative programme at this stage of the session which is nothing more than a "load of trivia". On the other hand, he refers to the constructive and important considerations of the Corbett Report, of which the provisions of this Bill represent one. One can hardly have it both ways: either it is a load of trivia or it is an important and constructive suggestion. We believe that it is the latter.

I point out that what appear to be, in the Leader's words, rats and mice are simply effective means of putting the house in order, and the fact is that the office of Public Trustee is a unique office because it is a body corporate in law and, as such, it is thought to be more appropriate that the holder of that office should have permanent status as conferred by the Public Service Act. I point out that the present Public Trustee will in no way be affected by this legislation, as he is already a public servant.

In response to the Leader's reference to the Health Commission Act Amendment Bill, I should also point out that the contractual basis of the head of the Health Commission was in no way changed by that amending legislation. It has been a seven-year term and it remains as such. The Bill now also provides for the Public Trustee to have the power to delegate any of his functions and duties to a Deputy Public Trustee, or any other officer, by a formal declaration in writing. Again, that is simply a matter of good housekeeping in order to set things on a proper basis. I am pleased that the Opposition supports this Bill.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CERTAIN LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES IN THE NORTH OF THE STATE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D. C. Wotton (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 1946.)

Mr. HEMMINGS: (Napier): The Opposition supports the motion but I would like to make one thing clear to the House. There is a considerable amount of concern on this side at the seeming lack of co-operation with Opposition members by the Minister in charge of the motion. When the Minister introduced the motion in the House, in effect, he asked that it have a speedy passage. I took the adjournment and I went to the Minister because I thought he would have co-operated and sent me a copy of the motion. I found that it had been given to a Government back-bencher. Perhaps the Minister was unaware that it was necessary for members of the Opposition who are to speak on this motion to have a copy of the Minister's speech.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: A copy was supposed to have been put on your desk.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Eventually I received a copy, but I felt that I would like to make that point. If the Government requests a speedy passage through the House, perhaps it should co-operate a little more in providing members of the Opposition with relevant speeches so that we have a chance to study them and give support. I am sure that in future the Government will provide all the relevant documents and information when requesting a speedy passage of a Bill through the House.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: That was put on your desk before dinner.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEMMINGS: We support the motion. We support any motion that will tend to reduce the number of councils in this State. Any move to amalgamate local government boundaries, as long as it is in the interests of all parties would be supported by the Opposition.

Even without the proposed Redcliff petro-chemical project, the Opposition believes that this amalgamation will benefit the community in the local government areas covered by the motion. This motion could perhaps prompt other councils to follow the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Local Government Boundaries, because I believe that, as has been proved by the Select Committee's report, local government will function much more efficiently if councils get together, thrash things out, and eventually amalgamate. The Opposition will co-operate to ensure the speedy passage of the motion. I expect that my colleague the member for Stuart will make a much more detailed contribution, as he has such an intimate knowledge of the area in question.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I support the motion. I congratulate the Select Committee on what I believe to be a very good report. I also congratulate the Government on the speedy way in which it grappled with the problem that existed in the areas of the Port Augusta, Wilmington, Kanyaka-Quorn, and Port Germein councils. I think it only fair to say that the previous Government had been working towards a similar measure for some time. I believe it is also appropriate to pay due credit to the Minister who had charge of this measure prior to the 15 September 1979 result, namely, the current Leader of the Opposition, who was then Minister in charge of local government matters. It can be said that the magnificent way in which he handled that portfolio resulted in his now being Leader of the Opposition, but I am not too sure that that was the only factor. I do not want to dwell on that matter, because much more constructive comment can be made than by my dwelling on the past.

A long history of problems has been associated with the existing boundaries in the Wilmington, Kanyaka-Quorn and Port Augusta area and, although the Redcliff development, which seems almost certain to take place (a decision will hopefully be made within the next two months), was the catalyst, nevertheless, as the Royal Commission's report so correctly pointed out, the conditions existed there, without the requirement of Redcliff being involved, to warrant such a recommendation being made. The people who live in the area know

only too well what has transpired over recent years. The small town of Stirling North, which will be more intimately affected by this decision than will most other towns, has a history of independence in relation to its dealings with the Port Augusta council. By that, I mean that it has always opposed such a move, but the inevitable occurred as a result of growth in population and development of Stirling North, which runs counter to the growth in population and development in Port Augusta, and which made this decision that much more sensible. The Redcliff project, which is almost on us, gives added weight to the decision.

I support the comments of the member for Napier that this might be regarded as a catalyst for other local government instrumentalities to accept the Royal Commission's recommendations. Although I know that the reality of the situation is that this will not happen, within my own area I should like to see the local government boundaries report applied to the Port Pirie City Council, the Port Pirie District Council, and the area of the Port Germein council on the western side of the Flinders Range amalgamate in the one council so that in the Spencer Gulf area from Port Pirie to Port Augusta the whole area was under the control of two separate councils. That is how it should be, thus making for good planning and management of the area, because all of the people on the western side of the Flinders Range have much more in common with each other than do the people on the eastern side. The recommendation has left the position of Quorn and Hawker dangling somewhat, I suppose, but that is not necessarily a bad thing, because the urgency with which this measure has been treated was well warranted.

If the report were to be delayed because a satisfactory resolution could not be found to the Kanyaka-Quorn and Hawker problem, the measure would not have been before the House until June, and I think that that would have caused considerable problems, because, in July, local government elections need to be held, and the time scale involved would have made that absolutely impossible to manage. It is my sincere wish that the Select Committee, when it again looks at the position of Kanyaka-Quorn and Hawker, is able to find the resolution to the problems. They are small councils with limited rate revenue and, as a result of this measure, if passed, the Kanyaka-Quorn council will be even smaller, with even smaller rate revenue, because the Stirling North sector of the local government area is a significant contributor to the Kanyaka-Quorn council's rate revenue. Whilst I have not had the opportunity to speak with my friends at Quorn, I trust that the member for Eyre, who is their member, may be able to express in this debate the attitudes of both councils to which I have referred.

Having taken the opportunity to discuss the report with the Port Augusta City Council and with the Wilmington council, I have been assured by the officers of both councils and by the Mayor of the Port Augusta City Council and the Chairman of the Wilmington council that they are in total agreement with the measure now before us. It will be interesting to see how the amalgamation between the Wilmington council and the Port Germein council in the new Mount Remarkable District Council operates. I have no doubt that the new council will be a very effective and efficient one that will operate to the benefit of the people in those areas.

It is always a difficult thing in small country areas to combine differing responsibilities. Over the years, the people in Melrose and Booleroo Centre have always been in friendly competition with the people in Wilmington and its adjoining areas. A certain parochialism builds up and, whilst it is friendly, it is real. It will be interesting to see how readily this feeling is broken down in the new Mount Remarkable council area. I feel confident that it will be broken down and that it will have a more viable district council which will operate to the benefit of all people involved.

I will confine the remainder of my remarks to Stirling North, Port Augusta, and the area that abounds the Redcliff development.

The people at Stirling North, as I said earlier, are of independent stock and a lot of them will not be terribly happy with this decision. That is historical, because Port Augusta and Stirling have, over many years, had this friendly rivalry. Although Port Augusta has grown at a much faster rate than Stirling, nevertheless, such rivalry exists. The Stirling community has been well served by the Stirling North Progress Association. Whilst that Association has no statutory power and is not recognised under the Local Government Act, most authorities that have dealt with Stirling North over the years have always taken the trouble to do so through the progress association.

In recent years, perhaps the influence of the progress association has waned somewhat because of the influx of new residents. The old families, who are traditionally those referred to as being Stirling North stalwarts, have been, in a sense, swamped. However, the Stirling North Progress Association has played an important part in the district, and I am confident that will continue to be the case, as it has a lot to contribute.

This measure will bring the Redcliff development within the control of the Port Augusta City Council, and that is of the utmost importance to Port Augusta. The Sir Thomas Playford Power Station at Port Augusta, which is in the Wilmington District Council area, currently pays an annual unimproved council rate of $60 to the Wilmington council. It employs some 500 or more people, who mainly live in Port Augusta. The Port Augusta City Council and the Port Augusta community at large have to provide all the facilities for these people, and for that the Council gets no rates at all.

In fact, in Port Augusta we have the unique situation where 72 per cent of the work force is employed in industry, in either the Australian National Railways or the Electricity Trust of South Australia, and yet less than 1 per cent of the rates that accrue to the Port Augusta City Council come from that area. This is a unique situation in Australia, and it puts a burden on the residents of Port Augusta that they are, frankly, unable to meet. If it was not for the assistance that the Port Augusta City Council gets from State and Federal agencies, that council would be bankrupt, and I expect that the same applies to many country councils.

I, as the member representing that area, am concerned that, when this measure becomes a fact of life and these new areas are included within that council area of Port Augusta, adequate rates can be received from the two major industrial developments. I was with the Port Augusta City Council when the former Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. Hugh Hudson) advised it that he had had discussions with ETSA and Dow Chemical, to the effect that he would be recommending that rates of $250 000 a year be paid to the Port Augusta City Council in connection with the ETSA development; that is, for the existing and the new powerhouses. I believe that that is not unreasonable. It could be argued that when the development associated with the new powerhouse has been completed a rate could be arrived at perhaps based on improved values, if the Port Augusta City Council deems fit to use such improved values. At least, at this stage, a payment of $250 000 a year in rates by ETSA is not unreasonable, and certainly was not considered to be such by the former Minister of Mines and Energy when he

made that proposition to the city council. I hope that the Government and the responsible Minister will give earnest consideration to that fact.

Concerning the petro-chemical development within the city council area, I point out to the House and the Government (although Government members, I am sure, are aware of this) that similar projects in other States and overseas draw a handsome rate indeed. I will give some examples of this. I will start with an example in South Australia in the district of the member for Baudin, namely, the Mobil Oil Refinery at Port Stanvac. When the indenture was first drawn up the rates were $230 000 and an inflation factor was included. I understand that the rates paid there for a rather small plant in comparison with the proposed Redcliff plant are $300 000 a year. The Altona Petro-chemical Plant and associated petro-chemical installations in that area in Victoria, which have a total value much less than that of the Redcliff project, pay rates of $1 200 000. Similar sized projects in the United States of America are generally rated at something like $2 000 000. Eleven similar projects, that is, world-scale petro-chemical plants in Canada, pay rates of something like $11 000 000 each.

I am not suggesting that the State Government, when it sits down with the Dow Chemical Company to draw up the indenture, will be able to convince that company that it ought to pay rates of that magnitude but, nevertheless, the fact that such rates are already paid in other parts of the world is a reasonable base from which the Government ought to start negotiating. As a local resident, I sincerely hope that the Government involves the people of Port Augusta in such negotiations. I recall an undertaking being given about this matter by the member for Baudin when he was Minister. He might recall the concern expressed at that time that no indenture should be drawn up without local input. That is not to be taken as being critical of the assistance currently being given to Port Augusta by the Government. I appreciate the statement by the Premier that he will be giving assistance to Port Augusta to enable it to cope with the magnitude of the developments that will take place.

I should give some credit to the Clerk of the Port Augusta City Council, now the liaison officer, Mr. Harry Richards, whose report I have read, and read from frequently, because it provides me with a lot of statistics I am using here tonight. I suggest that anybody who wants to talk about local government boundaries, rates or anything relating to Port Augusta or Redcliff should go to Harry Richards. He is a mine of information and dedicated to the welfare of Port Augusta. We consider ourselves very lucky that we have such a competent officer protecting our interests.

Mr. Gunn: More competent than the member.

Mr. KENEALLY: That is an interjection that I am prepared to respond to. The honourable member may be right; certainly in relation to Redcliff he is undoubtedly correct. I suppose that Harry Richards and I have abilities that may differ. Some of the abilities I have may prove of value to my constituents.

If they do not, the people will certainly let me know at the ballot box. If the member for Eyre wants to run one of his colleagues against me, I think the people in the District of Stuart will show some confidence in their member; at least I hope so.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to come back to the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: Certainly, Sir. One of the factors that encouraged me to speak on this matter, and to speak in this vein, is the experience in Gladstone, Queensland, where the existing community was required to meet the cost of rapid development out of its own rates and resources. Those people were unable to do this. Gladstone is a classic example of a developmental disaster in an urban area, and it is our concern that this does not happen at Port Augusta. I believe that that is the very reason that this measure is before the House at this time. Rates are a particularly relevant issue, and for that reason I think my comments are pertinent. There has been one or two expressions of concern to me by constituents as a result of their reading of the report of the Select Committee.

I have been asked why it is necessary that two councils be appointed, one council in my area and one in the member for Rocky River's area, rather than the normal procedure of having local government elections. I understand that it is clearly laid down in the Local Government Act that, where a new local government area is proclaimed, it is either the responsibility or the right of the Minister to appoint the council. I am not suggesting that if there was a local government election in the area of Port Augusta with these six new wards the council would be very much different from that which now exists; but I am always concerned when people are not given the opportunity, through the ballot box, to select their own representative. True, they have already exercised that right previously in relation to most of the councillors, and that one of the councillors from the Stirling North area is the elected representative of his constituents.

Nevertheless, this concern has been expressed and is a real concern. I have discussed it with the council officers, and they tell me that if the Minister had not made that decision it would have placed their council elections in absolute chaos; they would not have been able to prepare the rolls and give the necessary time for people to nominate, etc., for local government. So in that respect, although I cannot say I like the idea of councillors being appointed, nevertheless on this occasion that seems to be the only option available to the Minister.

Both the current Government and the previous Government have given considerable support for this measure, and so do I. I feel some regret for those people who think that this measure will adversely affect them, but the greater good has to be the concern of the Government and, in respect of this measure, the greater good has received that consideration. I support the motion.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I do not intend to take 22 minutes as the member for Stuart has taken.

Mr. Keneally: You won't do as well, either.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come back to the matter before the Chair.

Mr. GUNN: I apologise for the transgression. I support the motion, because if this important project is to proceed in an orderly fashion it is absolutely necessary that this arrangement be implemented as soon as possible. I am aware of the concern that has been expressed in certain parts of my electorate following certain submissions that were made to the Select Committee. It is fairly obvious to anyone who has followed this particular exercise that the recommendation in question will have some effect on the District Council of Kanyaka-Quorn and the fact that it will lose many thousands of dollars of rate revenue. A suggestion was made that that council should amalgamate with the District Council of Hawker. In turn, the District Council of Hawker suggested that it ought to extend its boundaries farther into the Flinders Ranges.

The question then arose where those people in the Flinders Ranges who currently are not incorporated in local government areas have made clear to me that they do not wish to be in local government. The District Council of Hawker does not wish at this stage to join with the District

Council of Kanyaka-Quorn. Therefore, we have a situation which in my view should not be forced. We should not take action that will force either of those councils to amalgamate against their will. The boundaries should not be extended unless the people concerned can be convinced that it is in their interests. I realise that the Select Committee has more work to do in this area, and I sincerely hope it is conscious of its responsibilities and does nothing that will antagonise the people of Hawker and Quorn.

I realise that councils have to be economical and that in the future problems could arise. However, I want to make my position quite clear by supporting this worthwhile proposition, and adding that I in no way support the compulsory amalgamation of local government bodies against the wishes of the local community. I believe local communities have to work out their own destiny in relation to this matter. I realise that the Select Committee and the Government have a role to play by informing the people concerned what may take place in the future and explaining economic trends. I do not believe anything will be achieved by compulsorily amalgamating the two council areas concerned. I certainly do not intend to take sides in the argument. It is a decision which the locals have to make for themselves in their own good time. I believe that the Government should perhaps create the situation whereby they can sit down and talk together. I understand that they have already had some worthwhile discussions.

In conclusion, I want to make one comment in relation to what the honourable member for Stuart had to say about rate revenue. I do not blame the Corporation of the City of Port Augusta for wanting to obtain for its electors the maximum revenue from the Dow Chemical Company or any other organisation, whether it be industrial or commercial. However, I think he should bear in mind that it should not get too greedy. I think we have to be very careful and that common sense and logic should apply here. I am surprised that the member for Stuart would want to create or even envisage that we may create a situation where a course of action is contemplated that may lead to that company having second thoughts. I am aware that if this project goes ahead certain demands will be made on the City of Port Augusta. I am also aware that there will be great benefits to the people of Port Augusta, people in surrounding districts, and to the people of this State if that project goes ahead. There will be job opportunities, and obviously that is important.

I am sure that the honourable member would want to see those positions filled by local people at Port Augusta. He should think carefully about his and his colleagues' policy regarding taxing every organisation, group or individual to the maximum. Unfortunately, that is the policy of the Labor Party; it wants to extract every cent it can from every group, organisation or individual, because it believes that it can spend taxpayers' money better than people can spend their own money. I am disappointed that the honourable member would support the proposition in relation to the Dow Chemical Company.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart has made his contribution.

Mr. GUNN: We had to listen to him for 22 minutes.

Mr. Keneally: Very worth while.

Mr. GUNN: That is a matter of judgment. The member for Stuart advocated that fairly substantial rates be applied to the project. It is all very well to make suggestions without having responsibility, but the Party to which the honourable member belongs gave away the Redcliff petrochemical plant on a previous occasion. I am confident that the Premier and the Government do not want to see that happen again, because it would mean a calamity for the people of this State.

If some concessions relating to rates and other taxes must be given to Dow Chemical so that it can obtain the Redcliff site, that should be done. This matter is far too important for the welfare of the people of this State; it should not be hindered by the introduction of taxes advocated by the honourable member. I support the motion, and I look forward to a report from the Select Committee. I sincerely hope that members of the Select Committee will be diligent in their investigations and reach a consensus with those parties with whom they deal in the future so that the interests of my constituents in the northern part of South Australia can be protected.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment): I thank the House for its co-operation in this matter on behalf of the Minister in another place. I commend the Select Committee for the work it has done in bringing down the interim report, and I wish the members of that committee well in its future work regarding this project. As I said earlier, the report of the Select Committee and the joint address to His Excellency the Governor represent a major part of the task that is essential for proper planning in this region to meet the challenges of the proposed industrial development. It is important that this motion be carried in this sitting of Parliament so that the new council can come into being on 1 July this year, and I am pleased that the motion will be so carried.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council agreeing to the address.

Motion carried.

VICTORIA SQUARE (INTERNATIONAL HOTEL) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 1945.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition will support this Bill, but we are not pleased about the haste with which it has been introduced; we are also not happy about the extreme pressure of time in which we must consider it. It is certainly true that propositions concerning an international hotel have been canvassed over many years. There is a world of difference between propositions being worked out between the Government and negotiating groups and legislation before the House for consideration to assist in enabling that project to go ahead. When it comes to detailed provisions being placed before the House, it is at least a courtesy to allow the Opposition and, indeed, back-bench members of the Government, a reasonable opportunity to study the Bill and to ensure that it gives effect to what the Government has stated in the second reading explanation and in the proposals concerning the Bill.

We must be allowed time, if necessary, to frame and move amendments to the Bill and generally to give a properly considered opinion on the Bill as it comes before us. Unfortunately, we have not been given an opportunity to do so today. The Bill was introduced and read a second time this afternoon. We were allowed until this evening to examine it so that we could make comments. We were told in the second reading explanation that, as it is not proposed that Parliament sit again until June, if the Bill is not passed within the next two days the matter will not be dealt with for two months; therefore, it must be dealt with in a hurry. I do not understand why the Government has

taken so long to introduce this measure. The provisions of the Bill are fairly simple but, because they involve complicated legal matters, they affect other Acts. At random, looking at clause 5, which refers to the closure of streets, other provisions usually apply in these cases.

If the normal provisions are overridden, we should at least be given the opportunity to spend some time considering them before they are debated in the House. We have been put under great pressure; we have been told that the cost of the project will escalate sharply if this Bill is not passed. We have been told also that the project could well founder unless the Bill is passed within the next few days. That is just not good enough. The proposal has been under discussion for a considerable time and, as noted in the second reading explanation, the former Premier extended the time limit for the consortium to come up with proposals to 31 December 1979. From the time of the last election until then, the consortium was presumably working to that second deadline. As is further recorded, on 27 December there was an all-Party conference, which determined heads of agreement. This was finally served, in the words of the second reading explanation, on the Government on Saturday 29 December, right on the knocker as it were.

By 29 December, one presumes, the Government had before it a document and a proposal to examine. Naturally, some time would have been taken in reframing that proposal in Cabinet, and so on; that is understood. Nonetheless, it is now four months since that date. On 1 April, three months after the time allowed, we have a legislative proposition put before us. Surely the Bill could have been introduced two or three weeks ago so that we would have had time to consider it.

The Bill has been introduced in haste. Nonetheless, we are prepared to consider it and give it some support. I must admit that it is rather surprising to find before us the proposition to build an international hotel in Adelaide. This proposal had been under discussion and investigation by the previous Government and was constantly criticised and attacked by the then Opposition. The project was referred to by all sorts of names; doubts were thrown on its viability. Rather extravagant statements were made about the extent to which Government assistance should be involved in helping private enterprise, although there are numerous examples of Government assistance being vital to ensure that an industry is developed or that some enterprise remains viable, becomes better established or more profitable.

On this side of the House we believe in a mixed economy in the concept of co-operation between the public and private sectors, and there is evidence abounding everywhere that such co-operation has proved fruitful and profitable for our community as a whole. After all, the Government operates on behalf of the community. We do not have this ideological fixation against Government involvement in this type of project. On the contrary, we believe there are occasions when the Government should not just aid such a project but become an active partner in it. We certainly do not criticise the project on that basis, and yet it was laughed out of court by the former Opposition precisely on that basis and on a number of others.

I am pleased to see that the member for Fisher is in the Chamber because over a period he had a number of things to say about this project. Until the present Government was elected, the honourable member was a front-bencher and an Opposition spokesman in the area of tourism. In fact, it was anticipated that he would become a member of the Tonkin Ministry, but he was one of the two unfortunates who were axed when the time came. They thought their moment had come but it was denied them. In many ways that is a pity because the Opposition spokesman on tourism, the member for Fisher, devoted a lot of time and energy to promoting Liberal policies in that area. Unfortunately he must now sit back on the back benches and observe tourism being handled as a minor adjunction to the Health portfolio. No doubt it is galling and frustrating for him to have to do so.

However, I am pleased to see him in the Chamber, and I hope that he will make a contribution on this matter. I hope he will recall to the House his own words at the time of the proposal for this international hotel. With reference to a *News* article on 27 September 1978, the member for Fisher, as Opposition spokesman (not just in his private capacity) said:

> No private developer in his right mind would consider building a facility in Adelaide while a threat of a taxpayer subsidy exists.

