HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 29 March 1984

The SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae) took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

QUESTION TIME

TAB SUBAGENCY

Mr OLSEN: Did the Minister of Recreation and Sport have any discussions with the TAB about the location of TAB betting facilities in hotels before the Board made a recommendation that an agency should be established in the Windsor Hotel?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I should first relate the sequence of events which occurred last year after the TAB Easybet legislation did not pass the Upper House. I was approached by TAB management with a suggestion that it might be possible to establish subagencies, as we have in other locations, in other business premises and in hotels. I had discussions with the TAB Manager, Mr Barry Smith, which revolved only around that proposition. I was aware from that time that TAB management had set the machinery in motion to provide hotels with an opportunity to have subagencies on their premises.

A number of hotels was mentioned. Finally, I think in September, a formal letter came to me stating that the decision of the Board was to establish subagencies at the Belair and Windsor Gardens Hotels. I want honourable members to appreciate that the Minister is required by the Act to approve the establishment of subagencies and agencies, and changes of location. I formally replied to that correspondence giving my approval.

The fact that the Windsor Hotel was one of the hotels chosen, and that the Belair Hotel was the other, shows that the TAB did not get any direction from me. As a matter of fact, at the Windsor Hotel (as we know from questions asked yesterday and the fact that I have represented my electorate for some 14 or 15 years) management personnel are known to me. Indeed, I also know the management of the Belair Hotel, but that is coincidental. If I had not approved the Windsor Hotel subagency I think that I would be seriously prejudicing its application and willingness to participate in this experiment.

I point out to the House very seriously that the experiment is, of course, on a trial basis only. Since that decision was made I have had a number of letters from various hotel-keepers. My reply to them has been that they should take up the matter with the TAB. The whole of this exercise seems to have arisen out of a visit from people who claim to be members or former members of the Enfield ALP Club. The Opposition has based its allegations on that information. I could tell honourable members, but I will not, who those people are and the reasons for their approaching the Opposition, but I do not think that is relevant to the argument. All I want to say quite sincerely and honestly is that the decision was made by the TAB and I approved it.

FLINDERS RANGES NATIONAL PARK

Mr WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy report to the House on the status of his Department's exploration programme within the western boundary of the Flinders Ranges National Park? As I recall the Minister's statement on this programme, he reported that stage 2 of the work had been deferred due to adverse weather conditions and that it would resume when the weather became cooler. Has a date for the resumption yet been set?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: A date for the resumption of the work has been set. Work will be resumed on 2 May. It is proposed at this stage that a small team will be in the area to carry out the subsequent work they still need to do in two stages from 2 to 11 May and 28 May to 8 June. Two forms of geophysical investigation will be used: induced polarisation and Sirotem. As I have said previously in the House, working methods have been tested outside the park to ensure that there is minimal impact on the park environment.

This current geophysical work will be concentrated in two areas, the first some distance north of Bunyeroo Gorge and the second about a kilometre south of the park's northern boundary. It is possible that a third area may be selected for geophysical investigation, but this will depend on the results of geological sampling and analysis of samples by Amdel, some of which is now available. If a third site is chosen, then it will be necessary to add another field trip to the two I have already described.

I add to the detail that I have just given the House by reminding honourable members that this matter has been of some concern to conservation groups in South Australian society and to individuals, also, who have written to me on this matter. It is for that reason that I have chosen a course at all times of making known in advance, wherever possible, full details of the work proposed within the park. I am glad of the opportunity to stress once again that the target area in respect of the hoped for lead/zinc mineralisation is well outside the confines of the national park concerned.

TAB SUBAGENCY

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Now that the Minister of Recreation and Sport has confirmed the information given to the House yesterday by the member for Torrens, does he admit that he had discussions with the TAB about the location of TAB facilities before it made its recommendations? Will the Minister confirm that he asked the TAB to rethink its initial suggestions on the location of these facilities in hotels?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: To make the matter very clear, I have already said that I had discussions based on an initiative by the management of the TAB. I do not deny that. The subject matter of those discussions involved the provisions of subagencies in hotels. In regard to location, I recall that a number of hotels were mentioned, a few of them being in country areas. I have said publicly that I believe that the proposition to place subagencies in hotels is probably more appropriate in a country town where there is no TAB subagency. As I say, the whole purpose of the exercise is an experiment in the interests of the racing industry generally. Of course, the TAB has been very successful over the past couple of years because of innovations that have been introduced in regard to turnover. I support those innovations; I support the introduction of subagencies in hotels on a trial basis. Indeed, I repeat: I have already answered the question. I do not know the point of the question—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Opposition, as I said, is hanging its hat on allegations from hearsay and rumour.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: What are the specific accusations of which I am accused? That I directed the TAB—that is not right; that I was to gain some personal advantage by

having a subagency in the Windsor Hotel—that is not right; nor the club with which I am associated—that is not right; or that the hotel was to gain some advantage—that is not right. All the Opposition's allegations are quite unfounded.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the next question I indicate that in the absence of the Minister of Community Welfare and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs that questions directed to him will be taken by the Premier, except for those questions directed to the area of community welfare, which will be taken by the Minister of Mines and Energy. In the absence of the Minister of Education, the Minister for Environment and Planning will take those questions.

PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Mr TRAINER: Will the Minister of Lands say whether it is correct that, following the disinclination of an Opposition member to comply with the requirements of the Pecuniary Interests Register with respect to the position of her spouse, Question No. 245 was placed on the Notice Paper on 15 November last year directed to the Minister of Lands in his capacity as Minister of Services and Supply? Is it also correct that the question was eventually withdrawn from the Notice Paper after the view was expressed that it was probably not appropriate to canvass this matter under Parliamentary privilege in the absence of sufficient firm evidence of there having existed at some stage a clear conflict of interest?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes.

TAB SUBAGENCY

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: My question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport is subsequent to his answers to the questions asked my colleagues. Which hotels did the TAB originally suggest in the Minister's discussions? Was the Windsor Hotel one of them? Why was the Minister not particularly happy about some of them? Why did the Minister ask the TAB to rethink those suggestions? In this House on 13 May last year the Minister, in relation to the location of TAB facilities in hotels, stated:

> There must be Ministerial approval in regard to locations.

He also said:

> The TAB has made suggestions, some of which I am not particularly happy about, and I have asked the TAB to rethink the matter.

He also told the House on the same day:

> Several locations have been suggested, but I do not agree with some of them.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The matter referred to by the member for Torrens involves my relationship in discussions with the TAB about the location of proposed subagencies. In those early days in May last year, as I said, we were discussing the principle involved in subagencies in hotels. The discussions involved me and covered a wide range of aspects of their operation and locations (I am relying on memory of the numbers mentioned). In the Easybet operation the House will recall that there were to be five locations established on a trial basis. The major criterion that I discussed with Mr Smith, the TAB Manager, was the fact that, if we were to establish an agency or a subagency in a hotel, it should not affect already established agencies in that location because it would be a stupid exercise to take money away from an agency that was already established and it would be unfair to the staff of that agency. That was the criterion upon which my suggestion was based. On that basis, I think the Karoonda Hotel was one hotel that was mentioned to me.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Was the Windsor Hotel mentioned?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I think so; the Belair, the Highways Department Building at Walkerville and Football Park were also mentioned—there were about seven or eight suggestions. My suggestion and view were agreed to by the TAB management, that it would not be a good exercise to place them in hotels with an existing agency close by. That is why at that time we had to be careful that we did not do that, and it was the basis of the answer that the honourable member has just referred to.

FLOODING

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Local Government investigate urgently the need to introduce legislation to solve disputation over backyard flooding? I have been approached time and time again by constituents from my district who have had difficulty because of flooding occurring in their yards. Much of this flooding, they suggest, comes from their neighbours and the only action that they have available at present is civil action, which is expensive and time consuming. As a consequence, I believe that I should (and they have asked me to do this) raise this matter with the Minister of Local Government.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member mentioned to me last night that he intended to ask the question. I thank him for that, and my investigations show that the member for Newland also raised these matters with my predecessor and was seeking some resolution of this problem, which is one that I think all members of Parliament run into at some time or other. I have some notes and, as the honourable member says, it is a disputation that occurs because of flood waters that run from one property into another, and that is something that needs to be looked at and I understand that it has been for some time.

The repealed Building Act contained provisions which clearly required councils to consider the rights of adjoining owners prior to giving approval to any building application. New building legislation came into effect on 1 January 1974 and the regulations required the roof or roofs of every building to be provided with a 'complete drainage system' so that certain conditions did not occur. Those conditions did not include water run-off onto adjoining property.

Councils interpreted the requirement for a complete drainage system as meaning drainage out to the street and this interpretation was criticised as being over-regulatory and adding to the cost of building. In 1978 the particular regulation was repealed and a new regulation enacted, which required only that water from the roof or roofs of every building shall be disposed of in such a manner that none of the following conditions occur. Those conditions referred to protection of buildings on the same site and again ignored the rights of adjoining owners.

Successive Governments have been aware of the problem and the need to amend the Local Government Act in such a way that councils would be able, on application from an adjoining owner, to investigate and take action to rectify any problems caused by stormwater run-off. The Government is currently considering amendments to both the Local Government Act and the building regulations in an endeavour to reach a satisfactory solution to the problem. I thank the members for Unley and Newland for raising this matter with my predecessor and me, and I think that all members of Parliament would be pleased to see a legislative resolution to this vexing problem.

WINDSOR HOTEL

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Has the Minister of Recreation and Sport, the Enfield District ALP Social Club or their representatives ever received a gift of liquor from the Windsor Hotel?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The answer is 'No.' As a matter of fact, the business arrangement with the Enfield Club and the Windsor Hotel is purely a business arrangement. Of course, the arrangement is the normal section 67 permit under the Licensing Act upon which, of course, the hotel gives a 10 per cent discount. That is the general discount given to all clubs, as I understand it, and those arrangements have existed for 10 years. I do not know what the honourable member for Davenport is getting at, because the Windsor Hotel has a social club (the Windsor Hotel Social Club) which is one of the few that does the right thing generally, because what they do—

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Quite a few have social clubs. The Windsor Hotel distributes to various schools, charitable organisations, social clubs and others around the district. I am informed that in the past two or three years $20 000 has been distributed, and the Enfield Club and I have refused to accept any offer in this regard, because we trade with that hotel. Management suggested to me that the club ought to get a donation. I have said, 'No.' I have refused because I believe that that is not the ethical practice and not the right thing to do. There may be other people who are members of the Party and who know their hotelkeeper. They may have received a donation. Certainly I personally or the Enfield Club have never received any donation from that social club.

WITTON BLUFF

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say what the Government's intentions are in relation to Witton Bluff? Is there any danger to people as a result of further erosion there, and when will work of any kind begin there?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The Witton Bluff is between Christies Beach and Port Noarlunga on the mid-south coast. It has been subjected to considerable erosion in the past. Of course, that is what cliffs are all about. There was a sea stack (I think that is the geological term) called Gull Rock, which disappeared in a storm in 1926. The Mayor of Noarlunga tells me that, when he was first elected to the council in the mid 1960s, he suggested at the time that the whole of the land on the top of the headland should be acquired and placed under public ownership to prevent development occurring on that headland. That foresighted—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for his assistance. I am aware of that, as I was going to share that knowledge with any members of the House who were not aware of it. That foresighted action was not undertaken and the result is now that the top of the headland is fairly intensively developed. My advisers tell me that there are possibilities of severe erosion which may create problems to houses at the top of the cliff and the people on the bottom. This has not been an easy decision. There is an argument which states that cliffs should be allowed to continue to erode and what the Government should be doing is acquiring all the properties on the top of the cliff, rehousing the people, clearing the site and allowing nature to take its course.

After considerable discussion and some heart searching on this, it has been decided that perhaps that is not the way that we should go. Some years ago the far northern area of the coast (the area immediately adjacent to Christies Beach) was protected. It was not a very attractive job. What one would hope to do is what might be called stage 2: to considerably upgrade the area aesthetically, but there is no doubt that the treatment that was given at that time has prevented further erosion from occurring. So, as the honourable member for Glenelg reminded us, the matter is currently before the Public Works Standing Committee. Officers of the City of Noarlunga have been urged to convert the esplanade at that point to 'one way' to further reduce the impact of traffic, and work will proceed just as soon as appropriate approvals are forthcoming.