Under clause 4 exemptions may be granted in respect of the following Acts: the Waterworks Act, Sewerage Act, the Pay-roll Tax Act, Land Tax Act, and the Stamp Duties Act. Further, we find that local government rates will be remitted during the period in question and that assistance is to be given in acquiring land for the project. That constitutes a considerable and major taxpayer subsidy for the project.

According to the opinion of the member for Fisher, as Opposition spokesman for tourism at that time, this meant that there would be absolutely no development of this type taking place as far as the private sector was concerned, because the Government would be subsidising such a development with taxpayers' money. I do not know whether the honourable member has changed his mind; perhaps he will enlighten us later in the debate. However, at that stage he was expressing policy on behalf of his Party, and this is the first indication that we have had that that policy has been changed. As is usual with many of the policy changes that have been made under the past six months, this change has not been made clear; has been glossed over and ignored. The Government does not like to be reminded of its words when in Opposition, because they are constantly at odds with what it is doing.

A little over 12 months ago, on 5 February 1979, the member for Fisher, in his capacity as Liberal spokesman on tourism, said that Government-owned facilities were given Government and local council remissions, making it impossible for private enterprise to compete on an equal footing. If the honourable member wants to draw a fine line regarding this project, he can say that it is not Government-owned, but simply Government-subsidised as far as the facilities are concerned; however, his basic point was that these facilities were given Government and local council tax remissions, and the Act clearly spells out a range of tax remissions. His point was that that made it impossible for private enterprise to compete. If that is so, this Bill makes it impossible for private enterprise to compete. Yet the Government Party, although when in Opposition it denounced any such proposition, is now coming bare-faced before us, with no explanation and no notice at all, to embody in a Bill those things that it claims it was dead against when in Opposition. At least the Labor Party can claim some sort of consistency in this matter.

We are prepared to support this matter, as we were prepared to advance it while in Government. We are familiar with many of the rather extravagant statements the Premier made when he was Leader of the Opposition. In fact, when speaking as Premier, he sometimes lapses into that hyperbole with somewhat disastrous results. When the Premier was in Opposition he made certain quite strong statements about this project. He constantly

wanted to heap scorn and derision on any attempt to develop the tourist industry and, in particular, an international hotel project. As far back as 1976, he stated that there was no need for an international standard hotel in Adelaide at that time. Again, the Premier might well say that that was 1976 and that now there is a need, but I point out, of course, that since that time we have had the development of the Ansett Gateway Hotel, the substantial upgrading of the Grosvenor Hotel and the upgrading of the Oberoi Hotel, with increased capacity, so that certainly much has happened in that area.

If an international hotel was not needed in 1976, I am not quite sure why it is definitely needed now. The then Leader of the Opposition said that there was no need for it. He said, "It must be financed by the Government." By this, does he mean that it is run by private enterprise without having any sort of Government involvement? If he does, it certainly is not accomplished in this Bill. This project is not financially independent of the Government. Indeed, the very basis of this Bill is Government involvement, which is necessary to get the project off the ground. It needs tax remissions, and it needs this enabling legislation before the parties can agree. I call that Government involvement and important and fundamental Government involvement.

Of course, when in Opposition the Premier took the stand that any project must be financially independent of the Government and that it must be developed by private enterprise. The proposal under this Bill represents that type of partnership or association between the private and public sectors which is so important. Two arms of the public sector, the State Government and the Adelaide City Council, are involved, as well as a number of separate private developers. It is interesting that the financier is not a multi-national finance house or a merchant bank: it, too, is a body which is run by funds from public sector employees managed by trustees under an Act of Federal Parliament—the Superannuation Fund Investment Trust, so there is certainly Government and *quasi* Government involvement in this project. Apparently it is now accepted, when before it was not. Of course, the crowning approach came in November 1978 when the Premier was reported as saying that this plan to build an international hotel was absurd. Those are the words he used. "It is well known that an international hotel has been one of the Government's pet projects over the past eight years," he said, derisively.

It was one of the pet projects, a dreadful thing that should not have got off the ground. Here we have this absurd plan being fostered and promoted by the Government in introducing the Bill. It is an extraordinary turn around, but one we are getting used to under the present Government. Comments by the member for Fisher, the Government's once official spokesman, and the Premier on this aspect would be welcomed by us to aid our consideration of the matter. What are the proposed terms? Certainly, the core of it is extensive tax remission and, in those details, it would appear to differ little from the sorts of offer made by the previous Government to consortia that wished to develop hotels.

The role of the previous Government in this project is given substantial recognition by the Premier in his second reading explanation, as well he might, because, on this occasion, he wants us to be involved to somehow try to fudge the inconsistency in his stand in relation to the project. It would appear that the financial remissions involved and the periods of time involved in them are ones which the previous Government had on offer and which have been taken up by this Government. The only difference one can detect is in relation to assistance in acquiring the necessary land.

It is in this context that one should raise again the question which is pertinent to the development of an international hotel on this site, namely, the acquisition of Moore's building by the present Government for law courts. The previous Government, as has been mentioned again and again in this place, in attempting to advance its development of Victoria Square as a retail and international hotel outlet, had made an offer for Moore's building in order to ensure that it could be used as part of this general overall development. The final decision as to how the building should be used had not be made, whatever the Premier attempts to say. No doubt, he has been culling furiously through the documents of the previous Government to find some definitive proposal to produce. I assure him, as I have done previously, that no firm decisions were made. This is confirmed by my colleague the former Premier, the member for Hartley, and, as a Cabinet member, I know that that was the case.

Putting that to one side, by the act of arranging for the acquisition of Moore's building by means of the Superannuation Fund and turning it into law courts, the value of the Victoria Square site for an international hotel has been diminished considerably. If it were integrated as part of the hub of a major retail outlet and office mix, whatever the future development plan for Moore's was, one could see that as forming an important part of that core area of the square. As it is, next to the international hotel will be a quite uncompatible use, cheek by jowl with it. One of the most disturbing aspects of the disastrous decision made by the Government to purchase Moore's building for courts has been to diminish this project. I imagine that the developers in the consortium are somewhat concerned about the effect this may have on the future viability of the hotel project. We will be looking closely at that, just as the small retailers (some hundreds of them), who have been adversely affected by the decision, will be looking at what happens to the site. It is tragic that that part of the site has not been acquired or developed in a way that would be consistent with the international hotel project. That is something that the Government will have to look to and, indeed, if the hotel project runs into difficulty, it will be interesting to see to what extent that disastrous decision has affected it.

There is the question of land acquisition. The Moore's site proposal by the previous Government was one of the areas in which we were looking to assist the international hotel, and the other is the acquisition of the William Angliss building. Here we have another example of the rather rough-shod way in which, apparently, this proposal is being advanced. That building has a number of reasonably long-term tenants, some with leases running up to two years before expiry. The building contains a variety of mixed businesses—a flower shop is one, a book shop is another, and there are others, and their proprietors have been kept completely in the dark about the future of this project, whether they will have continued tenure in that building or whether the building is to be demolished, and even whether there will be a future for them in whatever new developments take place there.

Here is another small group of traders, perhaps only very small compared to the Victoria Square traders, who are being affected by this decision, because there has been insufficient consultation with them. I was talking to one of them the other day. He had tried to get from Angliss, the owners of the building, information on what their future was. He had heard rumours that the project had to be finalised by 1 August, and the tenants would be given their marching orders by then, but they were only rumours and they could get no definitive answer.

They were referred to Angliss headquarters in Sydney, where there was apparently no-one who was prepared to say definitely what the future was for these tenants. They were referred back, in turn, to the Adelaide City Council, and the Town Clerk (Mr. Arland) was contacted. He could confirm the date of 1 August as being discussed with the consortium. No mention was made of legislation being introduced in the House (this was only a few days ago) and no definite answer was forthcoming from the council as to under what terms the tenants could continue their operations. I do not know what is happening there.

I would have thought that the Government, not only being a principal party in this matter but also having some responsibility for the future of these small business men, ought to be able to supply us with answers for them. What is the future of the Angliss building? How long will it be up? What is the future of the tenancies in that building at present? How long will they have there? Are they to continue in those premises until the international hotel is developed, or must they close their businesses and leave forever? They ought to be told, and given plenty of notice, so that they can make other arrangements instead of being run over rough-shod.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: It's been up for five years.

Mr. BANNON: Indeed, it has been discussed for a number of years. I have already drawn attention to the way in which the present Government attacked the proposition and, therefore, those tenants had every reason to believe that, when the Tonkin Government came to office, that was the end of the project. If they had read the previous statements, that would have been their expectation, but that is not the end of the project. We have the Bill before us, and those people ought to be advised of what the new Government has to say about their rights and their future. They cannot be shrugged off like that with remarks about what happened in previous years.

The financial position of the whole business is important, and I will come to that later. While talking about agreements as to the future of tenants and others, I notice that in the Premier's second reading explanation considerable reference is made to the fact that this Bill will not come into operation until proclaimed, and it will not be proclaimed until agreement, which satisfies the Government, is reached between the parties: that is a very important provision. To that extent, this is legislation that will lie dormant until the Government is satisfied of agreement.

That is another reason, I would have thought, why such haste in getting the measure passed was not necessary. However, it behoves the Government to tell us what are the problems in the agreement as it stands at present. What are the areas of disagreement? Which parties are not at present on all fours with the proposals of the Victoria Square International Hotel Proprietary Limited, the major consortium? Certainly, as I read the Minister's second reading explanation, I note that Victoria Square International Hotel Proprietary Limited is the developer and that Fricker Bros. is the builder. It is proposed that Hilton Hotels Australia will run the hotel and that the Commonwealth Superannuation Fund Investment Trust is the financier. Do the words, "it is proposed" suggest that Hilton Hotels is the problem at present, that it has not agreed to the proposal?

Perhaps the Premier will be able to enlighten us on the state of negotiations and how soon he thinks it will be before this Act, if it becomes law, is proclaimed. The financial aspects of the project are, of course, very important indeed. It is a very expensive project, costing $37 000 000, according to the Premier in his second reading explanation. A considerable amount has already been spent on developing the project in the planning stages. One of the reasons for having this legislation passed so hastily is that any delay will result in an increase in establishment costs; that is understood.

The major financial implications of this Bill are recognised. I think we should have more details about just what those financial implications are for Government revenue, and also about the Government's concept of what is the future of this project. It is an ambitious project; it is one that has taken a long time to get off the drawing board, as it were, and into the blueprint stage, ready for development and ready, indeed, for a Bill such as this to come before the House.

In that time the hotel industry has changed. There have been certain developments in tourism. There have been proposals mooted relating to the development of existing facilities, all of which make the financial viability of this project an important matter of concern. I think that the Government's views about its financial viability should be put before us firmly. It has certainly been said in public discussions about this project that its viability could be assured if this development was associated with the development of a casino.

The Premier is on record as saying that he is opposed to casino licences in South Australia, and that legislation would have to be introduced if such licences were to be granted. If, either in the short or long term, this proposal is dependent on a casino licence, the Premier ought to tell us that that is the advice he has received, or tell us whether or not his attitude might be modified about this regarding future developments.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Watch *Nationwide* tonight.

Mr. BANNON: Rather than watch *Nationwide*, we are entitled to have the Premier tell the House and have the matter recorded in *Hansard*. If we are going to conduct Parliamentary business by means of outside media and television, we are all wasting our time completely. Many major announcements made by this Government are made for the first time outside this House, even when it is sitting, by means of television. I recall that, regarding the emergency fuel rationing legislation, we had the Premier saying that his negotiations with the Transport Workers Union had consisted of hearing its secretary expounding his views on television. He did not think to pick up the phone and speak to the secretary, or to call him to the Premier's office. If the Premier wants to do business that way, well and good, but I do not want to watch the Premier on *Nationwide*. I want to hear him answering questions here, thank you very much. I think we deserve an answer to that question.

I do not wish to say any more, because I think I have covered all the essential points in the Bill. I have indicated the Opposition's support of it. One or two of my colleagues who have been interested in following this development want to speak about it. I hope that we can expedite the legislation, recognising that this is legislation with important ramifications for the hotel industry, the tourist industry and financially for the Government. I hope the Government is completely assured on all those counts as to its viability and public value.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I am pleased to speak on this particular subject. I support the Bill, although it is not, in my opinion, the right place for an international hotel. Objections I have held in the past are most probably still quite prominent in my mind, but when a former Government had encouraged different entrepreneurs into quite large financial commitments and the present Government was faced with those obligations, I can

understand the present Government's difficulties in trying to renegotiate areas when substantial promises had been made by the former Government, and by local government.

It is worth noting that this project has been talked about for eight years. Any person who believes now, eight years later, that it is going to be a goer without many problems is misleading himself. I know that people will ask who I am to judge this matter when people who are operators of international hotel chains, such as Hilton Hotels and people who are investing money (such as the Commonwealth Superannuation Investment Fund) must have some idea how they are investing their funds. People may ask who am I, as a Parliamentarian who has had no experience in the hotel industry and just three years experience as spokesperson for a political Party, to make those judgments.

A lot of the evidence given to me while shadow spokesman for the Liberal Party convinced me that the Victoria Square site was the wrong site for an international hotel. Again, I emphasise the point that because of previous commitments made by people and companies it was more or less a foregone conclusion that, whoever won the 15 September election, if there was going to be a so-called international hotel (and you have to get the visitors to frequent it before it becomes an international hotel), it was going to be in Victoria Square. What the Leader said was not true, namely, that I was the shadow spokesman for my Party on this matter at the time of the previous election. My removal from that position took place some 2½ months before that election, and that matter should be clarified.

I made the statements because I believe them. I will make the points that I have made many times before. If a site was chosen in the Hindley Street or Adelaide Railway Station area, the advantages would be substantial for tourists coming from other lands, other States, or even the country areas of South Australia. We have the railway station, Festival Theatre, museum, library, and Art Gallery all on North Terrace. The major shopping centres in Rundle Street and Hindley Street are closer to this area than is Victoria Square. The nightlife of Adelaide, whether we like it or not, is mainly in Hindley Street or in North Adelaide. It is no good kidding ourselves of anything different, because that is the position.

I cast no reflection on the expertise of the builders who are going to work on the project. In fact, I admire their work and the way in which they have progressed in South Australia. I admire their skill and ability to develop projects. I cast not reflection on the Adelaide City Council if it believes that Victoria Square is the best site, because it has been advised that that is the case. I have made the point about Hilton Hotels. I wonder whether it was the carrot offered by the Labor Government originally that it would make the land available at a peppercorn rental that caused the decision that that would be the site.

We are talking about the investment of more than $37 000 000. We know now, as we talk about it tonight, that before the project is completed it will cost more than $40 000 000 in total. We know that under Part B of this Bill, supported by both sides of politics, local government has the power of acquiring any private land for such a project, because that part allows for acquisition of private land. How much thought have we given to the acquisition of land in the Hindley Street or Adelaide Railway Station areas, or to the original concept of expansion of the Adelaide Railway Station site?

How much greater cost would have been involved if we brought the hotel to where the tourists are more likely to be, or to where it is available to tourists if they come to our city? Some people will say tourists could say that they can catch a Bee-line bus, but a person may be at this end of the city, wanting to get to Victoria Square on a cold winter's night, and there are not many Bee-line buses that run on a regular basis. It gives taxis some business, but it is not the sort of thing tourists like.

They prefer to be close to the centre of the activity. We have the airline terminals on North Terrace, to which the passengers come by bus. I am saying to the House that my doubts are still there, as an individual. A point was made to me by people on the international scene of hotels that hotels of over 220 rooms were getting too large for present-day ventures to be viable. We are talking of one, as I read the explanation given by the Premier, that will have 400 suites. I do not think it means 400 guests: I believe it means suites, because it is to be 19 storeys.

If we look throughout the world at the moment, we see that the majority of hotels, even in countries and cities with large populations, are around the 220-room mark or under. If we are going to move into that field, Adelaide may be better served with two such hotels of that size than with one large concept that we are talking about here. I say that the site is wrong and that I think the size will cause some headaches to the operators in the long term.

I know the Government is making $500 000 available to the Adelaide City Council to acquire the privately-owned land. The ratepayers will have to front up to that in the long term. I do not know what the terms and conditions of the Adelaide City Council are on this particular project. The Government may be able to tell us at a later stage, because negotiations have not been completed. I do not know how much the five years exemption for water rates, sewerage rates, and pay-roll tax is likely to mean in money terms.

I know that the actual development of the project will take a large part of that five years. It will not be operating for some time, because construction time will be substantial. If the developers run into the same sort of union strife as T.A.A. and the Gateway have run into, the construction time could be as long as five years from now. We all realise that, and there is no guarantee that strife will not occur. The five years exemption may be no real benefit to the operators in the stage of development, except that it is a cost they do not have to meet. Regarding the 12 years exemption for land tax, I wonder how some small operators feel when they see that big operators will be able to get that exemption when they do not get it.

I think the Government, the Premier and the Opposition need to consider that. Twelve years is a substantial period of time, although that period is not fixed. We must agree that the Government has the opportunity of saying after six years, "You no longer shall have the land tax exemption". The Bill provides a maximum period. The stamp duty is only on the documents. That will be a substantial amount to the average person, but over the overall project it is very small indeed.

One other minor point that would concern me if I owned the Hilton Hotel in the suburb of Hilton, or the Hilton Adelaide Motor Inn, is that we as a Parliament say that someone else has the right to the name "Hilton" by legislation. We must realise that the only reason why it is there is possibly that there was some doubt about whether that name could be registered otherwise. I have nothing against the multi-national company of Hilton Hotels or Hilton Hotels of Australia trying to have the names. I wonder what would happen if we reversed the process, if somebody wanted to start a hotel in South Australia and call it Hilton Hotels, while Hilton Hotels of Australia was already operating. That person would have no hope.

That must be a concern to those other two operators. They may be able to gain by it. In the long term, as the larger complex advertises that it is available in Adelaide, some people may come to the city, look up the telephone book, and perhaps book into the Hilton Adelaide Motor Inn on Greenhill Road. The motel may gain customers. The Hilton Hotel at Hilton may not have much accommodation and any international tourist going there would be disillusioned if he thought it was not the 19-storey building that he had expected to enter.

I make the point that we must think of other people and small operators when we move into the field of trying to get a large project like this off the ground. We are told that the hotel is being built for travellers from other countries, to encourage them to come to South Australia. While we have air fares that disadvantage South Australia as compared to other parts of Australia and particularly other parts of the world, it is very doubtful that we would expand the number of people that come to this land as straight tourists. We have, no doubt, a continuing number that will come because they have friends or relatives in Adelaide. A large percentage of our population originated from Europe, and other parts of the world, and naturally their families will come here to visit. That class of international traveller will continue to come, but will not stay at the Victoria Square complex. Some business men will come and stay there.

Denmark has already passed a law that, if business men want to claim travel costs as a tax deduction, there is a limit on the amount they can claim. Three times already before the American Senate there has been a proposition that there should be a limit on the amount of money business men can claim for staying at hotels and for all the frills that go with some of the international hotels. In the end the average person in the street is going to bring pressures on government and say, "We believe these junket trips made by some business men and professional people should not be met in total by the taxpayer." There will be a limit on the amount of money they can spend, and once some of the major countries start doing it, whether it be West Germany or America, countries like Australia will have to do the same thing. If we cut out that area of international tourists or even national tourists, we substantially reduce the number of people who are going to stay in first-class accommodation in hotels.

Again, people will say "Well, who is Evans, saying this to a group like Hilton Hotels, an international group?" I believe the companies are already conscious of this to some degree. If we give these concessions which the previous Government was offering, the hotel gets off the ground, and then five to 10 years from now, when these concessions have all run out and the project is still not showing a profit, what will be the attitude of the operators? Commonwealth Superannuation Fund money is tied up. That money belongs to employees, or ex-employees of the Commonwealth departments. Their money is at risk. Adelaide City Council also has some money at risk. State Government land is involved, and only a peppercorn rent is paid. Further, a large international company has some substantial investment in a project.

What do you think will be the pressures that are brought to bear on government in those times? If it is not a paying proposition (and there must be doubts that it will be) with a project of this size in a city of the size of Adelaide at a time when costs of travel are escalating with fuel costs, do we go back to sailing ships? By the time people finish their trips to Australia, the holidays will be over and they will have to fly back. The pressure will be for further Government subsidy by exemption from these forms of taxes or for a greater participation by the Adelaide City Council as part of the first proposition, with the ratepayers picking up some of the tab. The argument will be, as it has been in Paris, with their big convention facility which is divorced from the hotel complex, that the ratepayers should foot some of the bill because of the benefit that tourism brings to the city through convention and other facilities. Business houses are asked to contribute substantially, as is the case in the many other places throughout Europe where convention facilities are built.

In fact, I believe that there are only two places in the world where convention facilities pay. They are the Bella Centre in Brussels and the centre in Singapore. Unless there are trade and exhibition facilities on a large scale, the only way for the hotel to survive is under a casino licence, and no honourable member should say that that is not a real possibility. Perhaps the majority of honourable members support that scheme; it has never been tested in this Parliament. Perhaps the majority of members in the next Parliament will support that scheme. It is interesting to note that Victoria is going away from that concept and it will be interesting to see the reaction of the tourist industry or of other operators.

One thing is certain: with the sort of concessions that may apply to this project, it will have a distinct advantage for a number of years over any other operator in the city, unless land tax on business premises is abolished, because some of the operators in this city are in more than one operation. Because of the aggregation of land tax, this tax is quite substantial. We need to be conscious of the cost burden that will be placed on those operators as against the operator of this project, which will not carry the burden of those costs. When the agreement is reached (and I know that the Premier cannot say tonight how much the exemption for water rates is expected to save the project in cost over five years, if it has benefit for five years and if it concerns things like sewerage rates, land tax, stamp duty and pay-roll tax), I would like to know how much this project will be saved. I do not hope that the project does not succeed, and that is why I support the Bill. I believe that the present Government has been placed in a position in which it must accept the propositions because of the costs that are involved, the promises that have been made, and the expectations that are held.

It has been said that international flights must land somewhere near Adelaide. I am not a supporter of a new airport of international standard being built 45 km from Adelaide, and I am on record as saying that in the past; it would be wrong to suddenly change my mind. I do not support the building of an international airport in Adelaide as a separate project to help the tourist industry of South Australia, because I believe that the cost would be too high for the benefit that it would bring to this State or to Australia. It will never be justified. However, I believe that we need international facilities at the present airport and this can be achieved without interfering with people's life styles. I have been reported as saying that in the past, and the former member for Morphett said that he would use this in the election campaign. Perhaps he did, but the present member defeated him. It is possible for larger planes, not fully loaded with fuel, to land at that airport. They could take off, not fully loaded with fuel, without disturbing people.

The Adelaide Airport would be one of the few airports in the world at which planes land people close to accommodation and entertainment facilities. The cost of transport for 40 or 50 kilometres into the city is avoided. This is the case in a number of countries, and fuel costs must be considered. Those countries do not have the same

advantage of land as does South Australia; if they had, they would never have taken that action. The topography of land and the position of the cities forced some countries to do what they did. Some honourable members will say that an international airport will interfere with people's life styles to a small degree.

Townships have been wiped out in this State for the sake of water preservation, for the benefit of the majority. People's homes were knocked down. I am not saying that we have to do that in this case when I used this example previously, it was said that I advocated this action. I said that, if this action had to be taken, it must be considered, but we know that that action does not have to be taken in this case. We all know that, as technology improves, planes can land and take off in shorter distances and we will be able to use the facilities if we can obtain some understanding of the benfit that would accrue to the State. I know that there will be extra costs for immigration and customs officials, but the cost will not be substantial.

I also know that, for a country of 14 000 000 people, we have more international gateways per head of population than any other country in the world, except perhaps one or two small countries with a small population and with only one necessary international gateway. I do not support the Government's going into massive expenditure for such a proposition when there is an excellent set-up close by.

Some people might say that, because I speak so strongly about the Victoria Square concept not being the best site, I should oppose the project. If the Commonwealth Superannuation Fund is prepared to risk capital, if an international operator is prepared to take a punt and risk some expertise and not a lot of capital, if the State can afford to give the property a peppercorn rent, if the power given to local government by Parliament is such that it can acquire a private enterprise operation and give it to what one might call another private operator, if we can afford to close Page Street and to give $500 000 to the Adelaide City Council to buy the property, and if the people who are supposed to have the expertise believe that the Victoria Square site is the best site in Adelaide and the only one, and that that is where the hotel should be, who am I to say it should not be given a try.

I make three major predictions: the hotel will cost more than $40 000 000; it will not be built without a lot of industrial strife; and, within six years, there will be an approach made to this Parliament for some sort of financial assistance in the form of either continuing exemptions or an application for a casino licence of some type. I support the Bill in order to find out whether other people's judgments are better than mine.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I was interested to hear the remarks made by the member for Fisher. In many ways, I concur in some of the points he raised, but not all of them. I concur in some of his reservations about the proposal in this Bill. I support the Bill with some reservations that are associated with the ultimate economic viability of the hotel. I wonder whether Adelaide can sustain a hotel of the nature proposed.

I understand, from the second reading explanation, that the construction will consist of 19 levels plus a basement and, among other things, it will contain convention facilities and 400 guest suites. Accordingly, it is a very extensive project, and I am wondering whether the City of Adelaide can sustain such a project unless it is associated with other facilities. The member for Fisher raised the question of whether future proprietors of the hotel will seek other facilities. The establishment of a casino is a possibility.

The hotel seeks to attract mainly international tourists, and the member for Fisher said that to do this we need the facilities of an international airport, whether they be at the site of the present airport or outside the metropolitan area of Adelaide. If tourists are to come to Adelaide they need to arrive and depart directly rather than via the Eastern States, where, as I understand it, 80 per cent of tourists either arrive or depart. Another factor mentioned was that of costs in relation to air fares. If a project of this type is to be supported because it will attract international tourists, it means that we have to attract them in a way that is convenient to them and at a cost factor which is comparable with that in other parts of the world.

I would like to consider what effect the Victoria Square international hotel may have on other major hotels in the City of Adelaide. For instance, can the present hotels maintain their present position when, as I understand it, the hotel industry is in a void situation, and can such hotels maintain their financial position when an international hotel is operative in Victoria Square?

It is not my intention to oppose the proposal except to say those few words of caution in relation to the general viability of the project and to the costs involved to the community by way of the concessions that we make through the Government and other aspects of the project. I do not wish to put a damper on the proposition bandied around by the previous Government. The proposals are not final at this stage. I understand from the second reading explanation that the persons involved in the consortium have not come to a final decision or a proposal among themselves. The Government will need to know of the agreements that they come to. I support the Bill, but with a number of reservations.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I concur in the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Gilles in supporting the Bill, which seeks to establish an international hotel in Victoria Square. Obviously, there are quite a few comments to be made about the role of such a hotel and the tourist industry within this State. There has been much talk over previous months about the need to expand the tourist industry in South Australia, the need to expand the provision of tourist facilities, and generally to expand the role of Government assistance to the tourist industry.

This Bill is part and parcel of that programme, and I think to view it in any other way would be a mistake. To view it in pure isolation and to suggest that tourism in South Australia will be totally and sufficiently satisfied with an international hotel funded by the Government, with no other Government support in any other areas, would be a grave mistake. In fact, an international hotel will provide accommodation of a certain type among a broad range of mixed accommodation that is greatly needed in this State to provide for the tourists that we feel this State can well provide for.

Mention has already been made of the partners in the consortium at present negotiating the terms of the agreement to construct the Victoria Square hotel. I think it is important to look at the members of the consortium to ascertain some aspect of the viability of the project. Apart from the name of the hotel, the names that have been mentioned were Fricker Bros., the City Council, Hilton Hotels, and the Superannuation Fund Investment Trust. Certainly, three of those bodies are business concerns in their own right, and that is the name of the game as far as they are concerned. Their aim is to make a profit on invested capital, and I do not believe that we would enter lightly into a decision to construct an international hotel in Adelaide unless they believed that it had at least some viability. In fact, I concur in that; I think that such a

project does have some viability and that the bodies concerned have made that decision also.

I think we should be pleased and heartened by that fact. Nevertheless, there are questions of viability that have been raised in the debate tonight. I do not know that we should shy away from them; we should acknowledge that they are very real questions. Certainly, even business corporations, with all the acumen that they have available to them from research officers and economists, can make mistakes on occasions, and they can also misjudge the economic situation and perhaps not follow through a good investment. Therefore, it is possible that these three corporations that have been mentioned may not have made as wise a decision as might be anticipated. Nevertheless, I think that the coincidence for the three corporations independently to come to a mistaken decision would be somewhat great.

The important thing about the Bill is that it incorporates an aspect of Government support. Indeed, if there were not the need for Government support in one form or another there would not be a Bill before the House, because the project would have gone ahead without the requirements of a separate Act of Parliament. I think it is useful, worth while and to be supported that the Government has taken the initiative, the previous Government having taken the initiative originally. The present Government has decided to take the decision to support the project, and such support will offer real financial incentives through land tax, through assistance in purchasing land, and assistance with rates of one form or another over the years ahead. In terms of not only the running costs of the hotel but also the capital costs there will be a useful saving for the operators. Even though the project will cost many millions of dollars, those savings will still be of significance to the investors participating in it.

It is not unheard of for Governments in many countries to participate in hotel projects of one form or another and, indeed, in any form of tourist support. Those countries in Europe, North Africa or Central America that believe that tourism has an important place to play in their economy often have substantial commitments to various tourist facilities within their economy, and those facilities do not only include the provision of accommodation space.

In this regard, we are recognising that, in major capital investment projects of a tourist nature, the Government can play some sort of part, and I hope that that type of initiative is not lost just on the passage of this Bill: I hope that it continues with other programmes in the years ahead that can likewise bolster the tourist industry within this State.

The decision to invest money or to allow rebates or remissions of one form or another to organsiations at the expense of Government revenue has the effect of providing a flow-on to the tourist industry at large. It would be quite unreal to believe that the savings that will be made by the Victoria Square international hotel will be limited purely to the profit benefit of the operators of that hotel. Rather, by enabling the viability of the project and by enabling, therefore, the change for tourists to come to this State and stay in that hotel, the Bill will enable tourist revenue to be directed to other enterprises within this State. Shops, tourist facilities, transport facilities, and a whole host of revenue areas will be able to benefit from this proposal.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: We are talking here about the possibility of an international hotel being sited in Victoria Square rather than on North Terrace or in Hindley Street. In terms of the siting of major hotels of any sort in many cities of the world, compared to tourists or transport facilities, the relative position of the Victoria Square international hotel, in Adelaide, in relation to those facilities is advantageous to that hotel. The Victoria Square site is only half a mile from the railway station facilities and from the city terminals of the two major airlines that service the State, and only slightly more than half a mile from some major tourist attractions. It is little distance to expect tourists to traverse when coming to this city. In many cities of the world, tourists traverse far greater distances to reach equivalent facilities.

I do not believe that the Victoria Square site is a poor site; in fact, it could well have some aesthetic advantages over other sites. Land is already available there, such as car-parking space and the development possibilities which may still exist, although they are rapidly diminishing, with the purchase of Moore's building. This land would enable a proper development to take place, rather than would a hotel crammed into a relatively small site on North Terrace or in Hindley Street, if land were to become available.

Regarding the choice of the international hotelier to participate in the scheme, it is interesting to note that the Hilton Hotel Corporation has been mentioned. There are positive and negative aspects to that matter which should be mentioned in passing. It cannot be doubted that the experience of the Hilton Hotel Corporation, under the founding Chairmanship of Conrad Hilton, has proved itself to be a world leader in the provision of hotel accommodation in this country. It has proved by the number of hotels it profitably operates in many parts of the world that it knows what it is about. I understand that it not only operates hotels within the Western world but that it also has some hotels in the communist bloc itself, and that it is able, through the bureaucracy that sometimes exists, to make profits in those cases. It has international recognition, together with a high standing, and it operates an Australian-wide chain.

It operates hotels in Sydney, Melbourne and Perth, and to be able to add a like hotel in Adelaide would be of some advantage both to the company and, obviously, to the owners of the site in this State because, obviously, tourists who visit Sydney, Melbourne or Perth will have close access to and close liaison with the hotels in those three States and the one in Adelaide. This is a positive aspect about which I am pleased. Nevertheless, there are two other comments I will make.

To my knowledge, the Hilton Corporation has no direct or semi-direct international airline connection. Many of the international hotels generally throughout the world have close liaison with an international airline of some kind or other, and that has proved to be of great benefit. The Inter-continental hotel chain, another major international hotel chain, is closely connected with Pan American Airlines, while Singapore Airlines, likewise, has a liaison, and even Australia's own Qantas operates the Wentworth Hotel in Sydney.

That is a very clear advantage not only for an airline but also for a hotel, because it enables some sort of degree of captive audience that can be fed into the hotel. It also enables easy booking of facilities and tourist accommodation from the overseas offices of the international hotel chain when tourists book their flights. It would perhaps be useful if the operator in this instance had the same liaison.

The point will obviously be made that we do not have an international airport in Adelaide that services any international airline. Perhaps we should regret that; I do but, nevertheless, I do not believe that it is incompatible with an international hotel chain connected with an international airline to operate hotels in locations other than those that have international airports. There are precedents for international hotels operating in cities other than those serviced by international airports.

The other qualm I have relates to the inexperience of the Hilton Corporation in Australia. It has been positive with regard to the Hilton hotels in Sydney and Melbourne, and no doubt the Hilton Parmelia in Perth will prove to be a fruitful experience. However, the very first experience of the Hilton Corporation in Australia was not a positive one. We must look at that to see what lessons that has for the situation we face today. That first experience, in 1959 or 1960, I believe, was when the Hilton Corporation entered into a licensing arrangement with the Stonehill Corporation, as it then was, which was the owner of a property in Kings Cross, Sydney, and which resulted in the construction of what was to be known for two or three years as the Chevron Hilton.

It was officially to be a massive project containing vast entertainment and accommodation facilities, but it never reached its completion. To this date, it has reached only half the completion of its originally proposed plan and, what is more important, it is no longer, and has not been for some 17 years, a Hilton hotel.

The Hilton Corporation withdrew when the Stanhill Corporation met financial problems in the early 1960's, and left it merely as we now know it, namely, as the Chevron Hotel, in Sydney, which has changed hands on a variety of occasions, the last being, I believe, within the previous 18 months. I think that, therefore, one of the lessons we need to learn there is that any arrangement made between the various firms and the consortium, the Corporation of the City of Adelaide and the State Government, should try to tie up the arrangements that the international hotelier has with the consortium, and try to clarify exactly what pull-out agreements can be made by any single party in it. We do not want to find ourselves in the situation that the mat is pulled out from under the other partners in the consortium. The very name Hilton, in itself, attracts a certain clientele and, if that name were to disappear, that would hinder the viability of the project. One further point connected with the connection of having an international hotelier in the project relates back to the point of an international airline.

Many international airlines and hotel chains are frequent participants in charter and tourist schemes of one form or another. Even the Hilton Hotel Corporation, despite its lack of international airline connections, participates in various tour schemes of this nature. Indeed, a significant (not the majority) proportion of the accommodation nights occupied in the Hilton hotels in various parts of the world is made up of this type of accommodation, bulk-bought by tour agencies. They are the ones who provide the bread and butter for the viability of operations of that sort. While we look at the tariff rates of these major international hotels and we are somewhat astounded, I imagine, when they exceed $60 a night ($100 for some of the suites), we forget very often that those same international hotels are still selling (and this is what they are doing, of course) the use of some of those rooms at much cheaper rates to tour operators, who provide a large part of the economic viability of those hotels.

The economic viability of this hotel will depend on that particular type of arrangement being able to be made. With regard to the Moore's development, which was touched upon in some detail by the Leader, I draw to members' attention the situation existing with the Hilton hotels in Sydney and Melbourne and also the Southern Cross Hotel in Melbourne. These are just some of the major hotels in this country, all three of which are connected with major shopping arcade facilities. Those arcade facilities concentrate on type, price and range of goods that are not for the bulk of us when we go shopping. Nevertheless, they contain goods that are of interest to tourists when they come to this country. It would be hoped that any international hotel built in Victoria Square would have immediate access to a similar arcade shopping facility. The opportunity for Moore's to have been redeveloped into such a shopping arcade facility was excellent, as it was right next door to the proposed hotel. It had the possibility of redesign, and for the opportunity to have been passed up, I think, is lamentable and, in fact, poses some problems for the operation of the proposed hotel.

Turning to the question of viability of the hotel, I point out that various aspects need to be considered. It has been suggested that the cost of the hotel will be upwards of $37 000 000. Indeed, the member for Fisher speculated that that amount may be well below the final cost, given that the completion date may be some five years from now. If we accept the figure of $37 000 000, then we are looking at a cost per room of about $90 000, which is a substantial amount of money in anyone's terms. We are looking at the cost of supplying one suite, which probably has sleeping accommodation for two people and perhaps the ability to put in a third bed. It may even be a facility providing family rooms, but, nevertheless, at the very most there would be four people per room supplied at the cost of $90 000 a room. From my own experience of house prices in the electorate of Salisbury, that is about three times the price of an average home, a quite substantial capital figure.

I believe that, in fact, the major hotel investors who have sometimes found some economic problems throughout the world should look to that particular area to try to solve some ot their viability problems—the actual capital cost of the structure—because a large proportion of the tariff people pay for each night's stay at a hotel (and we mentioned a figure upwards of $60) goes no further than to simply amortise the interest repayments on the cost of building the hotel. They go no further than supplying some sort of capital return on the capital investment before any consideration can be taken of labour costs for cleaning the room, of providing other facilities within the hotel, or of providing a profit margin for the hotel itself.

Of course, the point has been made tonight that many international hotels take some years to reach a profit margin before they reach the point of profit break-through. It is my personal contention that the hotels that have that fairly lengthy period before reaching that profit break-through are those that have the high cost per suite provided. The European experience tends to show that hotels which have a capital cost much lower than that and which provide adequate and comfortable facilities reach profit break-through at a much earlier point in time. It is interesting to compare the $90 000 per suit cost of providing this facility with another facility with which the State Government has been concerned in the past couple of years involving a much lesser figure. A couple of years ago the South Australian Housing Trust (an agency under the authority of the State Government) purchased the Afton Private Hotel. That hotel has been offering accommodation of an adequate sort for many years. The cost price of that particular purchase was $2 500 per room (I think "suite" is too elaborate a term to use), and that is

somewhat substantially different from a cost of $90 000 a suite.

I am not venturing to suggest that the international hotel to be built in Victoria Square should be providing accommodation of the quality of the Afton Private Hotel by any manner of means. What I am suggesting is that perhaps international hoteliers could be seeking to provide the same standard of facilities they require to maintain their reputation and name at a somewhat lower cost than is the case in this situation, and has been the case in certain international hotels for some years now. If it were possible to reduce it, then they could reduce the tarrif and, consequently, attract more customers.

One of the vital things that hotels depend upon is the very economics of occupancy rates. The entire project will rise or fall on the percentage of rooms it is able to keep occupied at all times throughout the year. I do not know what the present percentage is for a break-even point, but I would imagine (and perhaps the member for Brighton, who is an expert in this area, could advise on this point) that it is about a 60 or 70 per cent occupancy rate to reach a break-even point. That is a fair percentage of rooms each night, and it means, in this instance, between 240 and 280 rooms every night of the year. Adjusting that for seasonal variations, obviously some nights would have less, but by corresponding consequences other nights must have more. I hope that the South Australian Tourist Bureau is doing its bit to see how that can be helped and how we can promote tourism to make sure we have that even flow of occupancy rate.

As I mentioned earlier, this should be part of a general package of Government concern and involvement in the tourist industry in this State. Indeed, I believe that, while there is a need for a hotel of international standing in South Australia (that has been the evidence of previous years, and it is supported presently), there is also a need for other types of accommodation to cater for the tourist who comes to this State. The point has been made that at this stage most tourists who come to South Australia will not be staying at an international hotel. They will seek to stay in accommodation of other sorts. I hope that at some stage in the future the Government will look to providing financial incentives to other providers of accommodation in the hope that they, too, will be able to improve and increase the number of rooms that they have available. I point out that there are a great many hotels within the city of Adelaide that presently maintain rooms, supposedly for lodgers, to comply with licensing regulations, but because of their present way of operating they would be somewhat inconvenienced if people took them up and asked to stay in the lodgings they have available. I believe that, if the Government were to offer incentives to these operators to make those rooms real possibilities for accommodation, and to improve the standards of some of them, that would increase the range of rooms available and improve the mix of accommodation available and, as a consequence, improve the total tourist accommodation in Adelaide.

There can be no improvement in the overall number of tourists to Adelaide if the total investment and concern is in one category only. The tourist industry, from overseas experience, indeed covers a wide spectrum. It covers the high income business man type of tourist right through the middle income down to the marginal income tourist that has become a feature of many tourist spots in Europe. Our role should somehow be to stimulate that cross-section of tourism, because by the mix of tourism the investments for all of them, international hotels included, become a viable operation. Without continuing at much greater length, I do support the Bill. The prospect of an international hotel in Adelaide is a pleasing one, although there are these important areas that we need to pay attention to. The viability of the project will depend on the areas that I have mentioned. If they fail to receive attention, we are in danger of the project not being the success that quite clearly all of us in this House want it to be. In future, we must look to going into other methods of supporting not only the tourism of this State but also the tourism that will have a consequence upon viability and operations of this hotel.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): May I say at the outset how very much I have been impressed by the speech of the member for Salisbury and the very real contribution he has made to this debate. It has been a soundly reasoned contribution, and the points he has made are most pertinent. I thank him indeed for the concern that he has shown and the attention that he has given this Bill. I think the points that have been made by the honourable member are such that they highlight the need for an international standard hotel, and they show quite clearly that that international standard hotel will have a very significant part to play in promoting tourism in this State.

I do not intend to canvass the matters which he so capably covered during his speech. The honourable member for Salisbury, while showing great confidence in the tourist industry in South Australia and its future, at no time mentioned the possibility of a casino being established in that hotel as an essential part of any scheme to attract tourism to South Australia. I admire him for that, and I, too, totally believe that, if we have the facilities, South Australia can support a major tourist industry. We do not need a casino to pull any extra tourism to this State.

I thank the House, too, for its co-operation in this entire matter. It has not been an easy matter and, of course, the Leader of the Opposition has properly referred to the haste with which this legislation has been introduced. I express some regret at the haste which has been necessary, but I cannot apologise for it. Because the question of agreement and negotiation has to be settled, the time table has been such that this course of action has had to be taken. I have already said that the heads of agreement were drawn up and signed by all parties present, except the Government, on 27 December 1979 and that the document was served on the Government on 29 December. The document proposed the construction of a hotel, as we have heard, and it was proposed that the site include the whole of Page Street.

Notwithstanding the execution of the document at the time, there were still some areas of disagreement between the parties, the principal disagreement, as I understand it, being between the Hilton Corporation and the developer, on the one hand, and the Superannuation Trust Fund on the other. That disagreement related to the mode of assessment of profit of the project, upon which, of course, was based the rent payable by Hilton to the trust. The document also contained some provisions not acceptable to the Government. Since the execution of the heads of agreement, the developer and Hilton reconsidered the project and decided to proceed on a slightly smaller site; that is, they decided to exclude from the site the east-west section of Page Street. There are presently some doubts as to whether the Superannuation Trust Fund accepts this variation, thus giving rise to one further area of disagreement between the parties. I must say that these are disagreements of detail, not disagreements of principle. One of the results of the areas of disagreement has been that the parties have not yet been able to negotiate new heads of agreement, and they appear most

unlikely to do so before Parliament rises. However, on the information given to us in the last few days, it seems very likely indeed that the heads of agreement will be agreed shortly after Easter.

In the expectation that the heads of agreement between the parties would be agreed before the end of February 1980, that is, in the relatively early stages of this development, the Government initially determined that it would not introduce legislation relating to the project until such time as the heads of agreement had been signed by all parties, including the Government. However, as the heads of agreement have not yet been signed, and since it seems that they are about to be signed, the Government has agreed to introduce the legislation prior to the execution of the heads of agreement but, of course, putting in the proviso that the Leader has referred to, namely, that the legislation would not come into operation until the final agreement between all parties has been reached.

That is the reason for the haste in introducing the legislation right now. As has been pointed out, the costs of delay now (the delays which have resulted because of the heads of agreement) have kept pace with the development of the project, but if there is now further delay in the heads of agreement and in proceeding with this legislation, the costs will be quite enormous, and they will mount up as time goes on. We cannot afford not to have the legislation in effect before the House rises.