WINDSOR HOTEL

Mr OSWALD: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether the Windsor Hotel was one of those originally proposed by the TAB as the location for TAB betting facilities?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I think that I have already answered that question. There were a number of hotels proposed—probably seven or eight—and I understand that the Windsor Hotel was one of those hotels, along with a lot of others and a lot of other sites. There were five originally in Easybet locations. We came up with a situation of general discussion, anyway, and there was nothing in writing. There were a number of suggestions and under the criteria, of course, they should be established away from already established agencies.

SECURITY INDUSTRIES SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CODE

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs, inform the House whether any changes are contemplated to the security industries South Australian code, relating to the licensing of investment advisers? Recent press statements have been made to the effect that any person can be licensed by the Corporate Affairs Commission as an investment adviser.

It has been stated in the press:

> A lot of these people cannot manage a raffle properly, yet they set themselves up to manage people's life savings. It is criminal in all but the eyes of the law.

The press has stated that most of those involved in the industry are honest, but a few bad characters are really getting things in a mess for everybody.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not personally aware of the matters which the honourable member has raised. I will refer the question to my colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Corporate Affairs in another place so that he can bring down a speedy response.

STATE AQUATIC CENTRE

Mr EVANS: Does the Minister of Recreation and Sport still expect work to begin next month on the State Aquatic Centre? The Minister announced last September that the Adelaide Swimming Centre would be extended at a cost of $4.75 million to establish as the State Aquatic Centre. This followed the previous Government's decision to establish the aquatic centre in Hindley Street. In his announcement the Minister said that the new centre would put Adelaide on the international map. He also said that construction would begin next month and be completed by October this year. However, I understand that there is now some doubt

about the Federal Government's contribution to provide funds for the project and that as a result work will not begin on schedule. Will the Minister clarify the situation?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I thank the honourable member for his sensible question. The original costs and estimates of the State Aquatic Centre, which is proposed at the North Adelaide Swimming Pool, have escalated considerably and the Government is considering the position at this time. Additional difficulties with the Adelaide City Council in relation to management and the deficit that may be incurred with regard to the running of the centre after completion have not been finalised. As a matter of fact, the Adelaide City Council is being quite difficult in that matter and, as a consequence, it could place the project in jeopardy.

ACCESS TO BEACHES

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning investigate easier access to South Australian beaches for elderly and disabled persons? Last year I had the privilege of attending a function at Estcourt House, at Tennyson, at which the Minister of Health (Hon. Dr John Cornwall) and the West Lakes Lions Club handed over a three wheeled motorised Suzuki bike and trailer for the carrying of severely disabled persons from that establishment along the coastal beaches. The Coast Protection Board, in conjunction with the Woodville council, also provided a bituminised access for those vehicles through the sand dunes to the beach frontage.

Subsequently I was approached by a constituent who was a paraplegic and resident on the beach front at West Lakes, seeking similar sealed access to the beach frontages. I also had investigated this matter previously, and received correspondence from the Western Australian Department of Youth, Recreation and Sport in which this matter is addressed. It says on page 3:

> Unfortunately, many of Perth's beautiful beaches and scenic picnic sites are inaccessible to people of all ages who have restricted mobility.

This document provides a guide to Perth's picnic sites, parks and ocean beaches for those people with restricted mobility. Will the Minister advise whether he would investigate this matter and bring down a report as to what can be done for easier access for these elderly and disabled people in South Australia?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The short answer is 'yes', but, as honourable members have come to expect, I rarely content myself with a short answer. In looking at this I will be concerned about the conflict that sometimes arises between ease of access on the one hand and concern for environmental values in what after all is a very fragile area on the other hand. If one wants to maximise access to the beach one allows people to drive their cars up and down. That is a situation that has gradually been receding over the years, and for very good reason. Just now there is debate in my own local council area about the continuing access of cars to a portion of the Moana beach as a result of a young lady being knocked down and seriously injured on that beach not so very long ago. I make no bones about it: my preference would certainly be for no cars to be on that beach at all.

Moving back from that situation, the second easiest form of access to the beach is to have an esplanade. We have that along much of our coastline, but that also comes under increasing criticism these days. The conventional wisdom is that one leaves the beach front untouched and has a series of spurs going through to the beach front from an access road that is at the back of the coastal dune system, or such of it as is still with us. Maybe that is what the honourable member has in mind, but in such a form as to make it convenient for people who are handicapped. I will certainly take the matter up and bring back a report, but it will be with those qualifications in mind.

KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Does the Minister of Transport now recognise that his announcement yesterday regarding the *Troubridge* replacement, together with the Government's new formula for charging, if implemented, mean that his Government will effectively abdicate its responsibilities to provide a continuous and affordable vehicular freight service link between Kangaroo Island and the mainland and that the impact of proceeding as proposed will be devastating to the Kangaroo Island resident community generally and to the $23 million per year Island rural sector in particular?

The Hon. Geoff Virgo, Labor Minister of Transport in the mid 1970s, gave an absolute undertaking to provide continuity of sea link service to the Kangaroo Island community. When questioned before the Kangaroo Island Transport Committee at Kingscote in 1977 he (the Hon. Mr Virgo) said in his assurance of continuity of the service that it would be at a price that would not disadvantage the Island community. He went on to say that it was his Government's objective to apply space rates on the Island vehicular ferry service that were comparable with mainland space rates over similar distances.

The district council members who were present at that local meeting and the council's minutes of 16 December 1977 reflect their acceptance also and, indeed, ultimately their adoption of that policy as their own, particularly in relation to the *Troubridge*, then already in operation for some years and subject to replacement consideration even at that time. The then Opposition was approached and the then Leader, David Tonkin, in correspondence dated 20 March 1978, gave an undertaking also, if elected to Government. I quote from his letter to the District Council of Kingscote:

> I can assure your council that in Government we will maintain a public sea link between Kangaroo Island and the mainland. This link would be a vehicular ferry service plying between Kingscote and Outer Harbor, with timetable and space adequate to cater for the movement of stock, machinery, merchandise, vehicles and passengers. Space rates would be comparable with other forms of mainland public transport over similar distances.

That commitment has been honoured as an entrenched objective of principle by both political persuasions in Government throughout the period since private enterprise has vacated its obligation of a vehicular ferry service to Kangaroo Island.

It is claimed by responsible Island residents, including the Mayor of Kingscote and the Chairman of the District Council of Dudley and many others, that the Minister's report dated January 1984, as tabled during his announcement in the House yesterday, was prepared and presented without any local consultation with Island residents, and it constitutes, they say, a disastrous future for the Island community in general and the rural sector in particular if implemented; that is, the proposed $11 million replacement vessel, designed to cater for 180 passengers and vehicular ferry facilities accompanied by what has been described as a devastating formula for charging for its services.

In conclusion of my explanation, I quote to the House a brief paragraph cited on page 1980 of *Hansard*, 9 November 1976, when the Hon. G.T. Virgo said in answer to a question that I raised in this place:

> Yes, but the honourable member would know from his investigations that the *Troubridge* is not a viable operation. In any

case it is certainly not viable from the tourist angle: it is only freight that justifies its existence.

That remark from the then Minister of Transport, recorded in *Hansard,* was a very important point of view that has been honourably upheld by, as I said, both political persuasions since that date. Since yesterday's announcement in the press, we find that the present Government has gone off in a direction of its own with a vessel that seeks to service the freighting and tourist vehicle and passenger requirements of the Island.

It has been put to me by Islanders, and it could be reaffirmed at any time from one end of the Island to the other, that we are well served in that community with air services for passengers, and with the current and potential services envisaged for Cape Jervis. For passenger transport we are more than adequately covered. To attempt to mix passengers with livestock and freight requirements on a new replacement for the *Troubridge* would have the disastrous outcome that I put to the House this morning.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am not aware of the Virgo agreement that he mentioned. I point out that the operating loss for the *Troubridge* is expected to be $3.4 million this financial year, which is an increase from a $2.9 million loss last year. If no action is taken, in the form of an increase in the current rate, even greater losses could be incurred. This situation cannot continue. I am sure that the member for Alexandra agrees with that, and that all honourable members would agree that that cannot continue. The *Troubridge* service represents a massive subsidy to the rural community of Kangaroo Island. It is a huge subsidy, far greater than for any equivalent community. In fact, one could buy half the Island with that sort of money over a few years. The Government is determined to try to recover the operating costs over a period of years. The report states that we will try to achieve that over nine years. If that is not long enough, we may have to try to achieve it over a longer period, but we recommend nine years.

In the notice that I released I stated that the operating costs were not the total costs. The provision of the $11.4 million replacement vessel and the servicing costs for the money will be borne by the Government and not recovered. The *Troubridge* report also recommends that the new pricing policy should be introduced from 1 July this year, and not as the press states from the first year of operation of the new vessel. I make that point quite clear. There will be a 12.5 per cent increase in July this year and a further 12.5 per cent increase in January 1985. Of course, that is a large increase, but there has been no increase in rates since 1981.

The Government is sensitive to the problems faced by Kangaroo Island. We would not be investing more than $12 million if we were going to close down the service or abandon the rural community. However, the Islanders must face up to reality: rates will have to increase to reduce the huge losses. I am sure that with consultation this new system can be introduced without undue impact on Kangaroo Island farmers. The Government is quite willing to discuss these matters and come to a mutually acceptable agreement. The whole purpose of releasing the *Troubridge* report is to make the discussions as informed and realistic as possible. The honourable member said that there was a lack of consultation. The committee that looked into the operation of the *Troubridge* and the replacement vessel met for a period of three months or more, and had numerous consultations with as many people as possible. We will appreciate their comments, and we are quite willing to discuss their concerns with them.

MORTGAGE INSURANCE

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Premier, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs, investigate claims that some mortgage insurance companies are suing members of the South Australian community up to four years after these people have lost their homes because of an inability to pay high mortgage rates? Secondly, if this is the current practice and it is legal, will the Minister introduce legislation to compel mortgage insurance companies and building societies to reveal all costs and responsibilities to a mortgagee?

It was claimed on a radio station in Adelaide this morning that people are being sued by mortgage insurance companies up to four years after they have lost their homes, along with the initial deposit for the house and the money spent on improvements. These people were given no warning that their responsibility when they took out mortgage insurance would mean that the building society would recoup any loss and that the mortgagees would then find themselves having to provide the difference between the sale of their home and the amount owed to the building society. It was further claimed by Jeremy Cordeaux on radio station 5DN this morning that, if this practice is legal, it is highly immoral.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Certainly, as the member has pointed out, it is always distressing to find some years after an extremely difficult and traumatic problem has been experienced by families that these debts and obligations pursue them and hang around their necks like a millstone. The terrible explosion in interest rates happened to coincide with the term of office of the previous Government: the extent to which it is responsible is debatable, but it certainly occurred during its term of office. Interest rates imposed enormous burdens on home owners. Fortunately, interest rates have come down, and with various other schemes of assistance home ownership has been made much easier and more sustainable. However, there are still victims of that terrible period during the depths of the recession who are still encumbered in a way that many of them feel they will never be able to get rid of in the foreseeable future. I think that the member has raised an important question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs to consider, and I am happy to refer the question to him and obtain a report.

WINDSOR HOTEL

Mr INGERSON: Can the Minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON: —of Recreation and Sport produce written proof that the Windsor Hotel was one of the seven or eight hotels originally proposed—

An honourable member: Who wrote that for you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr INGERSON: —by the TAB as a location for the provision of TAB betting facilities? The Minister has had two opportunities to state specifically whether it was the TAB that originally suggested the Windsor Hotel, but he has not done so yet. The Minister said that he thinks it is and understands that it was, but he has not given a firm answer.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I repeat: the discussion that was held between me and the management of TAB was not formalised in writing; it was a general discussion about the principle in general of subagencies in hotels, where they should be, and so on. It was a discussion involving he and me in relation to locations and other matters. I cannot produce any evidence in writing because there is no such evidence. What I am saying is that a number of suggestions were made on both sides in a general discussion. It was a

conversation only, and I am afraid that that is the fact of the matter. There is no written evidence at all in regard to that discussion. A number of hotels were mentioned, and the Windsor I believe was one of them, as well as the Belair, and many others.

HAULAGE VEHICLES

Mr PETERSON: Is the Minister of Transport aware of the difference in standards set by various Australian States for road heavy haulage vehicles, and of the disadvantages to South Australian industries created by these differences? Heavy industry in my electorate manufactures goods for interstate plants, and there have been problems in the past, and there is a current problem, concerning the need to transfer loads that are acceptable in South Australia to other prime movers and low loaders at the State border because of the different requirements of other States. The transfer involves a very high cost in lifting the equipment and using multiple road rigs to do the job. This puts the South Australian manufacturer at quite some disadvantage. As a matter of fact, in one case it was estimated that there was some $20 000 difference just in transport costs to cover the cost involved with requiring different rigs and different cranes.

I am aware of one manufacturer in South Australia which, because of the difficulties with making a compatible agreement with road transport, has been forced to seriously consider using sea transport, but that creates a whole new series of problems with insurance and making sure that the load is secure. It has been put to me that long delays are involved before manufacturers receive a rejection from the Highways Department to applications to transport goods. I cannot understand why rigs that are acceptable in other States are not acceptable in this State. It has been put to me that there is a real need to review the requirements applying in South Australia to bring them into line with other States and remove this disparity in competitiveness created by the cost factor involved in transferring loads.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am aware of the different provisions that apply in the various States. I do not know the exact comparisons, but I will look into the matter for the honourable member. The Federal Minister for Transport (Hon. Mr Morris) established an inquiry into freight rates between the States, and that inquiry is still proceeding. Hopefully, upon its conclusion some of the problems to which the honourable member has referred will be ironed out. I will be pleased to provide the honourable member with some information in regard to comparisons with other States.

WINDSOR HOTEL

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether he first suggested the Windsor Hotel as a TAB subagency, or whether it was the General Manager of the TAB?

The SPEAKER: Order! That question is so similar to a question asked before that I disallow it.

VICTOR HARBOR RAILWAY

Mr BLACKER: Will the Minister of Transport advise this House of the present position of the South Australian Government with respect to the announced closure of the Victor Harbor railway? Did the Minister or the South Australian Government consent to the closure, and, if not, has the announced closure by the Federal Government through its agency, Australian National, breached the railways transfer agreement? If that is so, is the agreement null and void, and does the responsibility of the line revert to the South Australian Government?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The Government has consistently opposed the closure of the Victor Harbor railway line. When the Federal Minister wrote to us asking for our agreement to close that line we replied to him by saying that, as we had previously advised in response to previous correspondence about the Federal Government's planning to discontinue the Victor Harbor railway on 29 February this year, the State Government was opposed to the closure of the Victor Harbor passenger train service and that the service be not discontinued. We opposed the closure on the grounds that discussions on the feasibility of a tourist railway should take place in an atmosphere of mutual co-operation. I believe that the attitude of some parties to those discussions would have been prejudiced had the decision already been taken to withdraw the service.

The deferral of the termination will also give the Commonwealth Government an opportunity to consider the Victor Harbor service as providing possibly a community service obligation, and we would be looking for as much financial assistance as possible from the Commonwealth Government in regard to whatever is developed. In the meantime, the State can assess the level of opposition to the closure of the passenger service and determine whether we wish to invoke the arbitration provisions of the railways transfer agreement. In the press release issued by Australian National last week that point was made. It intends to close the passenger service on 30 April and to maintain the line for a period of six months after that time to allow us the opportunity to discuss the matter with the Department of Tourism to ascertain what we can do to maintain sections of that line as a tourist attraction. What was the other part of the honourable member's question?

Mr BLACKER: If Australian National closes the line, will that represent a breach of the agreement, and would that mean that the agreement becomes null and void? If that is so, will the responsibility revert to the South Australian Government?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: That is what would happen; it would revert to the South Australian Government, and I can tell the honourable member that we do not want the responsibility for that line.

SOUTHERN BUS SERVICES

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport reconsider his decision to not reassess the provision of a bus service from the southern areas, particularly in regard to a service from Brighton, Glenelg and Warradale, to Daws Road Repatriation Hospital? In response to a letter that I wrote to the Minister some time ago, the Minister replied in a letter sent on 24 February. In part, he said:

> The Authority is unable to provide specific services to meet such demands, except by making it easier for passengers to transfer between services using their transfer tickets.

He went on to state:

> When public transport services in the south-western suburbs are next reviewed, provision for an improved public transport access to the Repatriation Hospital at Daw Park will be considered.

The Minister would also be aware that there are well over 3 000 ex-service personnel in the area that I mentioned. If one adds the area of Mitcham, one sees that there are well over 6 000 personnel and their families who are eligible for treatment as outpatients at that hospital. The outpatients and visitors are affected by this lack of service. As the Minister knows, the Repatriation Hospital is being upgraded

at a cost of about $6 million, which means that that hospital will be staying there. It is the only repatriation hospital in South Australia.

The people who travel from the areas that I have mentioned have to do so first by bus to Glenelg, by a tram from Glenelg to Goodwood Road and then by another bus to the hospital. After a three-hour journey they are then faced with a walk of more than a quarter of a mile to the hospital area and the outpatient section. After they have had their treatment these people face another three hours travel back home. Many of those people, who are sick and aged, are faced with this return journey, which is causing them great hardship and concern. I ask the Minister to reassess the situation.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I appreciate the interest that the member for Glenelg has shown in relation to this matter. I understand that he is seeking preselection for the seat of Bright and is determined to try to prove to that community that he would be an admirable member to—

Mr MATHWIN: On a point of order, I suggest that the Minister is being sly and nasty. This is a serious question concerning many people who are aged, ill and infirm.

The SPEAKER: I cannot rule on whether the Minister is being sly and nasty. He is not in breach of Standing Orders because it is not a reflection on the honourable member. I presume he considers it to be somewhat an honour for the honourable member to be in line for preselection to Bright.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I was not making fun of the member for Glenelg. He has been a very good friend of mine since I came into Parliament. I hope he wins preselection because he is an excellent member. I can recall the matter that the honourable member raised with me. The response to his request simply showed that there were not sufficient commuters to set up an additional service to the Repatriation Hospital. The State Transport Authority was hoping that, with the introduction of the new schedules on 12 February this year, it would assist the problem that the honourable member has raised. I will be happy to look again at the matter, reassess the situation and take further checks of the number of commuters who travel to the Repatriation Hospital. If the numbers are growing—and they do change because the patients in the hospital are coming and going—I will look again at the matter for the honourable member and see if something can be done.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION DEVELOPMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to facilitate the development of the site of the Adelaide Railway Station by the construction of a hotel of international standard, an office tower and other improvements; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

On 1 October last year I signed an agreement with Kumagai Gumi and Company Limited and the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust which cleared the way for the development of an international hotel, a commercial office building, an international standard convention centre, and a number of other developments at the Adelaide Railway Station site. This agreement, which I now table, was the culmination of efforts to secure the development of the Adelaide railway station by both my Government and the previous Government.

The major provisions of the agreement were fully outlined to the House in my Ministerial statement of 27 October 1983. Honourable members will recall that I said in that statement that the Government would introduce an empowering statute similar to the Victoria Square (International Hotel) Act, 1980, to give effect to the agreements reached between the Government and the other two parties. Section 2 *(p)* of the document I have just tabled sets out the Government's obligation in this regard.

This Bill provides for an Act which vests the site in the State Transport Authority, provides certain exemptions from State Government and local government rates and charges, streamlines the planning process, and provides temporary access to the site across parklands. Members will see the commitments that the Government has made on these specific matters outlined in the principles for agreement which I shall outline in more detail later. The Bill vests the Railway Station site and its environs in the State Transport Authority. None of the land so vested is parklands. Most of the land has in fact been alienated for railway purposes since the Act No. 126 of 1878 and some of the land is already vested in the State Transport Authority. The clause also clarifies certain difficulties that have arisen in the title. It varies the boundary near the rowing club boat sheds close to the Morphett Street bridge where some encroachment has occurred over the years. It vests in the State Transport Authority part of the roadway between the railway building and the Constitutional Museum. The roadway has always been assumed to be an STA roadway and is maintained by it.

This site has been surveyed and outlined on a plan deposit in the General Registry Office at Adelaide. The Bill also provides that part of the site will be that portion of land detailed in the schedule to the Bill. This portion consists of land which is vested in the Festival Centre Trust. It has been included as part of the site to ensure that it is covered by the same planning controls as the rest of the site but not vested in the State Transport Authority. It has been included because Government believes it is necessary to provide the option for the developers to utilise this area for underground car parking and because in any event this area must ultimately blend with the rest of the development.

However, before any further action is taken in respect to this portion of land, an agreement will have to be reached between the ASER Property Trust and the Adelaide Festival Centre, particularly as it concerns car parking for Trust staff for which the land is currently used. Clause 5 simplifies planning controls concerning the development. The City of Adelaide Development Control Act does not bind the Crown. However, successive Governments have always taken the view that, while the Crown is exempted under the Act, all State Government departments and statutory authorities should act as if bound by it. The principles to be followed in this regard were most recently set out by a Cabinet decision of the previous Government on 17 June 1980 and detailed in Premier's Department Circular No. 39 dated 26 June 1980. These guidelines require that projects by Government departments and statutory authorities should be referred to the City of Adelaide Planning Commission for comment in relation to the principles of control and regulations. They also provide a procedure for resolving disagreements between the developing agency and the Commission which give the final authority to Cabinet.

While this project is not strictly being undertaken by the South Australian Government, it is nevertheless being constructed on property owned by a Government instrumentality. The Government is providing certain incentives by way of concessions, has undertaken to provide financial

guarantees, and will be leasing a substantial proportion of the buildings on completion. Consequently, the Government believes that it is appropriate that this project be regarded as a Government development for the purposes of section 5 of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act. A later clause of the Bill, Clause 8, ensures that the development plans will be subject to comment by the City of Adelaide Planning Commission.

As I have outlined, the intention is that the project be treated as outlined in the Premier's Department circular to which I have referred. Clause 5 also gives the Minister of Public Works the power to grant exemptions from the Building Act. The intention here is simply to ensure that the necessary approvals are given with a minimum of delay. It is not the intention that the project be absolved from the requirements of the Building Act, but rather that it be given a fast track through the approval process. Clause 6 provides for exemptions from rates and taxes and other imposts. Members will see that this clause is in similar terms to section 4 of the Victoria Square (International Hotel) Act, 1980. However, that Act did not provide for council rate exemption as the council itself was involved in the Victoria Square project. It also provided for pay-roll tax exemptions which have not been given to the ASER development. As members would be aware, these concessions are quite appropriate to secure the benefits that developments of this kind bring to the State and, as these rates and taxes are not now being collected, there is no actual cost to the taxpayer.

The question of exemption from council rates has been discussed with the Lord Mayor of the City of Adelaide. Clause 7 of the Bill is designed to facilitate access to the development site. As members would appreciate, the site is adjacent to parklands. This clause gives temporary access during the development stage only. Clause 8 provides for the promulgation of the development plan by way of regulations to allow the Adelaide City Council and the City of Adelaide Planning Commission to make representations in relation to the development, as I have already outlined. As I have pointed out, the Bill is similar to that which was introduced in 1980 to facilitate the development of the Hilton Hotel in Victoria Square. However, that Bill was introduced in advance of any principles of agreement being signed by the Government. I would also remind the House that those principles of agreement were never made available to the Opposition.

The nature of the Bill is such that, as an enabling measure, it does not attempt to deal with every aspect of the proposed development. For example, the question of a guarantee is more appropriately dealt with under the Industries Development Act. The Bill is also not intended to relate directly to each section of the principles for agreement. However, I believe that it would be appropriate if I now went through that agreement in some detail. Much of the document is self-explanatory.