The whole project has been long heralded, as the Leader of the Opposition has said. There have been many announcements, and I must say (and I say without any apology again), that I have been a most vocal critic of this entire project and the way that it has been handled in the past. I have given trenchant criticism to it, because there have been so many announcements that have been made about the project before there has been any finalisation or before we have got to a stage where heads of agreement have been drawn up. That has been the tenor of my argument all the way through, and it is typical of a number of projects. The Redcliff project is one which we all want to see happen but which was announced on a number of occasions before there was any finality. The Victoria Square hotel is one such project that was announced. I am not sure whether it was 19 or 20 times, over a period of about eight years.

I agree that it is a good project. It is perhaps possible to announce it now because heads of agreement have been drawn up and have nearly been finalised. That is the time that such projects should be announced publicly, not before. The State, I believe, has suffered a tremendous loss of confidence in the past because projects have been heralded, trumpeted from the rooftops, and then indeed have come to nothing. I think people have had every reason to lose confidence because of that attitude. It is a policy that this Government has adopted that we will make no such announcements until we have reached the heads of agreement stage, or very close to it. The Leader of the Opposition has criticised the amount of Government assistance and has said that that is contrary to the policy which has been adopted by this Government. I point out to him that this Bill does give a considerable amount of Government assistance, some $5 000 000 worth, in fact, over a period of 12 years.

However, it does not go nearly so far as the original proposition that was considered by the former Government. Under that scheme, there was considerable Government involvement. Substantial concessions were to be made, and those concessions are well worth looking at. The Government's hotels committee gave the consortium an exclusive right to promote the proposed hotel. As has already been said in a second reading explanation, the company was given the exclusive right to place before the Government a firm and detailed proposal for the construction of the international hotel on that chosen site. The exclusive right was initially due to expire on 30 September 1979, but on 15 August the former Premier extended the exclusive right up to and including 31 December 1979.

The Government considered that, if the heads of agreement were not near the final stage by the end of December 1979, a halt would have been called to the entire agreement. As it happened, by dint of a great deal of discussion, the parties to the transaction came to an agreement and heads of agreement were proposed.

Inherent in the exclusive right that was granted, I point out, there was not only the package of incentives, including pay-roll tax, land tax, rating incentives, the availability of the site at a peppercorn rental for 99 years, exemption from stamp duty, etc., but consideration was given to quite substantial Government involvement by way of an interest-free loan of large proportions.

Mr. Bannon: Is that document to be tabled?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am afraid it is not. The former Government gave consideration to a substantial—

Mr. Bannon: Is that the committee's report?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, it is a note. Consideration was given to an interest-free loan. Consideration was given by the previous Government to taking a considerable equity.

Mr. Bannon: That is consistent with the former Government's philosophy.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not arguing about that. It is consistent with the former Government's philosophy. It is a commitment to that philosophy that brought the former Government very much to where it is now. I think that that sums up the situation very well. The Government has decided to honour the commitment made by the previous Government regarding concessions, and that has been done. We have not in any way involved ourselves in any equity or substantial interest-free loans. As I believe the leader has said, we are against Government involvement. Despite the Leader's attempts to show that we are involved in this project, I simply point out that we are not involved to the same extent and certainly not to such a significant extent as the former Government would have been had it signed an agreement under those terms.

Certainly, we are losing a certain amount of income as a result of the concessions that we will make, but I point out to the Leader what I am sure he already knows, namely, that we are not getting that money now. We are foregoing that income for a period of between five and 12 years. The block of land that has been sitting on the corner of Grote Street for longer than I care to remember has certainly greatly exceeded its original cost in terms of lost income. It has cost the Government of the day a considerable amount because it has been lying idle; it was used simply as a parking station for Public Buildings Department vehicles. The Government is foregoing a potential income for a time, but at the end of that time the income that will come to the Government will be substantial and will more than make up for the moneys we are losing now.

The Leader mentioned that I had made comments previously about the international hotel being a pet project of the Government over the past few years and that it was an absurd project. I still hold to that. Indeed, in the context of an anti-development Government, a Government that spent most of its time contriving policies to inhibit industrial and economic development in this State, policies that I will say caused industry and business to run down, that caused prosperity in this State to run down and caused people to lose confidence in this State, it

was absurd development. Of course, in that climate it could not possibly work; in a new climate, it can work. I will deal with that point later.

The Leader has referred to the Moore's site; he said that law courts are not consistent with an international hotel and that they will detract from the hotel. I will not make any comment about the Leader's perception of this matter other than to say that he should remember that the Government of which he was a member, as long ago as April last year, long before we came to office, was considering and having discussions with a developer on the proposal of converting the Moore's building into law courts. The Leader knows that. If he does not know it, he was misled by his officers or Cabinet was misled.

Indeed, I have documentary proof that shows quite clearly that the law courts proposal was put up to the Government and discussed with at least one Minister of that Government and Government officers in April last year. Because of the things the Leader has said on another occasion and on this occasion, I accept that he probably does not know about this, but he can take it from me that that was so.

Mr. Bannon: It may have been discussed, but that does not give effect to it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It was not only discussed but the people who put forward the proposition derived great encouragement from discussions with the Government of the day. I believe that that area of the city is bound up very much with the question of an international standard hotel. The hotel will rejuvenate that area more than anything else could. It will set a standard; it will provide accommodation at a certain standard and I believe that the entire area will be lifted because of it. The Leader referred to the acquisition of land. That matter is of great concern, I agree. The Bill, as presently drafted, makes no provision for the acquisition of Angliss land. The Minister of Local Government has advised the City of Adelaide that when heads of agreement between the parties had been signed, he will approve the scheme of development pursuant to the provisions of section 855(b) of the Local Government Act. The provisions of that section empower the council, once a scheme has been approved, to acquire the necessary land pursuant to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act. The Town Clerk of the City of Adelaide advised that, although the scheme has not yet been finally approved by the Minister of Local Government, the council has commenced preliminary discussions with Angliss with a view to acquiring the Angliss land and gaining entry thereto by 1 August 1980.

There is no question that the possible acquisition of the Angliss land has been fairly and squarely before them for a number of years. It has been no secret that the international hotel site involves that land. All of the concessions, as I have said, referred to in the Bill have been granted by the previous government to the developer and operator of the proposed hotel.

I refer now to the closure of Page Street, dealt with under clause 5 of the Bill. That clause was inserted because of a request from the council. The position is fairly clear. The portion of Page Street to be closed is the north-south portion. The east-west portion, the portion that lies between Victoria Square and the northern entrance to the market arcade, will remain open and will provide access to the arcade. Apart from the Government and the council, the only party interested in the portion of Page Street to be closed is the Angliss company, the land of which will be acquired by the council prior to the closure of the north-south portion of the street. Indeed, although this does to some extent cut across the provisions of the Roads Opening and Closing Act, the developer will be able to take possession of the site as soon as possible. Increases and costs will be kept to a minimum.

All of the safeguards that are normally built into the Act, including the question of safeguarding the rights of people who have properties, will be honoured before the closure of that street under this provision of the Bill. The Leader has cast some doubts, although only faint, about the validity of the agreement and has asked whether one party or another was particularly concerned. They were not particularly; it is all a matter of detail and there is no area of marked disagreement. Nevertheless, the details are not finalised and that is why we do not intend to proclaim the Bill until it is finally done.

Is it an ambitious project? Yes, it most certainly is and it is a most valuable project to South Australia and Adelaide. Is it difficult to bring into being? Yes, it has been most difficult. With regard to the question of financial viability, as the member for Salisbury said quite rightly, the Commonwealth Superannuation Fund certainly believes that it is. Hilton Hotels certainly believes that it is and I have every confidence in the ability of those people to judge whether a proposition is a viable one or not. I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition doubts that for a minute, and I suspect that he does not really. With regard to the question of a casino, the Leader asked me to make a public statement as to where I stand.

Mr. Bannon: Just to this House.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, you said "publicly". I have gone on record in this House in saying what I have said on a number of occasions, namely, that I do not detect a community desire to have a casino at this stage, and I see no reason to have one. I repeat that I believe the member for Salisbury was right on the ball when he implied that a casino was not a fundamental need in the promotion of tourism in a hotel of this kind. The fact is that this development has been hanging in limbo for nearly eight years. In the face of the most strenuous efforts by previous Governments to promote the project, it has remained in that condition simply because of uncertainty in the future of this State. With the election of a Government committed totally, as we are, to the development of the State the project has moved further towards finality than it has ever progressed before. That is why the matter has now come before this House, because the economic climate in South Australia is such that this hotel project is now possible. I give full credit to the previous Government for the project and the concept. I believe that it is a most imaginative one and a most necessary one.

I can give no credit to the former Governments for refusing to create the business and economic climate in which it could come to fruition. This Government will certainly take credit for creating the type of climate in which this project can and must be considered a viable proposition. There is a regeneration of confidence in South Australia and that has brought this and many other projects far closer to reality.

Bill read a second time.

The SPEAKER: Before the measure goes to the Committee stage, my attention has been drawn to the fact that this Bill might be considered hybrid in nature, particularly in regard to clauses 5 and 7. Joint Standing Orders (Private Bills) Order No. 2 states, in part:

> 2. The following shall not be Private Bills, but every such Bill shall be referred, after the second reading, to a Select Committee of the House in which it originates:
>
> A. Bills introduced by the Government whose primary and chief object is to promote the interests of one or more municipal corporations or local bodies, and not those of municipal corporations or local bodies generally.

After due consideration, I do not believe the Bill is hybrid, because it does not have as its chief and primary object the promotion of the interests of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide. I therefore rule that the Victoria Square (International Hotel) Bill is not a hybrid Bill.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

Mr. BANNON: Can the Premier be a little more specific as to the date on which he believes the Act will be proclaimed in force, if passed?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I cannot be absolutely precise. My information is that it should be finalised within the first two weeks after Easter. However, that is not binding and that is the information that has come to me so far. I understand that progress has been quite rapid in the past few days.

Mr. BANNON: Can the Premier comment on the suggestion that 1 August is an important date in relation to either giving effect to this project or heads of agreement? That date has been mentioned in connection with the Angliss building acquisition.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I cannot give the Leader an exact answer. I have some notes here on the question of acquisition and road closure. If the provisions of this Act are not applied to the closure of this road, it could be another three months before the Council could take action and it may be another nine months after that time before the council could have access to that land. Of course, that would be quite disastrous from the point of view of the developers meeting their schedule, so the costs would go up enormously.

Mr. BANNON: The Premier has indicated that the proclamation date depends upon the new heads of agreement being signed. Of course, the Government is a party to that and must approve that agreement. He mentioned that certain of the parties have differences on the matters of details. During the course of those remarks he said that there had been other matters raised in the heads of agreement to date which the Government did not find acceptable. Could the Premier outline those, as I think they are of concern to the Parliament?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: They were very minor matters and related to the question of concessions and how long they should run. For instance, there was a suggestion that not only would water rates be involved, but also sewerage rates. Those matters have now been satisfactorily resolved as far as we are concerned, but there is still the matter of the site and the size of the site to be settled. As I say, I understand that that is almost complete.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Exemption from certain Acts of Parliament."

Mr. BANNON: I am interested in the cost of those various concessions. The Premier mentioned that there they will be negotiated. That is understandable. Of course, exemption is provided for sewerage rates and I also take his point that what we are talking about is revenue foregone rather than actual income, which has been paid out at the moment and in time one hopes that these appropriate rates and taxes will be paid by the project if it is successful. I think it would be useful to have details of each of the categories and what it is anticipated will be the cost of them.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will obtain a detailed rundown on them, but the costing has been one of around $5 000 000, which includes all of the concessions and all of the matters that have been raised.

It does not cover the $5 000 000, which will be put in as bridging finance to cover the construction phases and which will come back to the Government. It is to be spread over a period of at least 10 years (probably 12 years) and, from that point of view, it is not a great burden on the Treasury, particularly, as the Leader himself points out, when it is not money coming in and which we would not expect to get, anyway. If the project were not to go ahead, the cost of holding that vacant block of land is almost as great.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Treasurer may grant $500 000 from general revenue."

Mr. BANNON: In relation to the sum, I point out to the Premier that, in his second reading explanation, he referred to a sum not exceeding $500 000, whereas the Act states that the Treasurer may grant the sum of $500 000 up to the cost of acquiring.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: My understanding is that it is an exact sum. The cost of acquiring at a fair rate is likely to be over $1 000 000 and, for that reason, the Government thought it appropriate that half of the cost, $500 000, would be applied. There was some discussion about the proportions of whether the Government should bear the cost of 50 per cent of the acquisition, but that was one of the matters which was negotiated.

Mr. BANNON: It is a flat sum, so it is not subject to escalation. At what stage will payment be made—at the time of the Act being proclaimed or at the time of the acquisition?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I anticipate that the payment will be made to the council at the time settlement occurs with the council and the owners of the land to be acquired.

Clause passed.

Clause 8, schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, lines 9 and 10 (clause 2)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 2. Pages 1, 2 and 3 (clause 3)—Leave out all words after 'repealed" in line 11 on Page 1.

No. 3. Page 3—After clause 3 insert new clause 4 as follows:

4. *Enactment of Part IVA of principal Act*—The following Part is enacted and inserted in the principal Act after section 39 thereof:

PART IVA
SHOPPING DEVELOPMENT

39a. *Interpretation*—In this Part—

"the advisory committee" means the advisory committee constituted under section 39c:

"non-shopping zone" means a zone other than a shopping zone:

"planning authority" means the authority or a council:

"the relevant planning authority" means—

(a) in relation to the Port Adelaide Centre Zone and the Noarlunga Centre Zone—the Authority; and

(b) in relation to any other zone—the council for the area in which the zone has been created:

"shop" means—

(a) premises used or intended for use for the retail sale of goods;
(b) premises used or intended for use for the sale of food prepared for consumption (whether the food is to be consumed on the premises or not),

but does not include—

(c) a bank;
(d) a hotel;
(e) premises for the sale or repair of motor vehicles, caravans or boats;
(f) premises for the sale of motor spirit;
(g) a timber yard or plant nursery;
(h) premises for the sale of plant or equipment for use in primary or secondary industry:

"shopping development" means—

(a) the construction of a shop or group of shops;
(b) the extension of a shop or group of shops; or
(c) a change in use of land by virtue of which the land may be used as a shop or group of shops:

"shopping zone" means a zone being—

(a) a District Business Zone;
(b) a District Shopping Zone;
(c) a Local Shopping Zone;
(d) a Regional Centre Zone;
(e) a District Centre Zone;
(f) a Neighbourhood Centre Zone;
(g) a Local Centre Zone;
(h) the Port Adelaide Centre Zone;
(i) the Noarlunga Centre Zone;
(j) a shopping zone as defined in the Metropolitan Development Plan—District Council of Stirling planning regulations;
or
(k) a zone prescribed by regulation under Part IX of this Act:

"zone" means a zone established by planning regulations.

39b. *Stay of shopping development for a certain period.*—(1) Subject to subsection (2) of this section—

(a) a person shall not proceed with a shopping development in a shopping zone before the 31st day of August 1980;
and
(b) a person shall not proceed with a shopping development outside a shopping zone before the 31st day of December 1980.

Penalty: One hundred thousand dollars.

(2) This section does not prevent a person from proceeding with a shopping development where every authorization, approval or consent required in respect of that development under—

(a) this Act;
and
(b) the Building Act, 1970-1976;

had been obtained before the 26th day of February, 1980.

(3) Before the thirty-first day of December 1980—

(a) no alteration shall be made to any planning regulation by virtue of which a non-shopping zone or part of a non-shopping zone becomes a shopping zone or part of a shopping zone;
(b) no recommendation shall be made to the Minister for the making of a planning regulation by virtue of which a non-shopping zone or part of a non-shopping zone would become a shopping zone or part of a shopping zone; and
(c) public notice of a proposal to make such a recommendation shall not be given.

(4) The Governor may, by regulation—

(a) exempt a specified shopping development, or proposed shopping development, from the provisions of this section; and
(b) exempt any specified part of the State from the provisions of this section.

(5) Before a regulation is made under subsection (4) of this section, the Minister shall obtain the advice of the advisory committee on the question of whether the regulation should be made, and, if so, the terms of the regulation and the Minister shall transmit the advice so obtained for the consideration of the Governor.

39c. *Special consents required in respect of shopping developments*—(1) A person who proposes to carry out a shopping development (either within or outside a shopping zone) shall not proceed with that shopping development without the consent of the Authority and the Minister.

Penalty: One hundred thousand dollars.

(2) When considering an application for consent under subsection (1) of this section, the authority and the Minister shall have regard to—

(a) the provisions of any authorised development plan;
(b) the question of whether the implementation of the proposal is justified in view of actual and prospective community needs;
(c) the health, safety and convenience of the community;
(d) the economic feasibility of the proposal and its effects upon employment;
(e) the effects that implementation of the proposal would have upon the profitability of other shops in the relevant area;
(f) the effects that implementation of the proposal would have upon surrounding areas; and
(g) the effects that implementation of the proposal would have on the amenity and general character of the locality affected by the proposal and upon the environment generally.

(3) Where an application is made for consent of the authority and the Minister under subsection (1) of this section, the application shall be referred for advice to an advisory committee consisting of—

(a) a public accountant;
(b) a person qualified in, and with experience of, town planning;
(c) a person with extensive experience in retailing;
(d) a person with extensive knowledge of and experience in environmental protection; and
(e) a person with qualifications in a discipline related to local government and with extensive experience of local government.

(4) The authority shall cause public notice to be given of an application of its consent under this section, and a member of the public may, within 42 days of the date of that notice, lodge in duplicate with the authority a written objection to the application.

(5) The provisions of section 36a of this Act shall apply in relation to objections made under subsection (4) of this section.

(6) No consent is required under this section in respect of a shopping development where every authorisation approval or consent required in respect of that development under—

(a) this Act; or
(b) the Building Act, 1970-1976;

had been obtained before the 26th day of February 1980.

Consideration in Committee.

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable Minister can discuss the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 2 and 3 together.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3:

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 2 and 3 be disagreed to.

The amendments comprise two parts, the first of which is section 36c, which provides for a moratorium on shopping development within shopping zones from 26 February to 31 August 1980. It also provides for a moratorium on all shopping development outside shopping zones from 26 February to 31 December 1980. Sections 39b (1) and (2) are the moratorium provisions, spelling out that, within shopping zones, the moratorium should come into effect between 26 February and 31 August 1980, while outside shopping zones, from 26 February to 31 December.

It is impossible for the Government to accept that part of the amendment. The proposed moratorium will apply throughout the State and will prevent any extension of existing shops and the construction of even small local retail facilities. This section of the Bill would be retrospective in its application, in the same way as would the Opposition's earlier proposals, that is, it would stop development that had not been obtained for any building and it would block approvals before 26 February.

As I have said before, this is likely to include some developments which have had approval in principle, or indeed, final planning approval from councils. Developers may have purchased land or made other financial commitments on the basis of council planning approvals that would be made void by this legislation. As regards section 39d(3), as I have mentioned earlier, this is another area that the Government cannot accept. Proposed section 39d(3) would prevent councils from making any changes to the zoning regulations to create or expand shopping zones before 31 December. The Government believes this provision to be an unnecessary and unreasonable restriction on council ability to review planning policies for its local areas.

We, as a Government, support local government and its decision-making power, and we believe that this provision would remove the rights of council. Section 39h(4) and (5) contains the provisions for exemption by regulation. The Government believes that these provisions are far too cumbersome. The Opposition's amendments proposed to allow for exemptions from the moratorium and that a limit on rezoning be required. We believe that this is inconsistent with the normal provisions for zoning regulations for exemptions from planning policies to be granted by the Governor in Council. We believe that it is a cumbersome way of dealing with desirable developments.

Are we to have regulations made for every group of local shops which should be exempted from the proposed moratorium? Clause 39(c)(5) removes from councils the power to assess shop development applications. It is interesting to reflect on a letter I received today that I believe was received also by members opposite and the Hon. Mr. Milne in another place from the Secretary General of the Local Government Association (Mr. Hullick), as follows:

After consultations with the metropolitan councils the Local Government Association has adopted the following position statements on retail development controls:

1. The original request for a moratorium was aimed at achieving a short period for consideration of the discussion paper. The Local Government Association action in the press and subsequent letter to the Government sent on 5th March 1980 was endorsed because the Government Bill achieved this.
2. The actions by the Local Government Association to achieve greater planning control for councils was endorsed.
3. The Local Government Association should press for a greater entrepreneurial role in shopping and community centres development by local government in partnership with the private sector and the State Government.
4. The Local Government Association should continue to press for a clear definition of the responsibilities for planning at the State and local levels.
5. The Local Government Association supports the Government's latest action and does not see the need for a punitive total moratorium.

On the basis of these position statements I can say that local government in this State would commend you and your Government for the legislation you are attempting to introduce to control retail developments. It demonstrates that your policies regarding the development of greater local council responsibility for planning and other activities are being adhered to.

The latest amendments by the Opposition which I have just recently seen in their final form are unacceptable to local government on two counts—

1. Section 36d as proposed removes planning control from councils and transfers this power to a State Authority which I do not believe has or will have any greater capacity than councils to make decisions based on the criteria set out.
2. The amendment contains provision for a total moratorium which the Local Government Association believes is unnecessarily punitive.

A total moratorium across the State even with exemptions granted by the Minister is unnecessarily bureaucratic and removes political decision-making from local people to a central body which must operate under very poorly-defined criteria.

The final paragraph of that letter is quite interesting, too, as Mr. Hullick states:

I would appreciate it if you could inform members of your party that the Local Government Association was not consulted by SARATAG on the text of a letter sent to all Parliamentarians on the 28th March 1980 and could not support the statement calling for a stay of all shopping developments.

Clause 39 *(c)* (1) removes from local Government all powers to consider shopping proposals. It would mean that, throughout the State, shopping development applications would have to be submitted to the State Government rather than to councils. There is no minimum size limit on the applications effected by the Bill, so even an application for a corner shop in any country town would be decided by the State Government. The Bill does not make provision for councils to consider applications and put recommendations about them to the State Governme-nt.

These amendments represent a larger onus on councils' traditional responsibilities for local planning. There is no provision for exempting areas or classes of shopping applications from the operation of this section, or for delegating State Government decision making responsibilities to councils in appropriate circumstances. That amendment also introduces viability assessments. This cannot be accepted by the Government. It also introduces specific provisions for planning authorities to assess the viability of proposed shopping developments.

I have suggested to the House previously that this is a major departure from the traditional role of the planning system in this State. If the Government is to make a decision to become involved in such assessments this

should be after considerable review of all the implications involved and not as a result of a hasty and ill-drafted Opposition amendment which the Government has only one day to consider. Such assessments would involve an unreasonable restriction on the commercial judgment of the private sector. It would require a substantial increase in the department staff, and a major transfer of planning responsibility from local to State Government.