Honourable members will see on page 1 a reference to a separate agreement between Kumagai Gumi and SASFIT who have together formed the ASER Property Trust. As that document involves matters of commercial confidentiality, it will not be tabled. However, the details of the financial relationship between the two partners and the means by which they will finance the project will, of course, be available to the IDC when the question of the guarantee is considered. Page 2 of the principles for agreement sets out the scope of the development and the extent of the investment by Kumagai Gumi and SASFIT. Honourable members will also see that there is provision for the construction of interchange facilities between transport modes, if required. It is not now intended that there be this interchange as its construction is not fundamental to the improvement of public transport, and would not be the most effective use of funds. This was also recognised by the previous Government.

Section 1 of the agreement sets out the obligations of the joint venturers. Members will note that 1 *(e)* requires that design work proceed quickly and that 1 *(f)* gives the Government the power to approve those designs. At this stage, design work is proceeding but is, of course, not yet finalised. Section 1 *(g)* requires the joint venturers to use their best endeavours to ensure that the development complies with the reasonable requirements of the City of Adelaide Planning Commission. I have already outlined the procedure that will be followed in this regard under clause 5 and clause 8 of the Bill.

Section 2 of the agreement sets out the obligations of the South Australian Government. Section 2 *(a)* relates to the definition of the site which is dealt with by clause 4 of the Bill. Section 2 *(b)* of the agreement sets out the rental which should be paid to the State Transport Authority. Section 2 *(c)* provides that the Government shall sublease the convention centre and car park for a period of 40 years. The rental has previously been outlined to the House and comprises 6¼ per cent of the capitalised costs of the convention centre and the car park and 30 per cent of the public areas. The rental is to be adjusted for CPI increases. This type of rental arrangement is identical to that entered into by the previous Government for the construction of law courts in the Moores Building. I will, however, make the point that on this occasion it is being used to facilitate the construction of a revenue generating project.

Section 2 *(d)* provides that the Government will sublease up to 11 000 square metres of available office space or, if it chooses not to do so, guarantee a comparable return. The Government Office Accommodation Committee, which is chaired by an officer of the Public Service Board, has recommended that the Government should take up the option of leasing the available office space. Members will note that the schedule attached to the principles for agreement sets out a minimum rent for the office space. The agreement provides that the rental will be either the minimum as outlined in the formula contained in the schedule, or a fair market rental comparable to many buildings the Government occupies elsewhere in the city, depending on which is the greater. Due to the increase in commercial rents over the past few months, it is now apparent that the Government will be able to sublease the office space for no greater cost than it would need to pay for comparable office space elsewhere in Adelaide.

Section 2 *(e)* relates to the guarantee on the loans provided by Kumagai Gumi and, as I have already stated, this will be dealt with under the Industries Development Act. Section 2 *(f)* relates to a warranty to SASFIT on the return to them from the operation of the international hotel. That warranty would not be applied if a casino was established at any place on the site. Subsequently, the investors have confirmed their understanding that this included the railway station building. However, following the determination of the Casino Supervisory Authority, this warranty no longer has to be given. Section 2 *(g)*, *(h)*, *(i)*, relate to the exemptions from rates, taxes and other imposts, which is dealt with in clause 6 of the Bill.

Section 2 *(j)* provides for the provision of infrastructure during the construction stage of the development, and 2 *(k)* deals with the question of access, which is covered by clause 7 of the Bill. Section 2 *(l)* of the agreement requires the Government to appoint a Minister to give all necessary approvals. I have dealt with this in describing the effect of clause 5 of the Bill. Section 2 *(m)* concerns the right of the body to have first right to lease the railway station. Members will recall that it was this section that prompted the Leader of the Opposition to make certain unsupported allegations

regarding a conspiracy. This section was designed to ensure that any application for a casino within the railway station building, if in fact such a facility was approved, would be integrated with the rest of the development.

Section 2 *(n)* provides that the South Australian Government will not provide direct or indirect financial assistance for any other international hotel within four years of the opening of the hotel comprised in the development. Section 2 *(p)*, as I have explained, relates to the Government's commitment to introduce legislation to give effect to the agreement.

Section 2 *(q)* acknowledges that the approval of the FIRB (Foreign Investment Review Board) is required because of the involvement of Kumagai Gumi in the development. This Bill provides for an enabling Act to facilitate the development of the railway station site. It is not a financial measure and does not commit revenue of the State, except indirectly by way of the exemptions that it provides.

However, the principles for agreement do raise the question of the financial exposure of the Government. There are two issues involved here: first, the guarantee on the loans by Kumagai Gumi and, secondly, the possible subsidies towards the operation of the car park and the convention centre. As regards the guarantee on the loans, this matter will go before the IDC. However, preliminary estimates prepared by Treasury indicate that on average projections there is likely to be an outstanding loan of approximately $25 million after seven years, secured by assets with an estimated net worth of $162 million. As to the convention centre and the car park, our current estimate is that the Government's exposure will be of the order of $1 million per year in 1986 terms.

However, a financial exposure of this order has to be measured against the considerable economic benefits to South Australia and the financial benefits to the Government's revenue. Apart from the benefits of the extra employment that will be created during the construction phase, and the very real boost the development will give to our tourist industry, the Government will gain directly from pay-roll tax receipts and other revenue sources once the exemptions provided in the Act have expired.

In the case of pay-roll tax receipts, there are no exemptions in the Act, as I mentioned previously. At this stage it is not possible to be too precise. This is because the design process is not yet complete. The rental to be paid by the Government varies, depending on the capital cost of the facilities it is leasing, and the Government is concerned that the project be designed in such a way as to maximise the economic benefits. For example, we are still studying the options available for the convention centre. It is already apparent that, by designing a centre that can also be used for exhibitions and perhaps even certain forms of entertainment, we will have a facility which could generate much more revenue.

Members will note that the Bill requires, under clause 8, that regulations be tabled outlining the plan for the development of the site. I will provide the House with full details of the design and the various costs involved when those regulations are tabled. The development of the railway station site has been discussed for some years. It was always clear that the site would not be developed unless the Government was prepared to play an active role in facilitating the development as well as providing incentives to potential developers. The agreement I signed in Tokyo last year, and now this Bill, are important steps to ensure that the project succeeds. It will itself bring enormous benefits to South Australia and also act as a springboard for new growth and development in our economy. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides definitions of terms used in the Bill. Clause 4 provides for the vesting of land. Clause 5 by subclause (2) exempts the proposed development from the requirements of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976. The exemption only applies in relation to the development plan which must be promulgated by regulation. Subclause (3) empowers the Minister of Public Works to give exemptions from the Building Act, 1970, to facilitate the proposed development. Subclause (7) provides for the expiry of the exemptions provided by or under this clause.

Clause 6 provides exemptions from certain rating and taxing legislation. Clause 7 provides for access over and occupation of Adelaide City Council land adjacent to the development site. Before conferring such rights the Minister must confer with the council. Clause 8 provides for the promulgation and amendment of the development plan. Subclause (2) provides for consideration by the Minister responsible for planning of representations made by the Corporation of the City of Adelaide and the City of Adelaide Planning Commission in relation to the plan or an amendment of the plan.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SMALL BUSINESS CORPORATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 March. Page 2986.)

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): This Bill has been addressed by a number of speakers in this debate, most of whom have focused their attention narrowly on other aspects of the skeleton of the material that we need to bring to account in debating this legislation. As my colleagues have stated, the Opposition supports the proposition, although I would have thought that it was possible within the existing framework of education resources, on the one hand, and Government agencies, on the other hand, to accomplish what this Bill sets out to accomplish, in fairly substantial part at least, without the necessity for the measure.

I commend the Government on its insight in including Part III, relating to the functions and powers of the Corporation, and it is to that aspect that my remarks have considerable relevance, particularly clauses 13 and 14. One looks at the record of the Labor Party in Government in this State and elsewhere in Australia: for that Party to ever involve itself in this fashion with business of any kind in general or small business in particular, it brings to mind the picture of an elephant inviting the ants to the dance. I have noted that on any previous occasion the Labor Party, nonetheless intending to be helpful, constructive and useful as to the direction in which it considers a policy ought to go, blunders in, bellowing its invitation, and stomps all over small business, crushing it into the ground, without realising how it has done so or why it has won the animosity of the people whose businesses have been obliterated.

The main substance of the remarks relevant to that matter have been canvassed by various members, and I want to address myself particularly to that problem which underlines the importance of the legislation, and that is our genuine

and real concern for unemployment. We all know that unemployment can be solved largely if we can stimulate and encourage small business in the economy to expand its employment. That should not be seen as meaning that small businesses already in existence, and those as yet to be established perhaps by virtue of the encouragement that this measure will bring to entrepreneurs, will employ people in jobs which already exist or which are to be created but that this measure will mitigate considerably against unemployment, and it will encourage people to consider becoming self-employed as individual owner/operators of a small business. Naturally, that would entail, in all probability, some immediate expansion that would take up the employment capacity of other individuals within their immediate family, of people known to them, close relatives or friends. In that way, however, we can certainly go a long way towards mitigating the effects of unemployment.

Referring to unemployment as it relates to the Bill and acknowledging that the Bill would not be before us if we were not worried about the necessity to inspire, encourage and foster small business to take up the challenge and help resolve the problem of unemployment, I want to refer also to the considerable reading material available on this subject in general and in particular to *Learning and Earning—A study of education and employment opportunities for young people,* which is in two volumes and is produced by the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission. Mr Coughlan is the Acting Chairman, Messrs Dunbar, Houston and Rees are full-time Commissioners (Mr Rees being an Acting Commissioner), and Messrs Goldsworthy and Gzell (who is a silk) and Mr Richardson and Caroline Searby are part-time Commissioners. These books deal with a Commonwealth analysis of obtaining the skills necessary not only to survive but also to prosper.

That is what small business is all about: it is not only about surviving but it is also about prospering. It is useless for us to consider any proposal that merely envisages the establishment of a small business that will enable the individual to barely survive. If the Government, through this measure, does that, as it has done in the past and as other Governments have done by propping up ridiculous, uneconomic and impractical industries such as the glove factory at Whyalla and the Riverland cannery, we will be wasting taxpayers' money and departmental resources, as well as our own energies, in passing this legislation. We will not be inspiring the creation of one new job. Such enterprises on analysis are not viable either, because their technology is irrelevant or because they are unable to be cost competitive in the Australian labour market or for other reasons in the Australian economy where they have to compete with imports or on overseas markets to sell a substantial part of their product.

It is just not sensible to take taxes from viable industries in one sector of the economy and use those taxes to prop up enterprises which are not viable and have no hope of ever being viable, just because we are sentimentally attached to those artificial jobs thereby maintained. It does not help anyone. We need to respect the values outlined in clauses 13 and 14, which are all about what is needed to be known to make a small business work.

I turn now to the theme of unemployment which has inspired us to consider this legislation. With its economic problems and its social evils unemployment is very much a part of our everyday life, and it shows very little sign of improving. In fact, figures released in February, indicate that unemployment has just increased somewhat. Of course, that is to be expected in view of the fairly large number of recent school leavers who are now looking for jobs. However, successive Governments have introduced measures to mitigate the problem of unemployment, and I intend to refer to a number of them.

It is heartening to see that there are many ordinary members of the community who are deeply concerned about and willing to make a contribution to mitigating the distress being experienced by large numbers of young people who, in particular, have been trying unsuccessfully to secure employment although that does not mean that the distress being experienced by older people is any less: it just means that it can have a more enduring consequence for society when that distress is experienced by younger people and involves a greater proportion of the community. It seems to me, therefore, that something more needs to be done along the lines of this measure to try to mitigate those effects and the South Australian Government is doing its bit by introducing this measure and certain other policy initiatives that it has taken (not all of which I would necessarily have pursued).

I want to acknowledge the help I have had from Mr Frank Street, a former Trade Commissioner, in the preparation of information relevant to this Bill. I said earlier that not only do we need to consider that this measure will provide jobs for the unemployed: it is also important that everyone recognises the necessity to seek work and not a pay packet when they go out looking for a job. Too many people have the mentality that what they need is a job because a job means a pay packet. What they need to remember is that the spending power they will have from that pay packet requires them to make an equal contribution—a *quid pro quo*—in value to that of their fellow citizens, so that what they are producing by their efforts in terms of goods and services has a reasonable value to their fellow citizens when their fellow citizens go to exchange their money for the goods and services provided accordingly. In my judgment it is necessary for us to work. One answer to why that is necessary is to be found in the International Covenant on Civil and Political rights, in which it is stated:

> Every human being has the inherent right to life.

Our society has recognised the Federal Government's role under section 51 (xxIIIA) of the Constitution to make laws relating to unemployment benefits and a whole range of social services. This right could be regarded as a recognition of the citizen's right to life and is consistent with it. However, the community's obligation (the rest of us as taxpayers) to assist unemployment is not open-ended; and, in fairness to the taxpayers, those people who are out of work surely have a duty to go and find it.

This measure we will give people a greater opportunity to find work, either as self-employed or as people working for any of the new enterprises that will result from this measure. According to statistics recently released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, 7 141 500 people were in the Australian labour force in December 1983, but only 6 453 800 were employed, 687 600 being unemployed. So, about 4 500 000 people 15 years of age and older who were not in the labour force were not seeking employment. Expressed as a percentage of the total civilian population, the labour force participation rate was 61.3 per cent of all people 15 years of age and older.

In December our national unemployment rate was 9.6 per cent, having risen from 8.9 per cent the previous month. The major concern that we feel about unemployment underlies the need for our consideration of the relevance of such measures as the Bill before the House. An economist, Mr H.W. Herbert, who writes for the *Brisbane Mail,* has conservatively estimated that in 1984 we will need 100 000 new jobs from somewhere if we are to stop unemployment rising. I believe that this measure will help achieve that goal. If the unemployment rate is to be reduced from the seasonally

adjusted figure of 9.2 per cent in December 1983 to 8.2 per cent (a further 1 per cent reduction), 70 000 new jobs must be created throughout Australia. They must be additional jobs, not just jobs that are switched from one business to another. Those 70 000 jobs would represent about 1 per cent of the total Australian work force at present, and South Australia's share, expressed as 10 per cent of the national total, would be 7 000 new jobs that are required to reduce unemployment in this State by 10 per cent. Incidentally, the unemployment rate for South Australia is slightly higher than the current national average while our population is a little less than 10 per cent of the Australian population.

I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a table showing Australian unemployment by age groups and sexes. The figures are taken from the brochure *Youth Wages, Employment and the Labor Force* produced by the Bureau of Labour Market Research and the table is purely statistical. I seek, also, to have three other statistical tables relevant to the information I am presenting to the House inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them. They are titled 'Labour Force Status of the Australian Civilian Population; Unemployed Persons, Australia, December 1983; and Unemployed Persons, States and Territories, December 1983.

Leave granted.

Full-Time Unemployment Rates

	1966 %	1971 %	1976 %	1982 %
15-19 years—				
Males	2.5	3.1	12.1	16.8
Females	3.8	3.6	16.2	19.8
20-24 Years—				
Males	1.3	1.7	6.5	11.5
Females	2.1	1.7	4.6	9.3
25+ years—				
Males	0.9	0.8	2.4	4.2
Females	2.0	1.9	4.0	5.2

Mr LEWIS: I also seek leave to have the following purely statistical tables incorporated in *Hansard*: Labour Force Status of the Australian Civilian Population aged 15 and over, December 1983; Unemployed Persons, Australia, December 1983: and the same table broken up into States rather than into age groups and vocations.

Leave granted.

Labour Force Status of the Australian Civilian Population aged 15 and over, December 1983

	Unit	Males	Females	Persons
Employed	'000	4 039	2 415	6 454
Unemployed	'000	421	267	688
Total Labour Force	'000	4 460	2 682	7 142
Not in Labour Force	'000	1 293	3 206	4 499
Total Civilian Population aged 15 and over	'000	5 753	5 888	11 641
Unemployment rate	%	9.4	10.0	9.6
Participation Rate	%	77.5	45.6	61.3

Unemployed Persons, Australia, December 1983

	Unit	Males	Females	Persons
Number looking for full-time work—				
Aged 15-19	'000	101	83	184
Aged 20 and over	'000	291	125	416
Number looking for part-time work	'000	29	59	88
Total Unemployed	'000	421	267	688

Unemployed Persons, Australia, December 1983

	Unit	Males	Females	Persons
Unemployment rate—looking for full-time work—				
Aged 15-19	%	29.3	29.7	29.5
Aged 20 and over	%	7.6	8.4	7.8
Looking for part-time work	%	10.3	6.4	7.3
Total unemployment Rate	%	9.4	10.0	9.6

Unemployed Persons, States and Territories December 1983

	Persons Unemployed '000	Unemployment Rate '000
New South Wales	253	10.2
Victoria	168	8.8
Queensland	102	9.2
South Australia	64	10.3
Western Australia	68	10.4
Tasmania	20	10.3
Northern Territory	4	6.2
Australian Capital Territory	9	7.1
Australia	688	9.6

Mr LEWIS: I now draw the House's attention (having included that information in support of the remarks I made) to the fact that South Australia's unemployment rate in December last year was 10.3 per cent. The Australian average was 9.6 per cent. We have to examine now why this has occurred, I believe, and see that in the context of how this measure will mitigate the situation. Most of the reasons for our serious unemployment situation have been canvassed in a paper called, 'Discussion Paper on Unemployment', which seeks solutions and which was prepared by the Australian Catholic Social Welfare Commission.

I found the list contained within that paper to be excellent. It states that the reasons for unemployment are the world recession through which we have just come, effects of droughts on rural earnings, which included the three years drought in New South Wales that broke 12 months ago, and our own drought year in South Australia, which was a complete wipe-out, virtually, and which had devastating effects on the economy. The breaking of the drought, of course, has substantially improved all economic indicators. It is not a Hawke led recovery that we have in Australia at present; it is, literally, a rural led recovery as the bumper season we have experienced begins to generate a cashflow through the economy, stimulating demand and confidence, not only of the consumer but also of the investor providing goods and services.

The effect of the drought was, also, to run down stock inventories in a really vicious way such as we have never seen in this country before; in other words, all stocks held by businesses large and small right across the country. Businesses are not only responding to the increased demand from improved consumer confidence, they are also rebuilding their inventories, having used the run-down in stocks to enable them to bring on at an earlier time a replacement of the technology and equipment which they use in production of their goods, thereby improving the relevance of their machinery to the current age. They are doing away with obsolete equipment and replacing it, which is also stimulating the economy. This is, substantially, almost entirely the result of the drought breaking. Unemployment otherwise is as a result of imports from lower wage structure countries. It has also been affected by the greater number of married women who have returned to the work force, due largely to the lack of effective family support policies by Governments, such as no income splitting where one member of a

marriage wishes to work and the other wishes tc stay at home to look after the children.

There are relatively higher award rates for young employees which places them at a disadvantage compared with older experienced employees whom employers find more attractive as an employment alternative. Employers do not wish to have the responsibility of paying out a greater amount of money for the reduced competence of the inexperienced, so they simply do not bother to employ young people if they cannot find an experienced worker. The cost of employing and training young people has become too high for industry. The measure contained in clause 14 addresses that problem in some way by allowing people who have the energy and inclination to go into small business to do so after they have obtained some training, which they undertake to seek as a consequence of certain assistance from the investing bodies through the corporation set up under this Act for a guarantee on their primary finance.

Turning to my other points, there are low average academic or training aspirations in the youth of the nation at present, compared to a few years ago, causing large numbers of relatively under-educated youth to struggle for positions in the shrinking lower skills section of the labour market. There are unrealistice demands for higher living standards not based on gains in productivity. I believe that that has to be part and parcel of any increase in wages. This real wage overhang is a great problem and it will cause greater problems if we continue to expect that we are entitled to increased wages and spending power just because time has passed quite unrelated to any gain in productivity.

There is structural unemployment because of irrelevant technologies. We have not adapted new technologies at the rate that we should, and this Bill will encourage us to do so as a society by providing some incentive to small business to seek to do so. There are high public sector wage structures which tend to give a pull to the private sector employees in their aspirations. Private sector viability has deteriorated as the private sector's share of GNP nearly halved during the early 70s which was largely because of the rapid wage growth which was well in excess of productivity gains.

It was followed later by the wage push and the onset of the world recession on which this Government's Party—the Labor Party—tended to place the blame for everything that went wrong when, in fact, it was Whitlam's own initiative to use the Commonwealth public sector as the trend setter in wages and conditions of employment. There were comparatively poor depreciation allowances, high direct taxation and high inflation which were also disincentives to industry during that period. Finally, we had the decline of the production sector and the displacement of its labour to the service and other tertiary sectors as one of the reasons for our present unemployment. Australia's export earnings can be generated significantly only by production.

We cannot require the rest of the world to pay us for something we have not done. Whilst we can get away with it here in the labour force by having unions which simply will not supply labour to an industry unless it agrees to pay them more, Australia itself cannot go to an international court and say that the world owes us this standard of living. We simply have to work to earn it, and we have not done that in the past. Presently there is a considerable list of programmes available from Governments to assist the unemployed. In fact, in 1981-82, the last year of the Fraser Government, $1.2 billion was spent by that Government on assistance to unemployed persons. This type of benefit is paid to males aged 17 to 64 years inclusive and to females aged 17 to 59 years inclusive. It has always been subject to an income test. A person seeking the benefit has to register with the Commonwealth Employment Service. We all know about the dole. However, during that time the Federal Government did a number of things which this Bill specifically addresses itself to and, because of the way in which other members yesterday and last evening attacked the Federal Government, I want to draw attention to what has happened in that regard. The things which were done and which need to be properly put on the record include:

Commonwealth Rebate for Apprentice Full-time Training (CRAFT Scheme)

Special Assistance Programme, providing subsidies to employers to engage apprentices retrenched by their former employer.

Skills training, including Government/industry co-operation.

School to Work Transition Allowance to enable eligible unemployed young persons to attend TAFE courses. That is a similar kind to that envisaged in clause 14.

Special Youth Employment Training Programme, providing subsidies to employers who make available work experience and on-the-job taining full time for 17 or 34 weeks.

Relocation Assistance Scheme to assist the relocation of unemployed people or those under notice of redundancy.

Fares Assistance Scheme, which helps unemployed people to attend job interviews with prospective employers.

Community-based Youth Programme, which encourage the community to support unemployment youth. These include: Community Youth Support Scheme (CYSS); Voluntary Youth Programme; and Community Youth Special Projects Programme. I have had involvements with all of them in my district.

Mr Evans: Which Government?

Mr LEWIS: This was the Fraser Government that was attacked by members opposite yesterday as having done nothing at all to mitigate unemployment, and I am listing these now and completely refuting that spurious allegation. I refer to the Community Youth Employment Programme—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: That is a joint effort. Who said anything about dole bludgers? Do not be such a lout. You ought to have more sense than to interject in such an inane fashion.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! I am sure that the member for Mallee does not need any assistance in making his speech.

Mr LEWIS: Community groups create new job opportunities in projects of real benefit to the community. Applications for participation in the programme are usually made by councils (that is, local government bodies), service organisations (such as Lions or Rotary), or perhaps a migrant group, that are formally established in their respective communities. Successful sponsor groups will normally be required to contribute 30 per cent of the total budget cost of the project. The latest initiative from the present Federal Government (the Labor Government) is known as 'Work Search' and that was announced in January. It is a group of 27 prominent Australians and the body is called the Committee for the Development of Youth Employment. This campaign was launched by the Prime Minister and has the support of all political Parties, and it has my personal support, for what it means. There are some other things to which I wish to draw to honourable members' attention, but time does not permit me to do that. I will conclude by saying that against this background and the information to which I have referred—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I want to address myself to the Bill before the House because I believe that the stated aims

that the Government has put forward in introducing this legislation certainly indicate that it has high ideals and there is a genuine attempt to assist the small business community. However, I believe that what the Government is doing is purely and simply bringing forward some window dressing. It has also addressed itself quite incorrectly in the manner in which it is going about its stated aim of assisting small business. I believe that the Bill before the House—in fact I not only believe, but I know—has definitely raised the hopes of small businessmen within my electorate. However, what I believe will happen is that those very same small businessmen will have their hopes dashed to the ground because this legislation will not provide the type of assistance which is so desperately needed by small business.