As I have said before, we in Government support the responsibilities of local Government. It is not our intention to take any responsibilities away from local authorities. Apart from that, we believe most councils could not hope to have access to the type of expertise necessary for carrying out such assessments. Implementing a system of viability assessments would necessitate Government seeking a lot of detail and confidential information from existing retailers, and would involve the Government in making arbitrary judgments about what is a reasonable level of profitability for retailers.

Without seeking such information and making such judgments there is no way in which the Government could determine whether a development proposal would have an unreasonable effect on the profitability of other shops in the relevant area. Clause 39(*c*)(6) refers to restrospective application of this particular section. The Government opposes this amendment on the basis that it is unwilling to accept any retrospective changing of the rules. There is a big difference between the Government's proposal, which would apply to applications made after the proposals were announced, and the Opposition's proposals, which would change the rules for applications which may have already received the planning approval from councils.

The Opposition's amendments also introduce a requirement for third party appeals on all shopping developments within shopping zones. The Department of Urban and Regional Affairs discussion paper recommends against introducing third party appeals within zones which have been specifically planned and designated for shopping developments. To do so, we believe, would introduce further unreasonable delays and uncertainties into the development control system.

The Government believes that it should be making planning policies and standards more explicit so as to provide greater certainty for both developers and residents. It also provides for joint decision making by the State Planning Authority and myself as Minister. It is not clear why the Opposition has proposed such joint decision making. The amendments do not make it clear what would happen if I, as Minister, and the authority, for example, disagree on a particular application. It has been a major concern of planning legislation to avoid the confusion which can result from dual approval arrangements.

The problems with the amendments proposed by the Opposition are so great that the Government believes that they should be rejected *in toto*. The Government's proposals as amended in the other place provided a reasonable holding measure to enable full debate and rational decision-making on the policy proposal set out in the DURA discussion paper. We believe that the Government should not be stampeded into making hasty and ill-considered amendments to the Planning and Development Act. If planning authorities are to be involved in viability assessments, this should be done as a result of a proper study and through the normal procedure set out in the Act, that is, the preparation and public exhibition of supplementary development plans which clearly set out and allow public comment on the criteria under which development applications will be assessed. We believe it is extremely dangerous to start including development control principles in the Act, especially without adequate time for public consideration and comment on them. I believe that the Government has bent over backwards to consult with as many people as it possible can on the matter of retail development control. I have received numerous deputations, both from those in favour of the Government legislation and from those opposing it. I have tried to listen to all sides of the argument. In fact, the meeting that was held last night provided an ideal opportunity for us to hear all aspects of the argument.

I believe that we have, in the amendments moved in the other place, shown that we were prepared to compromise, but that compromise has been rejected by the Opposition in another place. I regret that that has happened because, as I say, it was an attempt to compromise on the part of the Government, and I believe that it should have been accepted by the Opposition if it was genuine regarding retail development in this State. Therefore, it is impossible for the Government to support the amendments that have come down from another place, and I would urge members to reject amendments Nos. 2 and 3.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I support amendments Nos. 2 and 3. I think any member could be almost excused for wondering whether the Minister has been living in a vacuum for the last couple of weeks or so, because the points that he made really only took into account two organisations, namely, the Government and the Local Government Association.

The Minister did not specify any of the people to whom he listened on this matter. One would be pardoned, having listened to the Minister's remarks, for thinking that there is really nothing wrong in this area of shopping development and that all we need to do is to adhere to the original Bill, which has the effect of opposing these amendments, in order to solve the whole problem. If that is the case, I can only ask the Minister what is the reason behind an advertisement such as the one appearing today in the *Advertiser* which emanates from a very large group of organisations in the community. The advertisement itself is headed, "An appeal to Parliament from Saratag", and lists a number of organisations, including the South Australian Residents and Traders Action Group, the Federation of Chambers of Commerce of South Australia Incorporated, the South Australian Mixed Business Association, the United Trades and Labour Council, the Bread Carters Industrial Federation of Australia, the Consumers Association of South Australia, the South Road Association, and a number of other organised groups (either residents or action groups) from both suburban and country-type areas throughout the State.

One organisation whose name appears listed in that advertisement has, I understand, subsequently disclaimed any association with it, namely, Collier, Duncan and Cook Proprietary Limited. However, quite a large number of groups of people, including traders associations, small business groups, unions, and residents and consumers, are vitally affected by planning and development legislation generally, and their views give the lie (and I do not use that word in an unparliamentary sense) to the Minister's contention that all is well, if these amendments are opposed, in the retail shopping developers' area of South Australia. Nothing could be further from the truth. The reason for these amendments is that there is a large body of opinion in the community that the present situation is no good. All the Minister's amendments in another place did was provide for subsequent use in other zones. The Minister knows that that is not the problem. The problem is the proliferation of shopping development, whether in unzoned areas or zoned areas. The Minister suggested that these amendments we are now considering are designed to

disadvantage the Government on this matter. I remind the Minister of what happened in another place.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: How did I say it was going to disadvantage the Government?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Well, the suggestion was that the Minister had not had very much time to consider them, and so on, because 24 hours was the total awareness time that applied in this—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Well, it was not 24 hours, was it?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: What happened in the other place was that amendments appeared out of the blue at almost the third reading stage. The Government amendments were designed to try to defuse this very issue that I am raising now. This is not a matter for the Opposition and the Government to be in an argument about: it concerns the whole community in South Australia, as I have just demonstrated, whether it involves consumers, developers or shopkeepers. This is one matter where it behoves every member in this place and in the other place to listen to public opinion on the matter, not just to our own views on what is nice and tidy or what planners feel should be in the legislation. There is a definite feeling of unrest and upset in the community about this subject, and these amendments now being considered from another place are just as much the result of consultation and the ascertaining of opinion in the community as the Minister is claiming for his original amendment.

The Opposition has not spent its time saying "Shall we sit down and work out an amendment that seems to suit the case?" These amendments are the direct result of another meeting, which the Minister might do well to consider. A considerable number of people who attended the meeting put forward their viewpoint that it is no longer possible to continue wearing a blindfold. There are problems. The amendments now before us have come from that sort of consultation. The Minister objected to the requirements contained in the amendments, whereby approval shall be considered in a certain way. I cannot understand why the Minister objected to this provision. When considering an application for consent under subsection (1) of this section, the authority and the Minister shall have regard to the provisions of any authorised development plan. Surely there is nothing wrong with that. Why does the Minister object to that?

Other subclauses refer to the question of whether the implementation of the proposal is justified in view of actual and prospective community needs. Why should that not be a consideration? That is what is wrong with the present scene. It is not sufficiently up to date or flexible, and it is not sensible enough in the true meaning of the word "sensible". It is no longer sensitive to the community requirements.

The Minister had the gall to say that the Government did not want to interfere in the commercial judgment of retail shopping development, as if commercial judgment was always the only correct solution to such a matter! I remind the Minister that commercial judgment prevailed in the provision of petrol reseller sites in this State for quite a long time, and, if ever a mistake was made and a wrong operation carried on in regard to the community in South Australia, it was the way in which oil companies willy-nilly implemented commercial judgment in erecting a petrol reselling organisation on every corner that one could think of until the stage was reached where viability was the last consideration because of the other factors that entered into considerations.

The Minister should understand that the amendments before us are perfectly reasonable in their requirements. When an application comes forward, why should not the economic feasibility of the proposal and its effects upon employment be a consideration in this matter? That is not unwarranted Government interference, as seems to have been suggested. The Minister will still have the final say. That factor was glossed over very carefully by the Minister in his attempt to suggest that there was a duality in this situation: a divided form of approval would be required. The Minister knew that it would not work like that.

If the proposals go further than is needed, as the Minister claims, where was the approach from the Government to suggest improvement? Why was a holus bolus rejection argument advanced to reject the whole scene? It would be perfectly practicable and possible for the Minister to have made his objections upon some of these points by saying, "I have looked at those amendments and, in relation to the amendments put by the Government in another place, this is an area in which I can perhaps see my way clear to provide this as an ameloriation." No attempt was made by the Minister; he rejected the proposal completely out of hand. This does not suggest a genuine approach to the matter. It may be that the Minister, having been away quite unavoidably (and there is no quarrel about that), is not entirely up to date with the scene and with what happened while he was away.

There have been a number of meetings; letters have appeared in the press, as well as being sent to every Opposition member from groups and organisations that have never before, in my 10 years in this House, approached Labor members. That fact should be a signal to the Government.

I cannot understand the approach which indicates that, if local government and the Government have a view on the matter, everyone else is wrong. Other people may be partly wrong or partly right. I cannot understand why the Government does not try to sort out where the wrong ends and the right begins. By way of some form of compromise, the Minister should attempt to sort out the many points contained in the amendments. What objection could the Minister have to the amendment that proposes that, where application is made for the consent of the authority and the Minister under subsection (1), the application shall be referred to an advisory committee not for decision or interference but for advice?

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: We have been taking a lot of advice from the consultative committee that you set up.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The part of the Act that we are considering is that which the Minister admitted, from the time the Bill first came before us, was under review and needed alteration. The position paper referred to earlier has been circulated to the public, which has been asked for advice and an opinion. Yet, when the Opposition dares to move amendments in another place that call for this process to occur on a more official basis, they are dismissed out of hand as being unnecessarily bureaucratic.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Particularly when they are contrary to what the Retail Consultative Committee suggests in any case.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: We did hear that. I mention rulings made earlier, when I canvassed this matter with the Minister and asked him to give to the House the information from the Retail Consultative Committee, of which there was a real dearth. I even reread *Hansard* in case I had missed something that was said to have emanated directly from the Retail Consultative Committee by way of advice, letter or whatever. No quotations were put forward in the House other than the vague illusion that he had had some consultation with the committee.

In fact, there was an earlier statement that the Local Government Association had supported something that necesitated some very fancy footwork and the hand delivery of a letter next day on this very matter. When I spoke to the Secretary of the Local Government Association immediately after that information was given in the House and asked him whether it was normal practice for the Local Government Association to deliver letters to the Minister by hand, the answer I was given was "No".

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: It was different when you thought that they were supporting you.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I left the matter there because, after all, the Local Government Association, in the final analysis, is entitled to adopt any tactic, attitude or opinion on this matter that it desires. I remind the Minister that I took the trouble to check that aspect.

Mr. Hemmings: They're at pains now, though.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It seems fairly coincidental that the Minister was tonight able to quote another letter from the Local Government Association. I suggest that an ancient proverb addresses caution in these matters because it suggests that one should be careful about which tiger one gets on because some time later one might find it hard to get off. The situation is simple. There are problems regarding retail shopping development in both zoned and non-zoned areas. Everyone in South Australia, except the Minister for some unknown reason, admits that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the honourable member that, in accordance with Standing Order 422, he is restricted to 15 minutes on each occasion that he speaks. If no other member wishes to address himself to the matter before the Committee, I will allow the honourable member to continue into a second 15-minute period if he so wishes.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It has always been customary that a member, when speaking on any matter in this House, normally receives the assistance of electronic aids that have been around for quite a long time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! For the honourable member's benefit, that is not the practice in Committee. I have given him a little latitude in this matter and, although I do not wish to be unduly restrictive, the relevant Standing Order states:

> In Committee (except when an Appropriation Bill, a Public Purposes Loan Bill or a Supply Bill is being considered) no member, other than a member in charge of a Bill or motion, shall speak more than three times on any one question nor for more than 15 minutes on any one occasion, and debate shall be confined to the motion, clause or amendment before the Committee.

I will allow the honourable member to continue for a second 15-minute period.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I do not wish to preclude any other member from speaking, but I would like to be clear in my own mind, before I resume my seat, whether I will have another opportunity to speak on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can rise for two or more occasions for 15 minutes each. If the honourable member desires, he may continue and I will take that as his second 15 minutes. I am prepared to rule that the honourable member has spoken for 15 minutes. I have shown some latitude, and, if he wishes to continue, he will take the next 15 minutes from now.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: On a point of order, if you permit the member for Mitchell to proceed for a second 15 minutes in sequence, does that prohibit another member from addressing the debate?

The CHAIRMAN: It does not.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I have never looked a bonus in the mouth nor turned away from it. I accept the bonus that you have offered in taking my first lot of my remarks as a 15-minute exercise. However, I shall now resume my seat.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I regret that the member for Mitchell will have to continue his remarks later, because I am very interested in comments he was making about the amendments which have been passed by the Upper House and which are very edifying. I believe that all members appreciate the extent of the detail that the honourable member was giving in outlining how important are the amendments that have been passed by the Legislative Council.

I am very concerned about the effect of the legislation on shopping centre development, particularly in my own electorate of Salisbury. I was very pleased when I read that the amendments were moved and passed in the Legislative Council. It has a very direct bearing on the situation which has taken place within my own electorate and which was of great concern not only to me but also to many residents in the area, and indeed to many small businesses and medium-sized businesses as well.

Regarding the shopping centre development that is proposed for Salisbury, it is somewhat outside the actual designated district zone that the previous shopping centre studies in that city proposed and the effect that that would have on the overall shopping programme scheme for the entire electorate of Salisbury. If the Legislative Council amendments are permitted to pass, it will give a very important breathing space for the community and particularly the business people in my own electorate to consider the very important implications of any future shopping centre development at any point.

It has been stated that the supplementary development plans that exist in various areas of the city outline the very important features of the way in which development can take place, and the Minister is implying that these protect and cover the sort of dangers that might exist in the shopping centre development in the time ahead.

I personally query that. Indeed, I have had Questions on Notice that have since been answered by the Minister in this regard, but I do not believe they satisfactorily provide that sort of assurance. I received today a letter from a property consultant and operator within the city of Salisbury and I was interested to see that they agree with my contention in this matter. The letter is from Collier, Duncan and Cook, operators of the Parabanks Shopping Centre. That firm has had a great deal of experience with shopping centre development within the city of Salisbury for some years. It has gone into the process of expanding its development, and over a time I have critically looked at the way in which its development has been planned and expanded. I have analysed critically whether that fits into the entire shopping needs of Salisbury, and on occasions I have felt that perhaps its expansion has been a little too great at certain points of time. In that light, I continue to feel that the proposed shopping centre development to which the Myer name is attached is yet again far too extensive and excessive for the needs of that community. The letter states:

> The Minister in Parliament on 25 March stated that the Myer Shopping Centre proposal complied with the Salisbury Centres Supplementary Development Plan intent. This is blatantly incorrect as the supplementary plan indicates future retail expansion in the John Street area as shown on the attached copy of the plan. The area shown "D" is designated as the retail area on the plan whereas the area cross-hatched is the land on which Myers are hoping to erect a centre.

For the edification of members present, I indicate that the crossed hatched area and the designated area on the plan

are indeed two independent areas, albeit adjacent. The letter continues:

> Therefore, it would appear as though the Minister is receiving very poor advice about the interpretation of the plan or, alternatively, the plan was vaguely worded to allow manipulation of zoning boundaries without local residents or traders being aware of the council's or Government's intent.

That is a very serious opinion, which indicates that the Minister is not aware of the real implication of the Salisbury Centres Development Plan, and it puts in danger a lot of the very good work that has been done within the City of Salisbury, works that the council took a very active part in initiating over the previous few years.

I remind the Committee just how important that work was. If that work is not supported by the amendments here proposed, it is in danger of disappearing and will result not in good planning for the City of Salisbury with regard to shopping centre development but very poor planning that cannot possibly benefit the residents in the proper way that they deserve to be treated or cannot properly protect the many businesses in that area.

The series of plans that the council proposed some time ago as a result of studies with the consultants who are expert in their field proposed that the City of Salisbury has three district shopping centres, one of which will be centred around the John Street area, which would involve and include the Parabanks development, and indeed would even provide for an extension of that development. I suppose the query has been that the Parabanks extensions have extended somewhat larger than the district proposal at the time. Nevertheless, it is within the order of magnitude originally suggested.

The other district centre was the one designated at Ingle Farm, around the K-Mart centre, and that, too, provided for expansion of that facility. That expansion has taken place, and now the total square footage of retail space available is within the order of magnitude proposed in the original council plan.

The interesting one is the third one proposed which, I believe, is seriously endangered by my proposal in Salisbury and, therefore, which is allowed to be wiped out, thus making an entire mockery of the original proposition. This is known in the local district as site No. 4 shopping centre, and I am sure that the Minister would be aware of this, because I have asked questions about it. It was proposed to be built on the corner of Martin and Kings Roads and was to have been a district centre of an equivalent size to the expanded Ingle Farm facility. That area was chosen, because the Salisbury City Council and others who have concern for providing decent services for their residents believed that the expanding population in the west, south and in the north-west of the city of Salisbury deserved some appropriate shopping facility of an order above a mere neighbourhood centre: not only did they deserve it but they could also sustain it. It was considered that the buying capacity of the many thousands of houses in the area, or expected to be established in the years ahead, would support such a centre, and that that centre would consist of a discount department store and a wide range of specialty shops somewhat smaller than the present proposed Myer facility in the Wiltshire Street area. In attempting to provide for the needs of the local residents, the local council believed that it would be a suitable site on which to integrate non-retail facilities of a community nature—a general community centre to provide for the legitimate social and community needs of the many thousands in the area who did not have adequate facilities of that type.

The real danger has been expressed to me by local residents that, if the site No. 4 shopping centre proposal is skittled by the Myer development (and it clearly will be), it puts in grave danger the prospect of there ever being the community-type facilities for which they have waited so long. The have worked hard to get them, and they have constantly been told, "It's O.K., when the shopping centre is developed, that's where it will take place." Everyone had agreed on that point, but along came another developer who decided instead that he had certain interests of his own that need not take into account the interests of the local community, and who proposed to build the shopping centre in the Wiltshire Street area in contradiction of all the planning principles devolved over the years. There appears to be, from the evidence around, without the acceptance of amendments like this, little that can be done to stop that development from proceeding. It would be a grave shame if all that community work and interest should be of so little consequence as to be wiped out so quickly.

More specifically, the community concern within that part of the Salisbury centre itself is also in danger of being totally wiped out and ignored. I have had people from the Salisbury centre come to me on another question, namely, the heritage of the old Salisbury township, who are worried that a development of this nature would totally wipe out what is left of the concept of the old Salisbury township. Many members will know of the concept of a township nature of the Salisbury centre. Salisbury is an old town, one of the first settled in South Australia, in about 1840, and it maintains that character to this day. Those who have been along John Street or who have walked through the local streets of the area will acknowledge that it seems to be an area independent unto itself within the suburban development all around it, because of the way in which it has grown over the years, because of the maintenance of a part of John Street that in many ways resembles a country town main street, because of the existence of old buildings in the locale, and because of the existence of citizens of Salisbury who have lived in that area many years and who know each other well. That atmosphere has closely built up.

The development proposed would seriously damage that spirit of a country township nature, and the people there are legitimately concerned about that and have approached me, likewise, in that regard. The amendments would give the community the opportunity to consider just exactly how they rate their priorities in these regards, first, within the shopping provision nature and, secondly, within the aspect of the heritage and environmental atmosphere of the township of Salisbury. They would have until later this year to clarify these issues; otherwise, they will not be given that breathing space, but will be left with a proposal dumped in their lap, without giving them the reasonable time for consideration that it deserves. It also seriously endangers many small businesses that presently exist. Site No. 4 businesses do not exist yet; the site is open space but businesses within the City of Salisbury will seriously be endangered. I have not met anyone who favours the Myer proposal who disputes that point. I have talked with certain officers of the local council on this matter, and they acknowledge that, if the proposal goes ahead, there will be devastating consequences for many of the small businesses that operate in what is known as the old section of John Street.

Many businesses of long standing would be seriously jeopardised and their future, if they had any future at all, seriously affected. There was a time when many Salisbury citizens considered a concept of having a central mall in the area designed especially around the old part of John Street, but that concept was not proceeded with. Anyone

who has any idea of shopping centres realises that a mall must run between two traffic generators.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Take us for a run around the slaughterhouse again, with a dirty rag and a bucket of water! You washed the carcasses down 10 times the other morning.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is not for the honourable Deputy Premier to attempt to encourage interjections. I point out to the honourable member for Salisbury that his time has expired. I have been lenient with him.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I accept your point on that, Sir, and apologise to the Minister that I will not be able to do the dirty rag story for the eleventh time.

Mr. SCHMIDT: I oppose the amendments, particularly those to sections 39b and 39c. I am somewhat perplexed at the amendments, because they are contrary to Labor Party policy and, therefore, they smack very much of a rather contrived and malicious attempt to frustrate Government legislation. In the last election, the Labor Party, in putting up its policy platform on local government, said:

> Local government has a vital role to perform in bringing the functions of Government to the people at the local level.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That was before the election.

Mr. SCHMIDT: Yes, the Labor Party has changed its mind since. Here, it is putting Party policy aside in order to use its own schemes to frustrate Government legislation. On the other hand, it is indirectly supporting part of its Party policy, in that, further on in its policy, it states:

> Appropriate powers will be vested in the Minister to enable him in cases of maladministration and/or malpractice to dismiss a council.

I hate to think of the ramifications involved, but that is getting away from the topic here. Here, obviously, is a case where the Opposition is trying to take power away from local government and put it back into its own hands. That is the first example of where the Opposition is going contrary to its own Party policy. Secondly, the Opposition appears to be going against its own policy because it is going against development in South Australia as a whole. Thirdly, the Opposition is going contrary to Party policy, because it is not providing for the working man, who it purports to support or help, because, as was mentioned earlier, if a moratorium were evoked and development were to halt, the working man who is trying to find some form of employment will be most affected.

We have heard members opposite on other occasions make a hue and cry about the building industry not being what is required, yet here they are trying to curtail the building industry. Fourthly, they have given a rather gross example of over-legislation in this case again. The amendments have some good points contained in them, and I look particularly at new section 39c (3) where the Opposition puts forward some rather good ideas in respect of a committee of authority. Yet such a committee need not be set up through legislation; it could be set up through administration. But, again, the Labor Party has always been of such a nature that everything must be done through legislation. We can see the consequences of that in our over-bureaucratic State and in the hue and cry from people saying that they cannot move without being legislated at.

What the Opposition is also forgetting is what real effect a moratorium will have. They know that a moratorium will have no effect at all. It is like the proverbial ostrich with its head in the sand—they hope that, by burying their head in the sand and not getting dry rot they will keep their tails in the air and the problem will vanish, and that development will continue, particularly in the area of population growth. Once the population is there, support will be available for future development of shopping areas and they will be able to say "Look, our moratorium has had some effect."

Here, again, is a blatant example of the Opposition's contriving the situation for its own ends. Surely, in an area such as this, the market place must dictate the terms and, if the people are not going to support that sort of development, the developers themselves, if they are conscientious in their appraisal of their project, will make proper studies to determine whether or not there is a viable market for such a development. Therefore, to hide behind a screen like this is nothing more than an attempt to frustrate Government legislation.

I am surprised at the member for Salisbury, when he says this amendment will support the so-called little township of Salisbury. If the township atmosphere is to prevail, we all know that the deciding factor is that the township has a council that has control and knows what goes on in the area. The amendments are endeavouring to put that power back with the Minister and the State and to take power away from local government. For those reasons, I oppose the Council's amendments.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The member for Mawson has made a couple of interesting comments. One of the points he attempted to make was that a moratorium would not have any effect. I wonder why the honourable member was at such pains to oppose the moratorium if it was not going to have any effect, because it would then be of little importance to him, and one would think he would not have bothered to give it any credence in his remarks. In addition, the thing I noticed was that the honourable member was speaking very much like a member who is getting some local reaction to the course of action that the Government is following in this matter. It seemed to me he was anxious to get a few words on the record because in some vague way (and that is the only way his remarks could have been construed) this could be used to help him defend his position and that of the Government in this matter.

The Minister said that, in these amendments, we are proposing a total moratorium. Nothing is further from the truth, and I am sure that the Minister knows that. What we are saying is that, in respect of shopping centres (that is, areas already zoned), no development will proceed before 31 August 1980 that had not already received its final stage of approval on 26 February. I cannot see how that can be described as a total moratorium, which were the words the Minister used. What the amendment states, in effect, is that there will be a short-term moratorium, and the actual words provided to the Minister in the amendment refer to a stay of shopping development.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: What is the difference between a stay and a moratorium?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is more important to understand the difference between the two proposals.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: "Stay" is the "in" terminology.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: A stay in shopping development is simply that. There is a need for a breathing space, and a stay of shopping development is the correct term to be used, especially as it qualifies it even further by providing "for a certain period". Those words are provided in the side heading. I am surprised that the Minister failed to notice that.

There are provisions subsequent to that date under which shopping development approval may occur. The Minister may disagree with what has been put forward and have reasons for that, but up to now he has given few reasons for disagreeing with the proposals contained in the

amendments. If the argument were that certain necessary shopping developments must proceed, then that disposes of one provision, but the Minister was not clear on that point. There is provision for the Governor to make exemptions and to specify what would best be described as shopping proposals which have special merit.

That, of course, would account for such worries as may occur in relation to necessary development that needs to take place at Leigh Creek, for example, because the exemption can be defined both by way of the proposal itself and also by area. The amendments recognise that a problem exists. We say that you cannot stop development forever, but we also say that we cannot make out the problem does not exist, because it does. The amendments are reasonable proposals on how to deal with the matter. The way in which these matters have been considered before is no longer suitable, either for a given community or for the whole of society in this State, whether it be the poor, small businessman who has been forced out of his livelihood, or the local community that has been disadvantaged by some of the attendant disadvantages that come with a retail shopping development—and they do exist.

The Minister probably does not live near or within cooee of a reasonable size retail shopping development as already permitted in shopping zones, but I do and so do many people in this State. There are very many disadvantages as well as advantages. People are entitled to have greater consideration given to the possibility in relation to shopping developments in these times.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Do you shop in these large developments?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I do not do a great deal of shopping in these large developments, but one of the things I draw to the attention of the Minister is the absolute truth contained in this advertisement, which appeals to him as well as to me, to take note of what the advertisement sets out, and that is that the amendments foreshadowed by Dr. J. R. Cornwall be incorporated (and these are the amendments that we are looking at) into the Planning and Development Act for effectiveness and as a matter of urgent necessity. There are plenty of points there, and I will take two. One of them says that, despite the existing scene with retail shopping development, it is "providing no real cost benefits", and this has been clearly proven by an independent survey on the media showing that the prices and the quality available in some of the retail shopping developments, which the Minister proposes to allow to continue unchecked by opposing these amendments, is not in the interests of the consumer.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Are you suggesting the Minister of Planning should be responsible for the charges?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable Minister is now starting to interject and bluster. His turn comes after my 15 minutes has expired. I am quite happy to put the points up to the Minister and am willing to listen to his response. I would appreciate it if he would at least listen, because obviously, judging by the way in which he is acting in this matter, he has not taken any notice of the large body of opinion represented by this advertisement and by many others which we have already referred to during the progress of this matter earlier.

Another point made by this advertisement is "dehumanising the shopping experience". The Minister probably does not spend too much time in some of these retail shopping developments which are permitted, allowed, or whatever word one likes to use, if there is no change to the present scene. It is not a very edifying scene to see 50 and 60 people lined up, mostly women with young children trying to get out through the turnstile-type checkouts.

Those are the sorts of things that the Minister is prepared to allow to continue. He has argued it is perfectly all right, because there is nothing wrong with the retail development scene in zoned areas—it is already in the development plan, it is listed in a zone, and therefore it must be all right. If it was all right, we could not be getting this kind of response and action in the community. That is all that the amendments that we put forward try to show.

Mr. Schmidt interjecting:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The member for Mawson is perfectly correct. The carriage of these amendments by themselves will not cure that overnight, and at last he has said something sensible in the House. They are a step in the right direction and they are totally different from doing nothing about it. That is what is proposed by the Minister in opposing these amendments. That is the whole crux of the matter. One group, our Party, by way of these amendments which have come forward because of the approaches from the community, recognizes the difficulty that exists and is trying to do something about it.

The other group, the Government, is saying there is nothing wrong and it will oppose the amendments and will not do anything about the matter. That is not a responsible attitude to adopt. I accordingly ask the Minister to re-examine the amendment. If there are parts of them which are not sensible in his view or not suitable for the occasion, then let him speak up on the matter and the Opposition will be prepared to listen.

Dr. BILLARD: I think that the Opposition assumes too much when it assumes that all areas of Adelaide would be in favour of a moritorium. I represent a district that covers half of Tea Tree Gully, an area that in the past was represented in this House by two members of the Party now in Opposition. However, they have lost hold in that area and for good reason. I suggest that the approach that they are adopting in this issue is not likely to improve their position in Tea Tree Gully.

Tea Tree Gully is an area which is growing rapidly. It is an area in which, for example, in the year 1979, they had 30 per cent more building approvals than in the previous year. The council last year did a study of retail areas within Tea Tree Gully and produced what they call a Tea Tree Gully Centre Study. That study found that there was a substantial under-supply of retail space of certain kinds within Tea Tree Gully. They then proceeded from that study to do a Modbury Regional Centre Study and they are at the moment going through the process of trying to implement the policy changes which resulted from those studies. I think I may summarise their attitude and the obvious consequences of a moratorium by quoting from a letter which they have recently sent to the Minister of Planning, a copy of which was forwarded to me.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Did the council send it?

Dr. BILLARD: Yes, the council. I quote:

> As a final point it is necessary to express the concern of Council over impending legislation as a result of Section 36c lapsing last December.
>
> As you are aware Council has recently adopted policies in relation to the city's retail, commercial and industrial centres as a consequence of the Tea Tree Gully Centres Study, and the Modbury Regional Centre Study completed late last year.
>
> As the next step in the process, Council is currently preparing supplementary development plans designed to amend the existing regulations and implement the adopted policies.
>
> It is anticipated that a significant amount of pressure shall be received over the coming months from developers to

develop land bounded by Smart, Reservoir, and North East Roads (the Modbury Triangle), which Council intends to rezone for commercial/retail activity as an extension to the Modbury Regional Centre.

Should a moratorium exist on all shopping development outside of defined shopping zones, Council would be particularly concerned that exemption from zoning applications in this case could not be entertained.

Specifically, the clauses in the amendments of section 39b would preclude such changes being made until after the end of this year. For that reason, Tea Tree Gully would be seriously disadvantaged by the amendments proposed by the Opposition.

Mr. CRAFTER: I rise to support the amendments that have been sent to us from another place. I do so in the knowledge that in the district that I represent there is considerable support at the local government level and at the level of the community, in particular among small business people, for these proposals. The member for Newland has just pointed out that there is a great deal of variation throughout the community with respect to proper orderly shopping cente development. That is the reason why this matter is before Parliament, and these proposals try to meet this rather complex problem.

It is of interest to follow the Government's progress in this matter. It decided, for some reason, not to renew section 36c at the end of last year, and then in Febuary this year (the Minister has not told the House the reason, although he said it was not in any way connected with the representations he received prior to the Norwood by-election) the Government decided to intervene in this area, and the original proposals were put before the House. They were brought here in a state of some confusion. The Minister at a public meeting had said that his Government did not want to interfere with retail development; that was to be a responsibility henceforth of local government. In fact, he went so far as to say that local government already had the power to bring down its own moratorium if it so desired.

We then found that through the passage of this measure in the House a substantial change was made by the Government; it decided not only to interfere in shopping centre development outside shopping zones, but to come into shopping zones and bring in further controls. We now find that the Government's attitude is to go right back to a *laissez faire* stance. That, of course, is the most irresponsible of all positions, and it is one that leaves the small trader without any protection in the community. It also leaves local government without any powers to control the situation and to bring in any orderly planning. I say that for the reasons that have been expressed in this House previously, which are clearly known to the Minister. A most undesirable stand is being taken by the Government. In my counting, there have been five different stances taken by the Government in six months regarding whether and how it will intervene in this matter, or whether it will not intervene at all.

One thing is clear: the stand of the Government is unclear. The community is now in a position where it cannot follow the attitude of the Government. It has never been the intention of the Opposition to detract from the powers or responsibilities of local government, as some members opposite have insinuated. On the other hand, it is of vital importance that local government has adequate powers; it is important that the State Government does not shirk its responsibility with respect to proper planning. No local government body alone can bring down decisions that affect planning proposals and orderly conduct of the community outside its council area.

The State Government should accept responsibility for planning and not pass the buck to local government. Each body has its respective responsibilities, which must be carried out in co-ordination. The proposed amendments bring that about. They are not of a lasting nature. In regard to shopping centre areas, the amendments will apply for six months, and for areas outside shopping centre zones, they will apply for nearly 12 months. That is time enough for a proper survey to be carried out and a proper feasibility study to be undertaken so that rational decisions can be made at the end of that period. It is clear that the Government did not want to intervene in this area; it wanted big developers to have an open slather—an attractive proposition.

The Government has not been prepared to intervene on behalf of the small business man. In my electorate, the profitability and viability of these people is on the line, and numbers of small businesses are expected to close this year. We can already see from bankruptcy figures and the general economic climate that the life of a small business man is not easy. The future for these people is very bleak. The attitude that the Government is taking regarding these amendments gives little comfort to those people who conduct their own businesses and provide such valuable services in the community.

I was quite amazed to hear the Minister oppose the concept of third party appeals in regard to development proposals. I would have thought that this concept would have been welcomed at the local government level, by the community at large, and by many small retailers, so that there can be some participation in the planning process. The Minister, in his explanation, stated that that would be time-wasting and would add to the uncertainty of the situation. That reply, in my understanding, can only mean that the delay and uncertainty would be for those who are developers and not for the community—not for the people whose houses are threatened by those proposals, for the developments which the member for Salisbury talked about (the community facilities), and for the small traders whose livelihood is threatened by unnecessary and wasteful developments by way of large shopping centres.

The Government's latest attitude is one of total abdication from this area and is probably the most irresponsible and the most confusing of all attitudes that the Government has taken in the past few months regarding this matter. It is certainly not an approach that will be welcomed by the vast majority of people who have most to gain from proper and organised planning in our community. The State Government has a clear responsibility to ensure that competing interests are resolved for the good of the whole community. When we do not have judges, people who protect those who are weakest in the community, and when we do not have people who take objective views, then there is chaos, unfairness and a great deal of injustice. That situation will arise in the months ahead if the Government proceeds in the manner in which it is currently proceeding with respect to these amendments.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: The comments made by the member for Newland some short time ago were interesting indeed. He gave information about the centre study undertaken by the City of Tea Tree Gully and, while I do not know the details of that proposal, I think it sounds very praiseworthy, as if a lot of work has gone into analysing the true needs of the local community, much in the same light as the shopping centre studies conducted in the City of Salisbury some years ago indicated the same thorough work, research and understanding of the needs of the residents in the local community. That is the sort of thing that there should be a lot more of, rather than lack of planning where developers come in and superimpose

development on a community without any respect or cognisance of the needs of the local community. There should be council planning.

I imagine that, if the member for Newland thought through his own position on this matter, he would realise that the amendments proposed are therefore by consequence the best amendments, because they attempt to ensure that that planning process, that stage of consideration and attention to all of the aspects of development, takes place in all the areas where shopping centres are being considered. Not all areas have the same advantage, obviously, as have the City of Tea Tree Gully or the City of Salisbury by previous work (I believe partly undone by recent events). Surely that consideration should be given to other areas of the State. That must be considered useful and worth while. Obviously, the member for Newland did not clearly read the amendments, because he presumed that the proposals put forward in the Tea Tree Gully study would be stymied by the amendments, and unnecessarily delayed by the amendments.

[Midnight]

I point out to him that on page 3 of the document that was circulated subclause (4)*(a)* provides:

> The Government, may by regulation, exempt a specified shopping development or proposed shopping development from provisions of this section.

Paragraph *(b)*, the more important provision, states:

> . . . exempt any specified part of the State from the provisions of this section.

In other words, that quite clearly is an area where an exemption could be granted for that type of development. The Governor would take a serious view of what work had gone before, what aspects have been considered by local government and the authorities that they employ to do the studies, and would make a decision perhaps that further consideration was not necessary. If one looks at the type of process that is suggested should be gone through by these amendments on page 4, one can see the types of personnel that it is proposed will be consulted in an advisory committee. Largely, they are types of people who would already have been consulted in that situation within the Tea Tree Gully area, for example. We are looking at the other types of situation where that type of planning and that sort of consideration has not taken place, and if it has, it has not been given the due weight that it ought to have been given. I hope that the member for Newland gives the matter further consideration because I believe that, if he follows the thoughts he has shared with us tonight to their consequence, he will feel it only right that he should support the amendments.

The question of third party appeals, which the member for Norwood commented upon as a result of comments by the Minister, also concerns me. Part of the concern that I have for the shopping centre development within Salisbury relate to comments made to me by a group of people who could be called the third party range, by residents of the local community, consumers of the local community, or by people who were interested in the heritage and environment of the local community. If there is not to be the option for them, as citizens, to have their rights protected, and to appeal against developments if they feel they are not in the best interests of an area, then I think that is very poor indeed, and I ask the Minister to reconsider that matter. Surely it is important that local residents have some option enabling them to determine the way in which their own community proceeds. Any attempt to not allow them that option cannot be considered democratic.

The amendments seek to give this State the breather that would be necessary for the unplanned shopping developments that we have seen taking place. I suggest that some members take a drive through those areas of Adelaide where there has been lack of planning. While it is very useful, worth while and edifying to look at places where planning has been excellent, which is inspiring, it is not so inspiring to see places where shopping centre development has been superimposed on shopping centre development causing an over-capacity of retail trading, congestion of traffic as a consequence, and where there has been a serious impairment to the local amenity.

At some stage the Government will have to give serious consideration to all these matters which it does not seem to be giving at the moment. As the member for Norwood said, there seems to be quite a lot of vacillation by the Government at various points in time. It seems that one such area of vacillation has taken place in regard to the Salisbury situation and some land which is owned by the Education Department. There have been various stories at various times as to what is to happen to that land, as it is sited in the middle of the area proposed for the Myer shopping development. Initially we were told that the land was to be sold direct to the Myer consortium and that it was to be offered the first option on that land so that it could develop it. Somebody somewhere in the Government must have realised—

The CHAIRMAN: I do hope the honourable member will link up his remarks.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes. Someone in the Government must have realised just how hot an issue that was. Last week the Government changed its position and decided that it would have to put the education facility up for public tender. The result was that in the short term the Government put the Myer consortium offside, because the consortium felt that this was an unnecessary delay. Myer expected the thing to be handed over on a platter, which in fact was not the case. The Government has now realised, logically, that, if the land is to be sold, it should have been put up for public tender. This reinforces the other types of vacillation that have taken place by the Government ever since it came into office on 15 September. I hope it will not be continued much further because the amenity and character of the State are in serious danger.

Dr. BILLARD: I would like to answer some of the points raised by the member for Norwood, and I hope that in so doing I will also answer a response that was made by the member for Salisbury. The member for Norwood quite correctly stated that local government had a very proper role to play in the planning process. He also said that the State Government had a role to play, which is also correct. Yet the whole tenor of this amendment is to take away from local government its role and vest that in the State. Surely the whole point of the amendment is that the control is being taken away from local government. The member for Salisbury mentioned the goings on in Salisbury but he did not mention the attitude of the Salisbury council. I feel that it is crucial that, if it is a local government concern, the properly elected representatives of the people within local government are the people who should have the say.

Mr. Crafter interjecting:

Dr. BILLARD: They are the elected representatives of the people at the local level, just as much as we are the elected representatives of the people at the State level. The point is that I think the attitude of the Salisbury Council would be most relevant to the situation at Salisbury and that has very carefully not been mentioned.

I take the point made by the member for Salisbury regarding subclause (4), but the point is that the whole

tenor of the amendment seeks to vest the power in the State, and that if there are areas which require a moratorium, then we would have expected that a proper amendment would have suggested that a council decide that it requires a moratorium in its area and seeks to enforce a moratorium by regulation. That is putting the boot on the other foot, as it were, so that the initiative and the power lies with the council rather than with the Minister.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The member for Newland made the point earlier that in a local government area that is part of his district, a good and concerted effort had been made by the council, presumably together with planning consultants, and so on, to provide for the future planning of a part of that area.

In general, I have no quarrel with that sort of activity by a local council. One of the amazing things about the sort of survey, planning, calling in of consultants, etc., is that it seems to me that, somewhere along the line, the people who live in the area seem to get left out. I do not know how that is. I am certain that the people who do courses at the institute or university would understand that they ought to canvass the opinion of the residents, too, anywhere in the State.

I will put a simple proposition to the Committee that is directly related to major-size retail shopping developments which are capable of being built and which have been built under the planning laws and the Building Act. One should look at what has happened at the way in which people are required to shop at those large establishments. We have all seen people go into the place, queue up, and eventually get out of the check-out arrangement, having paid more than they needed to pay for the goods. That was established clearly by an independent media survey only a couple of weeks ago. They must find where their car is, and get their goods to it. The way in which that is presently achieved is, in most cases, for them to be able to use a trolley from the retail development which is so good in zoned areas that we do not need to do anything about the further consideration of them in other zoned areas.

Anyone who has seen the resultant disarray, the danger of moving in the parking area, which is also a driving area, by housewives with two children and a trolley and controlling its castors, which are designed to work on perfect floors but which cannot be used on paved areas—

Mr. RANDALL: On a point of order, I cannot understand what parking areas and housewives wheeling trolleys in car parks have to do with the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order, but I remind the honourable member for Mitchell that he must link up his remarks. I realise that the amendments are wide, but I ask the honourable member to ensure that his comments are in line with the amendments.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Certainly, Sir. I appreciate your ruling. The amendments obviously need to be covered in a wide manner. I appreciate the way in which you, Sir, have approached this matter in discharging your duty. I have been speaking about what happens in car parks associated with retail shopping centres and the way in which they have been built, which would be varied by the amendments. The input for approval to construct such shopping centres would be changed if the amendments were to be passed, as they should be passed by the Committee. I suggest that the honourable member who just took a point of order, as he is entitled to do, probably has not spent much time in some of these places, as he would have observed what I have observed. The amendments meet every present requirement, and I am trying to show in that simple example that many things are not what is required today. To transfer that to the larger scene, we can talk about location and the continuation within zones of further shopping proliferation and the effect that it will have on the livelihood of existing traders, and so on.

I was trying to show that it is no good saying, as the Minister appears to be saying by refusing to do anything about retail shopping development in zoned areas, that that is not so. I am not suggesting that, if we passed the amendments, it would mean that someone would sit down and design better wheels for the trolleys. Nothing could be further from the truth.

What has been going on does not mean that it is right, and that is what we are faced with now. People, including the Minister and other Government members, are saying that there is nothing wrong if a planning survey, etc., is done under the terms of the present legislation. That is baloney. It is not working, whether in the simple example I quoted of how no real thought has gone into the matter of getting the goods from the shop to one's home, or to the effect on traffic.

Mr. Randall: Are you saying that planning is a waste of time?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am not saying that planning is a waste of time. Surely after six months the member for Henley Beach ought to be able to interject and say something sensible. I am still waiting for him to do it. I am not opposed to planning. I have been involved in planning most of my life in various ways, whether in the army or navy, and we did more planning there than the honourable member has ever heard about.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the Bill.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The only success the honourable member has had in this place was to distract me from an important subject. I hope that, in the last instance, the Minister will see the point that we have been trying to make. We have received from another place amendments for consideration. The Minister ought to give them proper consideration or take time to examine those amendments, and it may be that he will report progress to enable him to reconsider his attitude on the matter, but he ought not dismiss them out of hand. I ask the Minister to support the amendments.

Dr. BILLARD: The ramblings of the member for Mitchell ought to be answered. He spent much time talking about the difficulties in large shopping centres. True, many of them have disadvantages compared to the operations of small shopping centres. For that reason, we have a mix within the community. The studies done in the Tea Tree Gully planned such a mix, and it is proper that many housewives, for example, who do their shopping normally would shop at a local shopping centre. However, that is beside the point of the issue being discussed. Whether we should have large or small shopping centres or whether one is better or worse than the other in a certain situation is a problem of local planning that is properly part of the planning carried out by the local council.

The Opposition suggested that we ought to have local people involved in the planning, and that is why we believe that such planning ought to be under the control of councils, because they are closer to the people and are able to know more than does the State Minister of Planning about local conditions and what is required locally. This is the whole tenor of our argument.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That's why he gets that advice.

Dr. BILLARD: Why not give the people who live with the results of a decision the power to make the decision? As soon as you take the decision out into a remote area where the person who decides does not have to live with

the consequences, that is when you start getting bureaucratic follies. It is the whole principle of liberalism and federalism that the people who must live with decisions should be the ones who make the decisions.