The Government has put an albatross around its neck, because it has stated to the small business community that it is setting up a new Corporation which will be of tremendous assistance to it. However, from a reading of the Bill before the House and from the speeches that have been given from the Government side, I do not believe that there is very much hope at all that small businessmen can pin on this latest move by the Government. The Government stated before the election that it would introduce a Small Business Corporation. It is now doing that, but, unless it can give it the support which it needs, it might just as well have saved the time of the House in bringing this legislation before us to consider. I hope against all hope that this Bill will do what the Premier has stated he intends it to do.

I know of many small businessmen in my electorate who have that same hope, but I believe that it would be quite irresponsible of me not to indicate to the House that I do not believe that the Government will go far enough, and I cannot see a lot of aspects in the Bill that I believe should be there. I hope that my understanding at present turns out in a year's time to be quite incorrect. However, what I am fearful of is that the hopes that have now been raised so high in the small business community will be dashed to the ground, and the bitterness that will then exist in the small business community towards this Government will be very great indeed. The Government will have brought that on itself if it does not (to coin the colloquialism) put its money where its mouth is.

There is no doubt that the way in which this Corporation has been sold to the small business community has made it very attractive indeed. I hope that the book will be as attractive as its cover. I frankly cannot understand why the Government has not purely and simply upgraded the authority, the powers and the expertise within the Small Business Advisory Bureau rather than open up a new corporation. I can only assume that it has done this because it is its political philosophy to have as many QUANGOs as one can possibly have. The personnel who will be introduced to the Corporation could have been employed by the Government within the Small Business Advisory Bureau. I honestly cannot see any need for a new corporation.

I am sure the Premier will agree that the Small Business Advisory Bureau has done a good job with limited resources; all that it needs is additional resources. I cannot see why we need a new corporation, and I make the point again that the staff who are coming into that corporation could easily have come into the Small Business Advisory Bureau and that Bureau, without setting up a new QUANGO and a new bureaucracy could have provided the assistance that is needed much more cheaply than will be the situation with this new Corporation.

The money that will go into running this Corporation could have been spent better within the existing resources by expanding them, as I have previously said. One of the things on which every speaker on both sides of the House agreed is that additional finance is needed by small business; there is no doubt about that at all. There are some entrepreneurs in our South Australian community who have some excellent ideas as to the development of new businesses within the State or the expansion of existing businesses, but the difficulty that they have is obtaining risk capital. I would like a dollar for every small business man in my community who has come to me and said, 'Look, I have tremendous difficulty in obtaining finance.' There is no doubt about that at all: the banks just do not want to know them; they forward them on to their finance companies, and the finance companies charge rates of interest so high that many of the businesses that are being put forward would no longer be viable because of the interest rates that the finance companies would require to to be paid on the loans that would be advanced to these business men.

So, what is desperately needed is a source of funds at a reasonable interest rate to be available as risk capital, as development capital, for small businesses to get under way or to expand. I do not believe that this Corporation will meet that need. Certainly, it will offer guarantees, and I will address myself to that shortly, but, now that we have the amalgamation of the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia, why could not a new bank be set up within that amalgamation, perhaps called the Development Bank of South Australia, with the sole purpose of providing finance to small business within South Australia? The Government could ensure that funding was made available through the combined State and Savings Banks in that new bank, the Development Bank of South Australia. That is a desperate need of small business in South Australia. I ask whether the Premier would seriously consider setting up such a bank; then funding would be available. I will be most interested to ask the Premier when we move into Committee just how much funding he believes will be made available as guarantees to the small business community.

I assure him that millions upon millions of dollars is required in the small business community here in South Australia. I now turn to one other aspect that concerns me about the new Corporation. It is going to be able to provide guarantees on exactly the same bases as guarantees are presently provided by the Industries Development Committee. I am sure that the Premier would agree with me, and I know that at least two of his colleagues agree with me, that the Industries Development Committee has been a very real asset to South Australian development over the years. The Industries Development Committee is made up of two Government members, two Opposition members, and a member of Treasury. I have been fortunate enough to serve on that committee for four years. In that time, under both the previous Government and the present Government, members of this committee have looked at every proposal that has been brought before it in a completely bipartisan manner.

Every proposal that has been presented to the IDC has been looked at as to whether it is in the interests of the State, that is, whether it will generate new jobs or income within the State of South Australia, and if it is deemed that it is, and provided that there are reasonable prospects of the proposal being viable, the IDC would recommend to the Premier that either a loan or a guarantee be given to enable the business to obtain funds to expand or develop in South Australia. I am most concerned that part of the role of the IDC is going to be usurped by the new Corporation. The new Corporation will be able to do exactly the same as the IDC in relation to the provision of Government guarantees for loan moneys. I believe that one will be played off against the other, and that an entreprenuer or a person representing a business will start considering whether he will achieve more success with the IDC or the Corporation.

I am concerned that the new Corporation will not look as closely at proposals as the IDC has done. I think the record of the IDC is outstanding. If one looks at the businesses provided with guarantees or loans by the IDC, one will find over the past four years that there has been no situation in which Government money, that is, taxpayers' funds, has been lost.

I am afraid that the new Corporation could act in a fashion similar to the old SADC. The record of the SADC cannot be compared with the record of the IDC. The record of the IDC is impeccable, because every proposal put before it is looked at closely in a bipartisan manner, in a manner that I have already explained. The new Corporation will not have that advantage, and it could become an avenue of political patronage. That cannot occur with the IDC. We do not want to see a Coalyard Restaurant situation occurring again. That cannot happen under the present structure of the IDC, but it certainly can occur under the way in which the new Corporation is structured. Political pressure will be able to be exerted on the new Corporation; it cannot be exerted on the IDC.

Mr Ferguson: Are you supporting it?

Mr ASHENDEN: The member for Henley Beach must be so thick that he has not been able to follow the points that I have set out so clearly expressing my concerns about the Bill before the House. Unless (as the member for Henley Beach admitted he did in his speech last night) one accepts blindly everything that is put before one, one will be criticised. I have studied the legislation closely. It contains many good ideas, although it has a lot of weaknesses. I am placing on record what I believe to be legitimate concerns regarding things that could go wrong in relation to the new Corporation. The Industries Development Committee is in a position of being able to provide the type of assistance proposed to be provided by this new Corporation. Is it necessary to have two bodies in a position to provide Government guarantees? I would certainly like the Premier to answer that question when he closes the second reading debate.

This involves a duplication of resources. The guaranteeing of loans by the Government through application to the IDC or the new Corporation will be a duplication of function. I can see no good reason at all why the IDC cannot continue with the charge that it presently has to look at all proposals and to make recommendations.

The IDC is not slow in acting. If the member for Mawson were here, I am sure she would agree with me in saying that when necessary the IDC has moved extremely quickly to ensure that finance is made available to South Australian enterprise and industry. I remember one occasion when extreme urgency was involved with an application, at which time the committee met and made a recommendation within 24 hours of the first approach to the IDC for assistance by a certain firm. I can think of another occasion where the IDC met on two occasions between Christmas Day and new year's day, then, very early in the new year when public offices in South Australia were closed. The committee came together because of the situation that existed with the industry which was involved and which needed considerable help.

We were then able to make a recommendation to the Treasurer, following which the finance was made available. That company is now surviving, and the last information that I received indicated that it is trading well and that it will get out of the difficulties that it was in. So, the committee can meet quickly and it can act quickly. It has the interest of the South Australian community very much at heart, and I believe that over the years it has played an extremely important role. When we have something that is working well, why do we need duplication in an area where political pressure can be exerted?

The record of the SADC is such that I am genuinely concerned that this new Corporation will go the same way. It will provide for funds to be spent in certain areas which simply will be throwing good money after bad. Pressure can be applied by a Government if it believes that, unless certain action is taken, the result may not be in its best interests. I do not believe that the Frozen Food Factory or the Government Clothing Factory can ever be put foward as being examples of decisions made in the best interests of the State. They were political decisions, and I am extremely fearful that the same sort of thing will recur through this new Corporation.

The SADC incurred huge losses because of political patronage and philosophy, and for no other reason. The IDC has never been involved in that sort of situation. It has never made recommendations for financial support where it was believed that developments (such as the Frozen Food Factory and the Government Clothing Factory) would simply chew up millions of dollars of taxpayers' funds. I believe that this could now again occur. One has merely to look at provisions of clause 13 to see why I have such concern. In part, clause 13 provides as follows:

(1) Subject to subsection (2), the Corporation may guarantee liabilities of a person under a loan entered into, or to be entered into, for the purposes of a small business or proposed small business.

(2) The giving of a guarantee under subsection (1) is subject to the following provisions:

(a) the total amount of each person's liabilities in respect of which guarantees are given under this section must not exceed such limit as is from time to time fixed by the Treasurer;

(b) the total amount of all liabilities in respect of which guarantees are given under this section must not exceed such limit as is from time to time fixed by the Treasurer;

Clause 13 then continues. In other words, the limit of the guarantee that can be given by this new corporation is entirely within the Treasurer's hands. Therefore, if he wishes, he can lift the guarantee to $1 million, $2 million, or $10 million. Again, we will have a frozen food factory and could have a Government clothing factory. There is absolutely nothing to stop it under the present legislation.

Mr Mathwin: It is dangerous legislation.

Mr ASHENDEN: I agree with the member for Glenelg that it is dangerous legislation because it opens the door for any Government to provide any degree of assistance to any proposal. That situation cannot occur with the Industries Development Committee. I believe that, if this clause is going to stay in, it must be amended. A maximum must be written into the legislation above which a guarantee cannot be given by the corporation, and above which the application must go to the Industries Development Committee. I am not for one minute suggesting an amount above the suggestion by the Opposition of $50 000 should not be available. There is nothing to stop a person or business requiring a guarantee of greater than $50 000 applying to the Industries Development Committee for that guarantee. That person will be treated well, his application will be treated quickly, and I will be only too happy to go through the records of the present Industries Development Committee to show the expeditious manner in which it has considered applications before it. This Corporation cannot and must not be given powers that could be abused and not used in the best interests of South Australian industry or the State's taxpayers.

I trust that the Premier will accept the Opposition's amendment in this area because in no way will it stop assistance being given on amounts greater than $50 000: it will just place a control on any Government. Even if the Premier gives us categorical assurances of what will occur while he is in office, unless it is in the legislation it will not bind future Treasurers or future Governments. It is far too open.

In conclusion, I therefore state quite clearly, for the benefit of the member for Henley Beach, that the ideals and aims purported to be the reasons for the Government's bringing this legislation before the House are good ones. I am extremely concerned, however, that these aims will not be achieved and that the high hopes that have been raised in the small business community will not be met. If that happens, the Government will be damned and will deserve that damnation. If it does not happen and this new corporation is able to grant assistance to the small business community, as it desperately needs, there is no doubt that the Government will stand highly praised and will deserve such praise.

However, there are areas in which caution must be expressed. I have stated the areas that cause me considerable concern. I hope that this new corporation works. I hope the costs to the South Australian taxpayer do not outweigh the benefits to the South Australian community. I hope it will not be used for political patronage, for frozen food factories or for Government clothing factories. I hope that the Premier will accept the limitation to clause 13 that the Opposition will be moving so that no Government guarantees will be considered by the Corporation if the amount of the loan exceeds $50 000.

The role of the Industries Development Committee must not be usurped: it has played a major part in the development of industry in South Australia ever since Sir Thomas Playford's day. I urge the Government to seriously consider my suggestion that a new division be considered within the amalgamated State Bank and Savings Bank of South Australia, and that a Development Bank of South Australia be established with a specific aim of providing risk capital and development capital so desperately needed in South Australia by small businesses. From the information I have received from constituents in my electorate, who are small business men, that is what they desperately need, not just education and advice, but an avenue of finance.