That is why we believe that councils ought to be given the power to make decisions that are properly the concern of a local area. Certainly, local shopping facilities are properly the concern of a local area.

Mr. Keneally: People who want to go to the Olympic Games—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Stuart will cease interjecting.

Dr. BILLARD: I could highlight that by pointing out the Modbury triangle to which I referred was a proposal not for a large shopping centre but for smaller shops to operate in competition with the larger Tea Tree Plaza development.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How do they do that with the present wholesale pricing policy? Come on!

Dr. BILLARD: It is all a part of competition. Surely, in a free enterprise area we can be offered different things in different areas. Certainly, within Tea Tree Gully, I go to my local shops for certain reasons. If I was getting ice cream, for example, I do not think I would go to Tea Tree Plaza because of the difficulty with parking, getting to the car, and so on: I would go to a local shop.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Will supermarkets and small ice cream cones solve the problem?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not think the Committee is helped in its deliberations by interjections.

Dr. BILLARD: For other articles, where there may not be shops selling the goods I require, I go to Tea Tree Plaza, perhaps to the city, or to another area. It is quite proper that there should be a mix of centres with a proper mix of the types of shop required. Honourable members will remember that I said that there are certain types of retailer of which there is a shortage in Tea Tree Gully. I refer especially to shops selling furniture and such goods. It would probably be quite improper for them to be in a shopping centre of the size of Tea Tree Plaza, and they may well be sited in other areas.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: True competition would have allowed them to be anywhere.

Dr. BILLARD: I am not specifying where they should go, but the point is that the local council is most likely to know what the requirements are in that area, to be sensitive to changes in demand, and to respond because the people who elect the local councillors are the people who have the needs.

Mr. CRAFTER: What the member for Newland has just said, in fact, supports the Opposition's amendments, because he made out a strong case for intervention for a period to clarify the problems that exist in providing the proper mix of retail development in the community. The honourable member talked about a local shopping zone, which has a particular connotation in this debate. I do not believe that he used it in its correct connotation as it is referred to in the amendments. In the definition of "shopping zones" that has a particular meaning, as does "the regional centre", "district centre zone" and "neighbourhood centre zone". They all fulfil specific functions in response to planning decisions that must be taken.

We have recently seen shopping centres built that can cater for 50 000, 60 000, or 70 000 people, more than the total number of people that live in any one local government area. Therefore, it is not possible for one local government area to make final and lasting decisions with respect to the needs of people for shopping facilities in other council areas. That point has been made by the Opposition on many occasions: that Government is so keen to give local government all the authority, yet it will not give them the power in this matter.

The Minister has promised to explain to local government in a paper the power it has and how it will work. I have not seen that paper, but I would very much like to see it when it is produced, as well, I am sure, would many councillors who have been frustrated both in decision-making and by the Planning Appeal Board with respect to inadequacies of the powers that they currently have. Many councils realise, as inner suburban councils do, that they do not have the power to control shopping centre development outside their council areas. The district that I represent takes in parts of four local government areas. There are currently, either developed or in the process of being developed, eight large shopping centres and ancillary shops. They provide for a total population of three to five times the number of people who live in the district. We can see that to give this responsibility to local government, as members opposite wish, is quite irresponsible.

It is certainly bad for the whole community to see this sort of piecemeal development being thrust on local government. What we need is a proper development plan for retail development in the whole of the community. It needs to be implemented quickly, because there is a degree of urgency. There is a crisis in the retail industry at the moment and no-one has denied that. A thorough survey needs to be carried out. We need to redraw (as the member for Newland said is needed in his area) the zoning areas for all these different categories of shopping zone. If we fail to do that, and that is the Government's wish with respect to these amendments, chaos will reign.

Mr. MATHWIN: I oppose the amendments. I first thought that some of them might have made some sort of sense, but, on reading them, one would think that they were a set of regulations. Whoever developed these amendments in another place must have grabbed a figure out of the sky when he decided on a penalty of $100 000. Of course, the person responsible is to be appointed without the consent of the authority or the Minister. That is taking the whole matter away from local government, which I suppose is the policy of the socialist Parties in this State. Indeed, it always has been. They have had little thought in the past for local government, and proof of that is in some of the legislation passed in this House in the unfortunate nine years that the Labor Government was in office. Let us look at the situation.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has the call.

Mr. MATHWIN: I do not see the sense in the Leader coming into the Chamber when the member for Salisbury has been on his feet since about 2 o'clock this afternoon—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Glenelg has the floor.

Mr. MATHWIN: One part of the regulations asks whether the implementation of the proposal is justified in view of the actual and prospective community needs. This is to be done not by local government but by the Minister. It also refers to the Health, safety and convenience of the community. What does the Minister know about a particular community in which a shopping centre is to be built? Surely, local government would know the answer to that question. Why do we want a convenience, anyway? Any local community would have a convenience.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already pointed out to the Committee that deliberations are not helped by unruly

interjections. I ask that the honourable member for Glenelg be afforded the normal courtesies.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Sir. I appreciate your protection. I return to the provision which has been presented here this evening and which relates to the health, safety and convenience of the community. I presume that the gentleman who drafted this meant a public convenience. How has the Minister the right to state where the convenience is to be situated in any community? It is a ridiculous situation when, before a convenience is put in a local council area, we must get the Minister and the authority to give the right to do so.

I refer also to the economic feasibility of the proposal and its effects upon employment. This is another area in which the Opposition desires to put all the authority in the Minister's hands. Government members saw this time and time again when they were in Opposition: the Minister had to be put in the Bill because he wanted the authority. That is, of course, the idea of the socialist parties: they lust for power. They give the Minister the power in any legislation that is introduced into this place.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Glenelg that there is nothing in these amendments dealing with socialists.

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer also to the effects that implementation of the proposal would have upon surrounding areas on the amenity and general character of the locality affected by the proposal and upon the environment generally. Surely Opposition members must see some common sense in the whole situation and will accept some sort of amendments in this matter that take away the whole responsibility from local government. This goes on like a set of regulations, and goes on to give all the power to the Minister and the authority. I refer to paragraph *(g)* which relates to the situation where an application is made for consent of the authority and the Minister under subsection (1).

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the honourable member for Glenelg does not invite interjections. I request the honourable member for Unley not to interject.

Mr. MATHWIN: Under this provision, the application shall be referred for advice to an advisory committee consisting of a public accountant; a person qualified in, and with the experience of, town planning; a person with extensive experience in retailing; a person with extensive knowledge of and experience in environmental protection; and a person with qualifications in a discipline related to local government and with extensive experience of local government. At least, the honourable member who proposed this type of regulation in the form of an amendment has given local government some sort of a show. He has selected one person to get on a certain committee consisting of a number of other people that have really got nothing to do with local government at all.

Mr. Keneally: I have known public accountants to be on local government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: Of course the honourable member has. However, the gentleman who drafted this did not intend the accountant to be from local government. He intended that these people should come from all walks of life and that only one person from local government should be represented on this committee. That is absolutely wrong. The person who drafted or suggested the amendment ought to be ashamed of himself for suggesting that local government should be completely cut out of this committee with the exception of one person. The provision states that we must cause public notices to be given, and so on. It goes on to say that consent is required under this section in respect of shopping development where every authorisation, approval or consent required in respect of that development under this Act or the Building Act, 1970-1976, has been obtained before 26 February 1980. This foolscap page of amendments ought to be in regulation form and certainly not in an amended form. I oppose these amendments.

Mr. CRAFTER: I was interested to learn of the opposition of the member for Glenelg to the use of the words "health, safety and convenience of the community". I presume that he was opposing the use of the words in this measure. I find that particularly interesting because that was not the Opposition's wording. The amendment was moved by the Minister of Community Welfare in another place, and this was his wording. I presume that it was at one stage the Government's intention to legislate in that way.

I do not know what stand the member for Glenelg takes on other matters in the Bill. Those words are, as many members would know, frequently used in legislation and have judicial meaning. I am sure that the meaning that the member for Glenelg tried to attribute to them is as far from the mark as his other comments. This matter is in a crisis climate, and the Legislative Council amendments are too important to be treated in that way. Many people are waiting anxiously for a rational, reasonable and responsible decision in this matter. It appears that the Government does not want to fulfil that function.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I was interested in the comments that the member for Norwood has just made on the contribution from the member for Glenelg. I too was wondering whether in fact the member had read the amendments earlier because, when he read the section not preventing a person from proceeding with a shopping development, he suddenly realised when he reached the end of that phrase that it was a totally non-objectionable phrase and that he had embarked upon the point that had no controversial aspect about it whatsoever. He then drifted away into some verbal wood to try to lose it between the verbal trees. That confirms the point that he is not really aware of the matters that have been brought up in this debate tonight.

The member for Newland posed a question to me earlier. It is a pity that he is not in the Chamber to hear the response, because it is important to the debate. He asked what was the attitude of the local council in my area to some of the matters which have come up tonight or at least which have been in the news for some recent time regarding shopping centre developments.

I clearly outlined the attitude of the council over the years to shopping centre development in Salisbury, and the way in which it went about the studies of retail needs in the local community and consulted the whole community, residents and various authorities was very good. I was a little dismayed at the way the resolutions were prepared; I hope that the information is not totally accurate, because it seems to undo all the good work that has taken place before today.

To confirm that fear, I mention the resolution passed by the council at its recent meeting on 24 March. I will not read the entire resolution, but a number of points are relevant and answer the questions raised by the member for Newland. The first matter is that council resolved that it support the proposal to extend a retail component of the Salisbury centre on the basis that such extension provides a substantial increase in the comparison shopping component of the centre. The extension of the centre should primarily include a department store, an associated discount department store, a supermarket and a specialty shopping centre being accepted.

That is interesting when one considers a previous resolution of that same council some years ago: the council argued that centre shopping facilities within the city of Salisbury should be extended only by a discount department store, supermarket and specialist shops. It made no requirement for a department store in Salisbury at that time nor for some time to come. The proposal before the community at present will provide double the number of specialist shops in the Salisbury area than is already available in the Marion Shopping Centre. The Marion Shopping Centre is a regional centre, whereas the Salisbury centre, by all agreement, is a district centre. That is surely an illogical situation—that the number of shops in a district centre be double the number of shops in a regional centre. That is one of the amendments that the council has put which is in conflict with its earlier sound judgment.

Apart from some councillors of the corporation, I have not met a resident in the local area who favours the proposal that has been in the news of late. If my remarks tonight suddenly encourage these people who are in favour of the proposal to knock at my office door tomorrow, I will listen to them and consider their opinion. They have not done so and are therefore outnumbered by the people who had expressed concern about the proposal.

The third proposition is to inform the State Government, by way of a deputation, of its decision and asks that favourable consideration be given to the urgent sale of Education Department land. This puts in serious doubt the method of public tender and whether the time limit that will be available will enable all possible parties to give options for development of that land, which the amendments consider and which would not be provided if the amendments were defeated. The council resolved, among other things, a matter of grave concern to the local community and something that would be of grave concern to all members—that, subject to the necessary and written binding objection of the development, the council enter on a compulsory acquisition programme to acquire those properties in the scheme that the developer has been unable to acquire, such action to be taken only when the council is satisfied that the developer has taken all reasonable steps to acquire the land.

We have heard that it is important that the residents be consulted and that the needs of the local community are paramount. This proposition provides that, if the local residents do not see it in their best interests to support shopping centre development, the council should use whatever compulsory acquisition powers it has, rip the land off them and provide it to the commercial development. I doubt seriously whether it is in the power of local government to use compulsory acquisition to that end. I am quite sure that the council will need to consider that resolution carefully. I say this against the background of the good work that that council has done in the past in regard to studies of shopping centres in the local area. I hope that the council will see the value of the work it has done and return to that spirit.

Adequate reasons have not been given by members opposite about why there should not be the right to third party planning appeal and why local residents should not have the right to protect the interests of their own community, as they have in other aspects. The Deputy Premier wanted to hear a dirty rag story; I believe that this proposal of the Government (the objection to the amendment) is a dirty rag story from the Government benches. It is an attempt to smear proper planning development in this State with a dirty rag and cover the proper needs of the community.

Mr. LANGLEY: I take this opportunity to express my concern about shopping development in the Unley council area. I would be the first to say that the Unley council has done all that it possibly can to ensure that development in the area is stable, but it has gone past that stage and I am sure that the council and its officers are now worried about shopping development in the area.

Many areas are saturated with shops, as is the Unley area, because new shopping areas are developed. We all know that theatres have been knocked down in certain areas and small businesses are being wiped out; there is no doubt about that. Nothing concrete can be predicted in regard to the future of people who want to move into these areas.

Members know how many small businesses have been swamped by the big multi-nationals. In regard to my district, I am worried that the Government and Opposition members are trying to move away from the fact that a decision must be made. The member for Glenelg can talk about Party politics; that does not influence the council members at all. These members do a very good job.

Mr. Max Brown: They are not socialists.

Mr. LANGLEY: Members of the Unley council are not socialists and they have an open mind. I am sure that the member for Glenelg does not think they do. All councils in South Australia would approve a stay of shopping development for a certain period because they are in trouble. There is no doubt that the Government is facing trouble and does not want to take action. If the Government did something, development would be stabilised. Four people started a business recently on the South Road. They are keen and willing, but they just do not know where they are going.

Mr. Randall interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not want to stop them. They want to know where they are going if they are investing money. I am sure that the member for Henley Beach does not understand that fact. At the present time they do not know. I cannot help them to a great extent.

Mr. Randall: I would encourage them to come and develop my area.

Mr. LANGLEY: You might. If they want to go to the member's area, they can.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: They have been waiting around for 10 years.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister has been waiting around for 10 years. I am sure the Minister does not know where he is going, either. This is a real hot potato and everyone knows it. The angle of it all is that the Government is in a hot seat and it does not know where it is going. It is about time something was done about it.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton (teller).

Noes (18)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, O'Neill, Payne (teller), Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Evans. No—Mr. McRae.

Majority of 5 for Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 2 and 3 was adopted:

Because the amendments raise matters completely outside the ambit of the Bill.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 2 and 3.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Billard, Crafter, Payne, Schmidt, and Wotton.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 10 a.m. on Wednesday 2 April.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference with the Legislative Council to be held during the adjournment of this House and the managers to report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The following message was received from the Legislative Council:

(a) the Legislative Council requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly in the appointment of a Joint Committee to which the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill be referred for inquiry and report;

(b) in the event of a Joint Committee being appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the Committee;

(c) the Select Committee be further instructed to inquire into and report upon all aspects of the relationship between alcohol use and road safety and measures whereby the problems associated with alcohol use and the driving of motor vehicles can be overcome.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PROPERTY) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

WILLS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CROWN PROCEEDINGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

BUILDERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

FURTHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 February. Page 1294.)

The Hon. J. D. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, Langley, O'Neill, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (23)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison (teller), P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr. McRae. No—Mr. Evans.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I was endeavouring to assist the Minister a little in this matter because, if we go to Committee on this matter in this day's sitting, it will be necessary for me, at this stage of my consultation with people on the legislation, to move an amendment. It might be that that could be overcome if the Committee sat on a different day, and I had an opportunity to make greater consultation. In any event, I will deal with the Opposition's thinking on this measure.

First, there are two amendments in the Bill which are identical to the amending Bill that we passed earlier today in relation to the Education Act. The first of these is set out in clause 2 (clause 1 being purely formal), and it relates to officers on probation. It provides, as was the case with the Education Act, that there should be the right of appeal for an officer on probation, something that has not existed in the past.

The Opposition supports this measure. As I said in the case of the Education Act, it was a matter that was brought to my attention and negotiations on the matter were substantially concluded with the Education Department during my period as Minister. The present Minister has obviously decided that he agress with the judgment that we made on the matter.

Mr. Becker: Why didn't you bring the Bill in?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am sure we would have, in due time. I am making no complaint about this matter. I am underlining the fact that we are supporting the honourable member's Party in this matter. I am sure that if we were to do otherwise, following the practice that the Minister's colleagues seem to have adopted recently, we would shortly have had a minute read from the front bench of the Government to the effect that there was at least Ministerial approval, if not Cabinet approval, on the part of the Labor Government for this to have taken place.

We support the Bill, although I make the point I made in relation to the earlier measure, that to a certain extent it breaks down the clear-cut distinction that has occurred previously between officers on probation and those teachers who are on permanency, in that in the past an officer on probation was not afforded the right of appeal in this sort of matter. Now the right of appeal will be there as a result of the successful passage of this measure. In any event, on balance we saw in Government that it was wise to make this facility available to probationers, and we see

no reason to alter our viewpoint simply because we are currently occupying the Opposition benches. Substantially, I would make the same point in relation to clause 3 of the Bill, which amends section 25 of the principal Act, which will now provide as follows:

> An officer may retire on or after the day on which he reaches the age of fifty-five years but, subject to subsection (1a) of this section, must retire upon reaching the age of sixty-five years if he has not retired beforehand.

Subsection (1a) will provide:

> An officer who reaches the age of sixty-five years during the school year that commences on the first day of February 1980, may retire after reaching that age but on or before the last day of that school year.

That is the saving clause, for the people who are in the system at present, for this year only. After this year, of course, (1a) would have no effect and (1) would automatically apply in all cases.

As in the case of the Education Act, the *status quo*, which we are endeavouring to change, relates to a labour market for teachers, or in this case, of course, to the various categories of teaching staff which applied in the Department of Further Education, which is rather broader in scope than what is recognised in the Education Department. That labour market position has changed quite drastically compared to what obtained even when the Further Education Act was introduced in Parliament by me as Minister of Education in 1975 and proclaimed, as I recall, early in the following year. It seems sensible, therefore, to proceed as outlined in clause 3 of the Bill.

I turn my attention now to clause 4. Here is a point at which I am somewhat bemused. Maybe the Minister can help me out in this matter; I sincerely hope so. If he can adequately explain the position, there will be no necessity for further action to occur in Committee. I have to indicate that although the Opposition supports the measure through the second reading and into Committee, we will want to look closely at clause 4. What it says here is that section 43 of the principal Act is amended by inserting in paragraph *(l)* of subsection (2) after the words "Director-General" the words "not being administrative acts or decisions declared by regulation to be exlcuded from appeal".

In 1979, I amended the principal Act, and I would like to refer to that matter. What occurred there was that the word "specify" was taken out of the verbiage of *(l)* so that as the measure currently reads it confers upon officers a right of appeal to the Appeal Board against administrative acts of the Minister or the Director-General, and it considerably broadens the ambit of appeals. Reference is made to that in the *Hansard* debate on the matter.

Those members who were here at the time may recall that it was one of a series of amendments that I moved in Committee as Government amendments to the Bill, which drew some unfavourable comments from the then Opposition benches. In any event, despite the unfavourable comments on the volume of Government amendments in Committee, there was no argument at the time that I can recall from the then Opposition relating to this amendment to strike out the word "specify". In a way, the amendment now being considered reverses that trend because it would then insert, although it does not insert the word "specify" again, after "Director-General", the words:

> not being administrative acts or decisions declared by the regulations to be excluded from appeal.

So, should this measure successfully pass both Houses, it is then open for the Government of the day, by proclamation, to make certain exemptions from the general rights of appeal which I placed in this section and certain administrative acts can be exempted from the rights of appeal.

I am a little bemused by the fact that there appears to be no great complaint from the Institute of Teachers relating to this matter, and by and large the institute is keen to see this Bill pass this House. I have no doubt that it is important that this measure should, taken as a whole, pass through the legislative aspects before we adjourn. It is important that amendments Nos. 1 and 2 should pass into law quickly. I do not really see that the present machinery under which the Department of Further Education operates would be seriously inconvenienced if this matter was not passed at this time. I can well see that the Institute of Teachers may be happy with certain administrative decisions that are taken, particularly as, of course, the justification used by the Minister in introducing this measure was that the Institute is represented on many of these boards.

However, I can well understand the situation arising where an individual teacher, although a member of the institute, would feel considerably aggrieved as a result of the decision taken on advice from one of these boards on which members of the teacher's own union were represented. It does not follow that individuals always necessarily acquiesce in decisions to which their own association is party. So, although one could say that in the broad spectrum of these matters which would be considered there would be every indication that, for the most part, people would be happy with what was happening, one could well foreshadow a situation in which an individual teacher or lecturer or tutor would feel aggrieved as a result of a decision taken, would seek to exercise his or her right of appeal, but would be unable to do so because the Minister would have gazetted that this action or area in which the action was taken was one of the areas declared by the regulations to be excluded from appeal.

I am happy to concede that there may be some aspect of the matter which I have missed. I have read carefully through section 43 of the principal Act, and through the *Hansard* report of last year, when I amended this subsection, and I have looked closely at clause 4 of the amending Bill. All I can conclude is that we are narrowing the rights of appeal where we really have no need to narrow them.

I am bemused by the fact that there has not been some opposition from the profession to the course which the Minister is urging upon us, and that the institute has not taken up the matter with the Minister. There may be some aspect that I have missed, although I have taken the normal advice that we all take when we see something which has been a matter of drafting and we wish to get some advice on the technicalities of the drafting.

From the advice I have been able to obtain, I believe that my interpretation of what is happening here is correct. The Minister may be able to disabuse me of that. Earlier in this day's sitting, when it seemed that the Notice Paper would collapse, I indicated to the Minister that I would be happy to proceed with this matter. However, the House turned its attention to other legislative provisions, and it seemed that I would be in a position tomorrow to take further advice. I intended, before the House adjourned this evening, to ask of the Minister his permission to speak tomorrow to one of his senior officers to see whether I could be on the right track, whether I could be convinced of the error of my ways. That is not open to me unless, by some reason, we do not get into Committee before we end this day's sitting.

The Opposition is happy with clauses 2 and 3, but at this stage is decidedly unhappy with clause 4, although we are

open to persuasion on the matter. If the Minister has some reasons in his armoury, we are only too happy to listen to them and to give them proper weight. If those reasons are not there, or if there is not the opportunity to further consult, in Committee we reserve the right to further consider this clause.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): There are a couple of issues, one relatively minor, the second to be referred to at greater length. The first was referred to by the member for Baudin when he said that probationary teachers had no right of appeal; in fact, it is considered by the South Australian Institute of Teachers and others that members of staff on probation do have a right of appeal at present under section 15(1)(e) of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. This section deals with the jurisdiction of the court, empowering the court to hear and determine any question as to whether the dismissal from his employment of an employee, not being an employee who has under any Act or law a right of appeal or review against his dismissal, was harsh, unjust, or unreasonable. If this course of action was followed, the costs to the department would in all probability be higher than if the Teachers Appeal Board was the appeal panel.