Mr Ferguson: You haven't read the report.

Mr ASHENDEN: For goodness sake! The member for Henley Beach is pathetic: of course I have read the report, but I have also listened to what small business men in my area have said. I am representing the interests of my small business men and the business community in South Australia which need an avenue of finance. This Corporation will not provide the opening that they so desperately want. I cannot understand why the Premier is treating my suggestions so lightheartedly, because they are put forward in a genuine manner, on the basis of the feedback I am receiving in my electorate. If the Premier does not want to hear it, be it on his shoulders. This Corporation will not provide the avenue of funding that is sought by so much of the business community today. That is why I have suggested the new Development Bank of South Australia and made other suggestions over the past 25 minutes. I hope that this Bill will provide the desperately needed assistance that the small business community in South Australia needs, but I am extremely concerned that it will not. However, I hope that that will not be the case.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the Bill, which is enabling legislation to implement an election promise of the Labor Government. It fulfils a major commitment by the Government to actively encourage the development of small business in South Australia, and it is designed to upgrade the assistance provided to small business by Government so that our enterprises are given the best chance to survive and prosper. I have taken that statement from the Premier's second reading explanation and it expresses highly commendable objectives.

The legislation proposed will not necessarily bring about the results that the Government expects of it. However, it is a reasonable attempt to provide in legislation for a corporation which has broad enough powers so that some discretion can be exercised by the members of that corporation: that is a commendable objective. It will not be a panacea for small business by any means and it is one which could bring about disappointment for many sections of the small business community. There should not be a corporation that will prop up every ailing small business: there should be a corporation, together with departmental and Government facilities, to promote worthwhile small business and those enterprises that have a reasonable expectation of succeeding, thereby providing employment for the general community.

The major initiatives encompassed by this Bill include the upgrading and expansion of advisory and counselling services, the co-ordination, promotion and possible conduct of training and educational programmes for small business management, and the provision of financial assistance for small business by way of grant or loan guarantees to enhance the efficiency of a small business operation. It was stated in the second reading explanation:

> The Corporation also will perform an important advocacy role and will monitor the impact on small business of all new legislation and regulations. It is intended in this legislation to establish a facility which will co-ordinate all available sources of assistance and information for the benefit of small business. The Corporation is intended to be a 'one-stop shop' for people intending to start a small business, wishing to expand existing operations, or experiencing difficulty and needing advice.
>
> This Bill gives the Corporation the ability to design and implement a range of initiatives to assist small business, and allows a degree of flexibility to the Corporation in carrying out its functions . . . The Board will comprise seven members, all but one of whom will be drawn from the private sector. Members will come from a wide spectrum of business and possess considerable expertise in small business matters.

I believe that they are good objectives, but only time will tell, and there was much debate last night and today as to the effectiveness of the Corporation. It would not matter how many words were spoken in this House now: the real test is the practical test of whether the Corporation will be able to succeed. Although it is within the powers of the Corporation to perform an important advocacy role and monitor the impact on small business of all new legislation and regulations, I believe that that feature must be expanded because, if the Corporation acts in the way in which I suspect it will act, one of its first recommendations will be to get Government regulations and red tape off the back of small business. That reflects some of the predominant difficulties that small businesses face today.

Some time ago I was talking to a general agent in a small country town who handles numerous commodities and who was, in general terms, the focal point of that country town. He told me that he had 54 licences, permits or authorities required by Government legislation or regulation to operate a general agency business. It surprises me considerably that it was necessary for that general agent to have 54 such licences, permits and authorities, most of which involved a licence fee. If small business is subjected to that kind of regulation, hopefully this Corporation will recognise the fact and recommend to the Government that it should cut out red tape and let small business get on with the work it is best able to do.

Over the years I have had numerous contacts with the Small Business Advisory Unit. While many of those inquiries have not resulted in Government loans or guarantees being provided to small business, nevertheless the Unit has served a very useful advisory role. As was stated, some members believe that an expansion of the Small Business Advisory Unit would provide an adequate role and would cut out

the apparent or expected cost of setting up the Corporation. We could talk about this matter all day, but we should wait to see what happens.

I believe that everyone is approaching this proposal in good faith, but I hope that false expectations are not built up by people who want to develop or establish a business and who have not really thought through the matter. In that sense, not only will the Corporation be an enabling body: it will also have to vet very carefully those applicants who are genuine and those who are not so genuine. Clause 10, in relation to functions and powers of the Corporation, provides:

(1) The functions of the Corporation are as follows:
(a) to provide advice to persons engaged in, or proposing to establish, small businesses;
(b) to promote awareness of the value of proper management practices in the conduct of small businesses and to promote, co-ordinate and, if necessary, conduct training and educational programmes relating to the management of small businesses;
(c) to disseminate information for the guidance of persons engaged in, or proposing to establish, small businesses;
(d) to monitor the effect upon small business of—
(i) the policies and practices of the Governments of the State and Commonwealth and of local government;
and
(ii) Commonwealth and State law (including local government by-laws),
and to make appropriate representations in the interests of small business;

Obviously that, clause is designed to pick out the best of relevant State and Commonwealth legislation and I applaud that. Quite often if one looks over a neighbour's fence one can find the answer to one's own problems. The clause continues:

(e) to consult and co-operate with persons and bodies representative of small business and, where appropriate, represent their views to Governments;
(f) to provide financial assistance to small businesses by way of the guarantee of loans or the making of grants under this Act;
and
(g) generally, to promote and assist the development of the small business sector of the State's economy.
(2) For the purposes of this Act, the Corporation may—
(a) acquire, hold, deal with and dispose of real and personal property;
(b) enter into any kind of contract or arrangement with other persons;
(c) acquire or incur any other rights or liabilities;
or
(d) exercise any other powers that are contemplated by this Act or necessary or expedient for the efficient performance of its functions.

I believe that the powers of clause 10 (2) are wide sweeping and I would not like to see another commission, similar to the Land Commission, set up under the guise of the Small Business Corporation and going to that extreme. I would appreciate an indication from the Premier that that cannot and will not be the case.

I support this Bill, the intentions of which I believe are good, although I do expect some problems in its practical application. However, I think that if all persons approach it with goodwill the small business community of this State will benefit.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I support the Bill. I am disappointed at some of the remarks made by Government members in the debate so far. It seemed to me as though they believed that the previous Liberal Government was completely anti-business and did not have incentives to help small business. I thought most of their arguments were weak. It is well known that the previous Government did everything in its power to help small business. We will see what the situation is like after another two years. I would not crow too much until we see whether the economy improves.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: Do not forget that the effects of modern technology cannot necessarily be overcome by Government legislation: it represents progress, and people have to go along with technological changes. I was very unimpressed by many of the comments made by members of the Government, especially the member for Hartley, who said that wages are not a major factor in business today. That is an absolutely ridiculous statement to make. I would love to know what he has to say about the article on the right-hand side of the front page of today's paper. In relation to the significance of wages, I will take the example of a self-employed builder. He would probably charge about $12 or $14 an hour for his services, and if he also employed an apprentice he would be more likely to charge $14 or $16 an hour for his services plus the cost of the apprentice, which could vary from between $6 and $10 an hour.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

Mr MEIER: The figures given by me before the luncheon adjournment are interesting when compared to the cost of a part-time builder who may engage in weekend work and charge from $8 to $10 an hour. Again, a larger building company employing between five and 20 or more persons may charge from $23 to $30 an hour. One of the big problems facing small business is clearly that, as soon as it starts to employ additional persons, its overheads rise enormously: not only does the wage bill increase, but so too, do superannuation, workmens compensation and rent. However, wages are an important part of the costs of any small business.

The Small Business Advisory Bureau has done a marvellous job, as I know from personal experience, and I compliment the head of the Bureau, Mr Peter Elder, who was most helpful when I have brought matters concerning constituents in the Goyder District before him. Mr Elder was able to advise on what should be done and where my constituents should go for further information. He also examined any new venture to which his attention was drawn and advised whether or not the State Government could give aid. The main criterion for assistance from the Small Business Advisory Bureau has been the likelihood of the new business creating new jobs (four or five jobs has been the required minimum before financial help has been forthcoming). Will this new Corporation be subject to such a criterion in respect of financial aid that may be given to a small business? After all, I do not see much point in setting up a new organisation if the conditions applying to its operations are similar to those that have operated in respect of the former organisation.

I see the new Corporation as a new model, the old model being the Bureau. Possibly we can find an analogy in the automobile industry, where the old model can fulfil its function satisfactorily but the new model has advantages and can often function better, even though it may fall short in one or two respects. However, one hopes that the new Corporation will do all that the Premier has said it will do. I look forward to making representations to it on behalf of business interests in my district so that such interests may receive the benefits that may flow from the State Government. I trust that the Corporation will result in a boost to South Australia.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I shall speak only briefly on the Bill because previous speakers have covered all the worthwhile points. I support the Bill because, prior to the last election, members of this Government told the people that, if they were elected to office, they would set up such a Corporation especially for small businesses, and this Government was elected with that plank as part of its policy.

However, if I had to decide myself, I would not support the establishment of such an organisation because I believe that there is a better way of making money available to private enterprise through the State Bank and the Savings Bank. I hope that the Corporation does not become a body that subsidises people towards failure and that it does not subsidise inefficiency because, if it does, a person conducting a successful business by means of hard work, sacrifice, and efficiency will be penalised, whereas a person guilty of waste, neglect of business, and bad management may go to the Corporation and obtain help.

I join my Leader and other members on this side in claiming that one of the problems today concerns the controls and regulations that bind small business. I hope that this Corporation will examine that area and recommend to the Government a reduction of the paper work that must be done by small businesses. Indeed, small business proprietors who work long hours running their business must often spend hours over the weekend doing their paper work while the rest of the community spends its leisure time in recreation or looking after the garden. As the people, by their vote, said that they would support the setting up of such a Corporation, let us see whether it can function successfully. I support the Bill, subject to the amendments foreshadowed by my Leader.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): This has been an odd sort of debate, a much longer one than I expected. Indeed, most speakers commenced their remarks by saying that they supported the Bill but, unfortunately, as many of the speeches developed it became apparent that members opposite were giving the legislation only grudging support. One could almost feel the resentment on the part of members opposite because a Government of our political persuasion had taken such vigorous action in support of small business and because of the way that we seem to be stealing a constituency for which members opposite claim to have a special privilege of representation. However, my Party has always been involved with the workers and with small business in our community. The populist philosophy bound up in our democratic socialist tradition embodies very much the concept of smallholders and small business, and much of our legislation and activity has been directed to that end over the years.

On the contrary, our conservative opponents, by and large, have represented big business and monopoly capitalism in our community. My latter statement is, I concede, a crude categorisation and generalisation of the true position that does not apply generally but, on our side, it is a crude categorisation to suggest that we in some way are hostile to small business or do not have the concern of small business at heart. To the contrary many of our members are involved in small business and every member on this side acknowledges the value of small business to our economy. So, on that point at least, members on both sides are on common ground.

Many of the points raised by members in this debate will be dealt with in Committee. I was especially disappointed with the approach of the Leader of the Opposition because it was a shallow and negative approach—a case of 'Damn with faint praise, assent with civil leer', as Alexander Pope said. The Leader talked not so much about the substance of the Bill and what it set out to do but tossed around a whole series of slogans and talked about the great tax burden that members on this side had imposed on the community, showing his usual total inability to understand the reasons behind the legislation.

I repeat, as I have said many times, that if the Government of this State is not able to deliver the services and facilities expected of it by the community, or if it does not have the resources to do that, then the whole community suffers. A bankrupt Government will lead to bankrupt business, and to bankrupt small business particularly. That is what we are facing. Then we had a number of very broad statements about red tape and this hoary question of the Deregulation Unit that some members have talked about (and some members have talked about window dressing). In this case, if that is not window dressing, I do not know what is.