It was considered by the department that since probationary employees, either from the Department of Further Education or the Education Department, have this implied right of appeal, it would be better to provide a formal channel which was quicker and at the same time cheaper to all parties concerned. That was the rationale behind introducing that aspect both in this legislation and the Bill which went through earlier today. The member for Baudin is correct in his assuming that this legislation is designed to restrict the rights of appeal which were given under the previous amendment ot this section.

Perhaps I might raise the history of clause 43(2) (e) since the Bill was first introduced to the House in 1975. In fact, clause 43(2) (e) was a little briefer than it at present reads. Originally it read, "conferring upon officers a right of appeal to the Appeal Board against specified administrative Acts or decisions of the Director-General". I think the former Minister of Education introduced an amendment when the Bill was passing through the House in that early stage, where, on the recommendations of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, he added the words "or decisions of the Minister" before "the Director-General". The Institute of Teachers at that time counselled the Minister pointing out that specified acts of the Minister performed through the Director-General should also be the subject of appeal, rather than limiting only the Director-General's specified acts.

That was, to some extent, precedental, since the Minister was acting on the direct advice of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. Subsequently it was decided that this clause gave a right of appeal only against specified, in other words, fairly narrowly defined acts of the Minister or Director-General. So, in his wisdom, the former Minister changed the Act in so far as "specified" was omitted. As the member for Baudin has pointed out, this immediately widened the right of appeal, giving everyone a general right of appeal against administrative acts or decisions of both the Minister and his Director-General.

As was implied in the second reading explanation (although it does not specifically say so), both the Director-General and the South Australian Institute of Teachers approached me at the end of last year shortly after I assumed Ministerial responsibility and requested that a regulation be drafted precluding the rights of staff generally to appeal in specific cases. On investigation I pointed out that the present legislation provided a general right of appeal, and that it would be improper to draft such a regulation without first changing the Act. The Institute of Teachers and the Department of Further Education were to some extent annoyed at my reluctance to bring in a draft regulation without first changing the legislation, but subsequently it was agreed that this was in fact the better, the more formal, and the correct procedure.

So, I refer to the precedental action of the Minister in acceding to a request of the South Australian Institute of Teachers in amending the legislation in 1975. I am acceding to a request of the Institute of Teachers in this regard also. I would have no objection whatsoever if the member for Baudin not only approaches the Institute of Teachers, with which I am sure he would confer tomorrow, but also the Director-General of Further Education to ascertain that what I have said is correct.

The reason for the request for a draft regulation long before Christmas last year was that in fact, under machinery set up by the former Minister, who is currently questioning this move, and his department, both the Institute of Teachers and the Department of Further Education were engaged jointly in arriving at decisions regarding appointments in promotion positions, these being made by selection panels representing both the Institute of teachers as well as the Department of Further Education. There would have been some general consensus. I believe that the Minister himself would have approved the actions of those panels in deciding who would gain promotion positions. It was because of that joint decision having been made that the department and the institute felt that there should be no right of appeal in such cases.

There are other examples of which the honourable member would be aware where joint decisions have been arrived at by the Institute of Teachers and the Department of Further Education, and it is to cover such contingencies that this current legislation has been brought before the House. The draft legislation involving the regulations would then specifically refer only to those cases. I believe that the member for Baudin would have been familiar with the procedures that were set in train between the Institute of Teachers and the Department of Further Education in those cases.

So this legislation is legislation which he, too, would have been asked to bring to the House. Whether he would have agreed to the draft regulations being brought forward or whether he would have decided, as I did, that that was the incorrect procedure, I do not know. I do believe that it is more correct first to amend clause 43 (2)(e) by giving teeth to draft regulations to exclude specific actions of the Minister where in fact the Institute of Teachers and the department have requested them. We believed that the department and the institute could have been embarrassed at the end of last year by certain members of staff making appeals against decisions, and we found that, in a couple of instances, that possibility arose. The problem was resolved by discussion and mutual agreement, but the point was made that, before similar problems arose at the end of the current year (when promotion positions and probably some transfer positions are being decided), we should have the legislation well and truly fixed.

I do not think that there is much more by way of explanation than I can offer the member for Baudin or the House. Should he decide that, after having heard that explanation, he still wishes to confer with the institute and the Director-General of Further Education, we will have to seek an adjournment until tomorrow, rather than move into the Committee stage.

The SPEAKER: I indicate to the honourable Minister that the honourable member for Baudin will not have another opportunity to speak until the Committee stage, and it will be necessary for the Minister, if he has concluded his remarks, to have the Bill read a second time and then go into Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.45 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 2 April at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 1 April 1980

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WINDANA HOME

585. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has the Minister yet prepared a full reply to correspondence from the member for Ascot Park of 8 January concerning the state of the galvanised iron fence on the south-west corner of Windana Home?

2. Is the delay in response associated in any way with negotiations that have been conducted concerning the unused Windana Remand and Assessment Centre's premises re-opening as a nursing home?

3. What upgrading of the premises for this future use took place in 1976-77?

4. What further upgrading has since taken place or is likely to take place?

5. What limitations will exist as regards the numbers and types of patients who will be eligible for admission to the nursing home?

6. What fees are likely to be imposed on patients?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. A reply has been sent.

2. No.

3. None.

4. Some minor work and additional equipment may be necessary.

5. The total number of beds will be 90 and only adults will be admitted. Patients will be selected to meet the following criteria:—

(1) Long-term bed centred nursing care;

(2) chronic brain failure.

6. The level of personal contribution would be that charged in other nursing homes, i.e., approximately $8 per day, which would be adjusted from time to time according to movement in the rate of pensions.

FOOD PRICES

600. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What consequences to food prices in this State are likely to follow from—

(a) the Federal Prices Justification Tribunal's inability to do more than to merely "monitor" these prices; and

(b) the dominution of price control in South Australia?

2. Is there evidence of manufacturers giving incentives, kick-backs, discounts and allowances to supermarkets and large retailers to pay them for advertising the manufacturers' products and is it a fact that these handouts to key accounts are running at higher than 2·2 per cent of purchases?

3. Is it also a fact that key retailers such as Safeways in Melbourne, substantially increased their incentive fee late in 1979?

4. Has this practice contributed to sharp increases in food prices which are being passed on to the consumer?

5. What were the recommendations to the Federal Government of the Prices Justification Tribunal inquiry into the processed food industry?

6. Does the State Government propose any action as a result of the findings of that report?

7. Does the Minister regard every conclusion of the P.J.T. in its report as capable of rectification by the industry without outside interventions and if not, which conclusions require Government action and what action does the Government propose to take?

8. In view of the Tribunal's finding that the "specials" system appears to be raising the prices of processed food and the apparent inability of manufacturers to overcome the power of major retailers in this regard, will the Minister act to protect—

(a) consumers who are paying more than necessary for their goods; and

(b) the small business sector which is unable to compete because of the unfair competition inflicted upon them by large retailers and suppliers?

9. In view of the increases in the C.P.I. will the Minister examine what effect co-operative advertising payments have on the cost of goods to the consumer?

10. In view of a recent statement by a food industry leader in Queensland which claimed that an amount of 4 per cent in co-operative advertising payments was justified, will the Minister advise how he intends to control these payments to large retailing chains which are having adverse effects on consumer prices?

11. Have small business firms made representations to the Federal Trade Practices Commission to seek protection from some of the practices of food distribution monopolies and near-monopolies and has the Minister received any such representations?

12. Does the Minister propose to take any action to protect small firms from any of these practices?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. *(a)* None.

(b) None.

2. No.

3. This cannot be substantiated.

4. This is not known.

5. No specific recommendations were made in this report.

6. No.

7. Most conclusions of P.J.T. in its report are capable of rectification by the industry. Any Government action would need to be taken on a national basis.

8. No action by the Government is considered necessary to protect either consumers or small businesses in this case.

9. No.

10. Government control of these payments is not considered necessary.

11. This is not known.

12. No.

GAS AND ELECTRICITY PRICES

683. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier:

1. When is it anticipated that the current negotiations on prices between the Cooper Basin producers and the Natural Gas Pipeline Authority of South Australia will be completed?

2. What would be the effect on electricity tariffs of a 5 per cent increase in the "field gate" price of natural gas?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows:

1. A determination by the arbitrator in the current arbitration proceedings is expected by 30 June 1980.

2. An average increase of approximately 0·5 per cent.

MARINE AND HARBORS COMMERCIAL DIVISION

699. **Mr. PETERSON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: In relation to the Commercial Division of the Department of Marine and Harbors—

(a) what has the total cost of this division been each year since the appointment of a commercial manager;

(b) how many people have been employed in this division and in what capacity for each of those years;

(c) what trips have been undertaken, to what destinations, by whom, for what purpose, and at what cost for each of those years;

(d) what promotional devices are used by the division and what is the cost of each;

(e) what industrial estate land has been sold since the appointment of a commercial manager, and to whom; and

(f) what additional shipping lines have commenced using Port Adelaide or Outer Harbor since the appointment of a commercial manager?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

(a)

Year	Cost
	$
1976-77	350
1977-78	136 650
1978-79	200 720
1979-80	142 580 (to end Feb.)

(b)

Year	No. of Officers	Capacity
1976-77	2	Commercial manager, office assistant.
1977-78	7	Commercial manager, publicity and promotion officer, marketing officer, clerical officer, graduate officer (research), two office assistants.
1978-79	7	Same as previous year.
1979-80	8	Same as two previous years plus assistant publicity and promotions officer.

(c) Overseas travel

Year	Destination	By Whom	Purpose	Cost
				$
1976-77	Nil	—	—	—
1977-78	South-East Asia Japan, China	Commercial Manager	(i) To renew or establish contact with shipping organisations relevant to South Australia. (ii) To negotiate for direct Port of Adelaide sailings.	3 042
	U.K.-Europe and Middle East	Commercial Manager	As above plus attendance at special RO-RO conference.	5 278
				8 320
1978-79	Japan, Hong Kong	Commercial Manager	Follow up on previous negotiations.	3 185
	U.K.-Europe and Middle East	Commercial Manager	(i) Follow up on previous negotiations. (ii) Attend Conference of International Cargo Handling Co-ordination Assoc.	8 910
				12 095
1979-80	Japan, Hong Kong, South Korea	Commercial Manager	Follow up on previous negotiations.	2 965
	Japan, Hong Kong	Commercial Manager	Follow up on previous negotiations.	3 933
				6 898

(d) (i) The South Australian Port and Shipping Journal—monthly trade publication—approximately $3 300 per month.

(ii) Port and industrial estate advertising (overseas and Australia)—approximately $25 000 per annum.

(iii) Multi-vision programme and film—Port of Adelaide facilities—initial equipment and production costs $17 600.

(iv) Brochures and booklets $638.

(e) Industrial sites at Gillman totalling 14·188 hectares have been sold to 14 separate organisations.

(f) Anro Consortium; Gulf Shipping Services; Aust-Iran Line, (ceased August 1978); Pacific Salt Pty. Ltd.; Kansai Line.

AUCHMUTY INQUIRY

702. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the State working party yet made a submission to the Auchmuty inquiry and, if so, was the submission vetted by Cabinet, will it be made public and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The South Australian Inquiry into Teacher Education has not yet made a submission to the Auchmuty inquiry, nor will it do so. The inquiry, chaired by Mr. K. R. Gilding, was established in February 1979 by the then Minister of Education, with terms of reference which made it quite clear that its relationship to the National Inquiry into Teacher Education is one of co-operative independence. The South Australian inquiry will report to me on or about the end of May 1980.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

705. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many people have been admitted as justices of the peace in South Australia since 16 September 1979?

2. How are these new admissions spread in terms of residence according to suburbs?

3. How many applications in process at 16 September 1979 were rejected on the basis of that particular suburban quota being full:

(a) before the applicant was interviewed by the committee assisting the Attorney-General in these matters and by the local police; and

(b) after such interviews?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. 262.

2. This information can be obtained by inspection of the list of appointments published in the *Government Gazette* of 20 December 1979.

3. *(a)* 77 applications have been rejected since 16 September 1979. Of these, 19 were rejected on basis of the quota for the town or suburb being full, without the applicants being interviewed and police reports obtained.

(b) It is not my policy to give reasons for not recommending persons for appointment, and I am therefore not in a position to supply an answer to this part of the question.

NOARLUNGA HIGH SCHOOL

706. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What land has been set aside for the Noarlunga High School?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: A site of 8 hectares has been purchased in part section 335 of the hundred of Willunga. The site faces Commercial Road.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

716. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice): asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Does the State Transport Authority intend to cancel the 6.25 a.m. train to Virginia and return and if so, will it be replaced with an S.T.A. bus service, or is it the intention of the Government to contract this service to private enterprise?

2. How many such services will be cancelled, and in each case is it the intention of the Government to pass them over to private contractors?

3. When such decisions are made, does the Government hold consultations with the appropriate unions?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. In order to make more effective use of railcars and to provide a more convenient service to patrons, principally school students, the State Transport Authority intends to replace the present morning rail service between Virginia and Salisbury with an authority bus service which can be provided without extra buses or staff. It is not intended to operate this service under contract to private enterprise.

2. There are no current proposals for other changes from rail to bus operation.

3. Conferences are arranged between authority representatives and appropriate unions to discuss proposals for changes to bus, tram and rail services.

AUSTRALIAN RAILWAYS UNION

719. **The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Did the Minister receive a request from the Australian Railways Union for a joint investigation into the costing structure of the catering section of the State Transport Authority and, if so:

(a) was this request granted and, if not, why not; and

(b) has the investigation been completed?

2. Will the Australian Railways Union be given the opportunity to present the findings of their investigation?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: During my discussion with the Australian Railways Union, it was suggested that an internal committee with union representatives be established to investigate the financial aspects of the catering and trading operation of the State Transport Authority. However, I did not accede to this request, as I considered that it would be preferable to arrange for an independent investigation to be carried out. This was done and the investigation has been completed. The Australian Railways Union will be informed of the results after the report has been considered by the State Transport Authority.

PUBLICITY AND DESIGN SECTION

755. **Mr. TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Which six members of the Publicity and Design Section are to be retained and how will they be used and where will the other 17 members be employed?

2. What is the material and financial extent of the investment in plant (particularly machinery and plumbing for the photographic rooms) that exists in the Grenfell Tower for the section and where will the equipment be relocated?

3. What is the extent of rented space for the section in the Grenfell Tower building, what is its cost and what are the terms of the lease?

4. Who will take over the support given by the section to the Constitutional Museum?

5. Who will take over the "Life. Be In It" programme?

6. Will advertising agencies continue to place contracts with the Government Printer and, if not, what employment ramifactions will follow?

7. Of the suggested 85 per cent of Government publicity and design work that was not performed by the Publicity and Design Section, what proportion was done within other Government departments and which departments were they?

8. Of the $570 000 annual operating costs of the section, what proportion was allocated to salaries and how was this allocated among the 23 employees?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. Cabinet has requested a review of the resources required following its decision to de-centralise most of the functions of the Publicity and Design Section. When this review is complete, decisions will be made as to which staff will remain in the Premier's Department and which staff will be re-deployed in other departments.

2. The investment in plant etc. in the Grenfell Centre totalled $280 000, made up of:

	$
Building work—partitioning, painting etc.	55 000
Electrical work—rewiring	20 000
Mechanical work—air conditioning, plumbing etc.	30 000
Audio-visual booth	16 000
Ceilings	14 000
Furniture and specialised equipment	128 000
Architectural design and supervision costs	17 000

Decisions on the relocation of equipment will be made when the review mentioned in Part I (above) is completed.

3. Rented space in the Grenfell Centre covers approximately 850 square metres. Cost to rent including cleaning has been estimated at $79 880 for the year including 30 June 1980. The lease for the floor in question expires on 31 December 1980.

4. The advisory facility of the Publicity Section of the Premier's Department will continue to be available to the Constitutional Museum.

5. "Life. Be In It" maintains its own co-ordinating unit within the Department of Recreation and Sport. The advisory facility of the Publicity Section of the Premier's Department will continue to be available to "Life. Be In It".

6. Advertising agencies may place work with the Government Printer where this work has been undertaken on behalf of a Government department or authority. No ramifications on employment are envisaged.

7. The 85 per cent figure is an estimate arrived at after consultation with the large number of departments which maintain publicity/promotions and information staff. The major departments which handle their own work are Agriculture, Education, Engineering and Water Supply, Further Education, Highways, Lands, Mines and Energy, Police, Services and Supply.

8. The estimated annual operating costs of $570 000 for 1979-80 included an amount of $391 887 for salaries made up as follows:

	$	
Manager	27 581	
Assistant Manager	20 265	
Publicity/Promotions Officer	20 884	
Temporary Publicity/Promotions Officer	20 884	
Journalist	17 514	
Photographers (2)	24 561	
Artists (7)	98 237	
Graduate Officer	14 419	
Liaison Officer	14 419	
Clerk	13 001	
Clerical Officers (6)	58 411	
	$330 176	
Payroll Tax	16 509	
Total for 23 employees		$346 685

In addition to this amount, however, there are the salaries of a further three officers who will not require to be re-deployed as follows:

	$	$
Visual Aids Officer (resigned January 1980)	12 896	
Photographers (2) (one of whom retires in March and the other to retire in May at the conclusion of his current absence on long service leave)	30 154	
	43 050	
Pay-roll Tax	2 152	
		45 202
Total Salaries		$391 887

QUESTION ON NOTICE NO. 469

762. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What is the reason for the delay in answering question number 469?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Negotiations are continuing between the Government and Council of the Hartley College of Advanced Education as to the future use of the college's Kingston campus.

EDUCATION LETTER

766. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What response has the Education Department made to the letter of 23 November 1979 from Mr. Kevin Modra of the Barossa and Light Principals Association to Mr. M. B. Schiller of the department?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: On 4 December 1979 Mr. C. A. Laubsch, Director of Personnel of my Department, replied to Mr. Modra's letter, as follows:

> I refer to your letter to Mr. Schiller dated 23 November 1979 in which you inform him that the following motion was passed at a recent meeting of your Association.
>
> That we write asking for an urgent enquiry into the means of terminating the appointment of unsatisfactory teachers, whether full time or fractional time.
>
> Mr. Schiller has forwarded the letter to me for consideration.
>
> The issue which you raise is a complex one and your Association might find it useful to refer the matter to the Primary and other Principal Associations for discussion within the South Australian Institute of Teachers. At the same time, I, and some of my officers, would be happy to discuss this matter with members of your Association. I suggest that you contact me again to suggest how this might be done.

Mr. Modra subsequently wrote to Mr. Laubsch inviting him to attend a meeting of his Association at the Sandy Creek Primary School on Wednesday 16 April 1980. Mr. Laubsch has accepted this invitation.

WILLUNGA HIGH SCHOOL

768. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is the Minister aware that a "work-in" held at Willunga High School late last year identified as school needs provision of specialist areas in resource/library, drama, P.E., music, agriculture and staff preparation?

2. Which of these needs are included in stages I and II of the redevelopment plan for the school, and what is the current position on the timing of these stages of the redevelopment?

3. When will funding be made available for stages III and IV?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. I am aware and had already replied late last year to the President of the Willunga High School Staff Association who had cited a list of needs of the school involving the provision of specialist areas.

2. Of these, the resource/library and staff administration areas are provided for in stage I of the redevelopment; drama, physical education and music in stage II. Stages I and II have been endorsed by the Public Works Standing Committee and work has commenced on site. Completion is scheduled currently for February, 1981.

3. No date can be given since sufficient priority for this work has not been given that would allow the work to be included in the major works programme scheduled till 1984. The Central Southern Region is one, of course, in which the need to house new enrolments assumes significant emphasis.

YOUNG OFFENDERS

777. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What was the total number of young offenders being held in institutions as at the end of February 1980 and how many were being accommodated in surroundings as similar as possible to the normal family situation?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Number of young offenders held in institutions on 29 February 1980—105.

Number of young offenders accommodated in surroundings as similar as possible to the normal family situation on 29 February 1980—888 including 798 placed with their own families.

QANTAS FLIGHT

780. **Mr. ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What pressure will the Minister exert on the Federal Government for the inclusion of Adelaide in the proposed Qantas flight between Tasmania and New Zealand?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Government is most anxious that the proposed direct flights between Tasmania and New Zealand should be extended to Adelaide.

The travel trade in Adelaide strongly supports this proposal and the Government is currently preparing a submission to the Federal Minister of Transport which will embrace the views of both the trade and the Government with the objective of extending this service into Adelaide.

CROWN LAND

785. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How much unallotted Crown Land is on Kangaroo Island?

2. Is any of the land used for grazing and, if so, under what terms and conditions?

3. How many people hold grazing rights to this land, and who are they?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. There is in excess of 18 000 ha of unallotted Crown land on Kangaroo Island.

2. No.

3. See (2) above.

RIVERLAND

839. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What forms of leasehold tenure which exist in the Riverland irrigation settlement can be converted to freehold under the new Government policy on freeholding?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Irrigation Town Perpetual Leases are the only forms of leasehold tenure which exist in the Riverland Irrigation Settlement which can be converted to freehold under the new Government Policy on Freeholding. The Government is currently considering amendments to the Irrigation Act to enable lessees of Irrigation Perpetual Leases to freehold their properties.

HAWKER ROAD

856. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it the intention of the Highways Department to continue sealing the Hawker to Leigh Creek Road past Parachilna and, if so, when is it anticipated that it will be completed?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Highways Department proposes to continue with sealing the Hawker-Leigh Creek Road and anticipates completing the work in approximately five years time.

KINGOONYA REPLACEMENT

857. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Has a final site been selected for the service town on the new Stuart Highway which will replace Kingoonya?

2. Has any decision been made so that those business houses wishing to transfer can make application for land at the new site and, if not, when is it anticipated that a decision will be made?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. A final site has not yet been selected for a new service town on the Stuart Highway which will replace Kingoonya. The Highways Department has narrowed the site of the junction of the secondary road to service Kingoonya to near Glendambo, which will probably be the site for the new centre.

2. It is not yet possible to be specific about the exact location as this will depend on the availability of water. The Highways Department has advised that testing for water supplies will not commence until April 1980.

RAILWAY CATERING

870. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: When is it likely that the Government will make a public announcement on the future of the catering and trading services operations at the Adelaide Railway Station?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: In the near future.

SECURITY STAFF

871. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Minister inspected the office and the environment in which the security staff in the Adelaide Railway Station are required to work and if not, will he have a joint inspection of these premises with union officials?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows: No. Yes.