I again put on the record that this Government does support deregulation. We believe, on our examination and analysis of the Deregulation Unit, that in fact it was bureaucracy in order to reduce burueacracy with the result that where those regulations were being made, and where the action was in the departments, they were able to, in effect, absolve themselves of any responsibility. On questioning, they would say, 'That is being handled by the Deregulation Unit.' We have put the responsibility for deregulation back where it belongs—in the departments where the regulations are being framed. We have a number of projects which the deregulation unit was handling and which we picked up. They are still proceeding, have no illusions about that.

Deregulation is part of our overall policy of streamlining the Public Service and its bureaucracy, but we do not do it by creating a bureaucratic division. We put it back into the departments themselves. Of course, then we have, finally, the concept of getting out of the way of business. I am amazed that any member of Parliament, or any serious student of our economy, still continues to produce that particular phrase. It was the disastrous 'Get out of the way of business' policies of Fraser, coupled with those of Tonkin in this State for an unhappy three years, that plunged our economy into the deepest recession since the 1930s.

I say again very firmly indeed that all the evidence is that unless the public sector is working in close partnership in a healthy state with the private sector we simply will not get private development. I would have thought that that former experiment had been tried and had failed totally. We are now trying to pick up the pieces and do something about it. I would have thought that a creative Opposition could move on from that old fashioned doctrine of the 1970s which has palpably failed and start telling us about some new directions it thinks the State can take. But no, we get all the old phrases. If we get out of the way of business it would collapse. We must work together with business in partnership. It is not a case of anyone, in fact, getting out of anyone else's way. It is a case of us marching forward together in co-operation and partnership. That is the crucial point and it is a point I have stressed again and again.

I invite any members of the Opposition to speak to those in business and to ask them what they think of this approach and how they think it is benefiting them. I think they will get the response that 'Yes', indeed they do welcome it. It is odd, having set up that kind of rhetoric, that we still get members in their addresses on this subject talking about more resources being devoted to incentives to industry: more of this, more expenditure on that, the corporation cannot work unless it has a big budget, and so on. One cannot have it both ways. I happen to believe that the health of the public and private sectors is intertwined. That is the policy my Government is following. If those on the other side of the House have a better idea and (not a discredited one) to put up we are prepared to look at it. Some of their contributions I think were well researched and constructed. The member for Bragg, particularly, I thought had done a lot of work on the facts, figures and statistics. His analysis of the Bill was well worthwhile. Also, there were points in other members' contributions that I think were important. But that approach to the Bill is surely

the way we should be treating it in the Committee debate—a constructive approach to see how best to make this legislation work.

It is not a case of duplicating things that are in other areas of Government, as some members have alleged. Part of the whole philosophy behind the Small Business Corporation and the Report of the Working Party into Small Business is the concept of one stop shopping, not being sent off somewhere else or off to another department or committee, but to be able to go to one central point that can assess the total needs and meet them totally at that point. That is embodied in the Bill. That is why it has powers to provide guarantees for loans; that is why it has some limited powers to provide assistance in financial areas. They are present in order not to duplicate facilities which are appropriate for other areas of business but to ensure that the small businessman is not confused by going into a series of departments, divisions or whatever. He can go to an independent corporation which is supported by the Government and which he would see as his advocate. If that is how the Small Business Corporation operates I believe it is going to provide benefits for small business—not all the answers but very distinct benefits. I hope that the very lukewarm support expressed by members opposite will be translated into a much more vigorous support of the Corporation when it is eventually established.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr INGERSON: Subclause *(b)* mentions a business or undertaking of a 'class'. Could the Premier explain what 'class' means?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A class of business relates to, say, delicatessens, or something of that nature. It is unlikely that that sort of categorisation would be used because there are a few classes that could be defined as exclusive to small business. It may be that that is a convenient way of doing it.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Constitution of the Corporation.'

Mr OLSEN: I seek clarification from the Premier in relation to the Board's composition. Subclause (1) *(b)* provides:

> . . . the remainder shall be persons appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister.

In the Labor Party policy, particularly as it relates to small business, it is indicated that representatives of small business will be included on the board of the Corporation. Will the Premier say on what basis the remaining members, other than the head of the Department of State Development, are appointed? What mechanisms will be used by the Government for people representing small business to be appointed? Will it be the employer or small business organisations who nominate specific people? Will the Government seek people with particular expertise in the small business area? And, of the total number of people left to the discretion of the Minister to select or nominate to the Governor in Council to be appointed to the board, how many will come from the small business community who practise their day-to-day activities in that area?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The intention, certainly, is to have a very adequate mix of professional and practical skills on the board with an emphasis on direct experience in small business. In selecting such persons the Government will consult with various representative organisations of small business. We have not determined whether we will actually ask them to nominate individuals. It is more likely that we will ask them to give us a few names to which the Government can give consideration. I think that it is important not to have direct representatives on such a body so that those who are actually on it feel that they are part of an individual corporation and not a representative of the particular interests of the small business organisation or group to which they belong. When I talked about a mix of professional and practical skills, by 'professional' I meant that we should have people with the relevant background in things such as marketing, accounting or legal affairs on the board. For instance, there is probably a case for someone experienced in corporate law to be on the board. The way in which the clause is drawn provides a flexibility in selecting these persons, but they will be selected after the consultation process I have described.

Mr OLSEN: I want to take the matter one step further as it relates to the last point put by the Premier. I concur with the point that if one seeks representatives from various representative bodies then there are difficulties stipulating that in the legislation. For that reason, whilst we considered such an amendment to the legislation, we refrained from introducing it for the reasons advanced by the Premier. My concern is that the majority of the remainder of those persons (if not all of them I believe) appointed by the Governor in Council ought to be from the small business sector. I trust and I seek an assurance from the Premier that those persons will not come from the Public Service, as such, even if they have marketing skills, accountancy skills, or corporate planning skills, because I think that there is a world of difference in terms of understanding some of the difficulties that small businesses face *versus* those in the Public Service, which has a somewhat different structure. Therefore, people in the Public Service are not directly related to the day-to-day experiences of small business. If the Small Business Corporation is to work, it has to have people with that practical day-to-day experience right through the structure, not only at officer level but also at board level. I am seeking an assurance from the Minister that at least half, if not all (but by far the majority), of people appointed will be practising small businessmen, and not come from the public sector.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The only public sector position that is secured is that of the Director of the Department of State Development. I think that, because of the nature of that position, the occupant of that position in many cases will be someone who has had some experience in business. Certainly the current incumbent falls into that category. As I see it, that would be the way in which the interconnection with the Government is established. However, I would agree certainly that the majority of the members of the Corporation should not be drawn from the Public Service. It may be that there are one or two other Public Service type skills or individuals that could make a contribution. However, I use the term 'one or two' advisedly. One would then have three, say, out of seven at the most. At this stage we have made no final decision, but certainly the majority would be drawn from outside the Public Service.

Mr INGERSON: I refer to clause 5 (1) *(a)*. Some associations have expressed concern at the possibility that the position of the departmental head may be downgraded, or that someone of high standing within the Department may not be used. I think that this is a matter of clarification as to how the Premier perceived that person's role and who he may be, and I seek his comments on this matter.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As a matter of preference, we would perceive the permanent head being a person on the Corporation. If there is to be a delegation from time to time as suggested in the Act, then at the very least we would envisage an officer at the level one or two down from the permanent head, in other words, a senior officer. To do otherwise would defeat the purpose of securing that position,

which is to ensure that the Corporation has immediately at its disposal access to the Department of State Development and its various facilities and services. Ideally, that is through the permanent head. However, if for some reason (such as time constraints or whatever) the permanent head finds matters difficult, certainly the appointment should be at a high decision making level, otherwise its purpose will be lost.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'Terms and conditions of office.'

The CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable Leader wish to move the whole of the proposed amendment? It is linked, but I do not know how.

Mr OLSEN: I move:

Page 2, lines 41 and 42—

Page 3, lines 1 to 3—Leave out subclause (1) and insert subclauses as follows:

(1) Subject to subsection (1a), an appointed member shall be appointed for a term of office of three years and upon such conditions as may be determined by the Governor upon the recommendation of the Minister.

(1a) Three of the members first appointed upon the commencement of this Act shall be appointed for a term of office of eighteen months.

(1b) An appointed member shall, upon the expiration of his term of office, be eligible for re-appointment.

Page 3, lines 24 to 26—Leave out subclause (5) and insert subclause as follows:

(5) Upon the office of an appointed member becoming vacant, a person shall be appointed, in accordance with this Act, to the vacant office, but where the office of a member becomes vacant before the expiration of the term for which he was appointed, a person appointed in his place shall be appointed only for the balance of the term of his predecessor.

The amendment to lines 24 to 26 is really consequential. The purpose of this amendment is to follow a very consistent line by the Liberal Party as it relates to terms of office for boards of this nature. It has certainly been consistent with the practice we have followed in Government and in amendments that we have proposed to various legislative matters introduced by the Government. We believe that it is important that the legislation provides for staggering of appointments every 18 months so that the composition of the board or Corporation shall alter after that 18-month period and so that there is not a complete change of Board membership every three years.

I recognise that members are eligible for reappointment and it might not be that all members of the board go off and are replaced by new members. However, I think that for continuity and job functions of the board, it is important to roll over or stagger the composition of the board so that one has a continuity of work process of the board. At the same time, the 18-month cycle brings in new ideas and initiatives as a result of changed economic conditions or changed circumstances within the community, and gets a greater number of people involved in the Small Business Corporation to contribute to the direction that that Corporation should take. However, the amendment revolves around the principle my Party believes in, that it is appropriate to stagger such appointments so that one does not have the prospect or possibility of a complete board being changed overnight, thereby destroying the continuity of board proceedings, decision making, and policy direction for the staff to follow. That is one of the most important factors that the business community requires: predictability in actions and direction of Government instrumentalities. I think that that also applies to policy development of a Board such as this. One needs some predictability in actions and directions of the board. By staggering appointments one can at least be more reassured that some continuity in policy making of the board will take place.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not disagree with the principle that the Leader is enunciating, but I believe that the amendment will make the clause somewhat inflexible. This clause is a standard one that is present in many pieces of legislation. In practice it would be the intention of the Government to appoint the Corporation initially with staggered terms so that we would achieve the result about which the Leader is talking. What he says is, as I say, in principle most desirable: that one has terms expiring at various stages over a period of three years and not all at once. However, equally I think that there should be flexibility in terms of reappointments and the period for which such reappointments can be made. There may be special circumstances which suggest that it should be done in that way. However, I put on record quite clearly that our intention would be to have staggered terms, which means that over time the result that the Leader is seeking to achieve through his amendment will be definitely achieved. I oppose the amendment only on the basis that flexibility should be retained for future Governments.

Mr OLSEN: It is not the Opposition's intention to take the amendment to a division, but I point out to the Premier that this is new legislation, and in establishing it on the Statute Book a principle with which both the Opposition and the Government agrees should be embodied in the legislation rather than leave it to the intention of the Government of the day to follow that course of action. If we agree with the principle, then I pose the question of why on earth it cannot be put in the legislation. If there is no disagreement with the principle, I believe the amendment ought to be accepted. The Premier has given an assurance that it is his current intention to follow that course; that may well be the case, but one does not know what his current intention will be in three or six months time or at a later time. I accept the assurance given in good faith by the Premier as it relates to this matter now, but circumstances can and do change. I believe that the principle is an important one and for that reason I persist with the amendment. I do not believe the Premier has responded adequately as to why it ought not be included.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Functions and powers of the Corporation.'

Mr INGERSON: I seek clarification from the Premier concerning the provision of training and education programmes. I found in my general investigations that certain organisations in particular were concerned about the priorities of the Corporation in the provision of training and educational programmes. Can the Premier clarify the matter of priority of providing these programmes as opposed to simply co-ordinating them?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The report of the working party indicates the stress that is placed on that aspect of the operation. Later clauses in the Bill provide for empowering the Corporation to provide grants, one of the purposes being to allow managers to undertake appropriate training or educational programmes. There are elements throughout the Bill which refer to the concept of a training function. The way in which the clause is worded I think indicates the intention, namely, that the Corporation should not duplicate existing facilities or try to set up its own framework, and that as much as possible it should work to ensure that existing training institutions, of which there are a number, should provide courses easily accessible and at a cost and a level that meets the needs of small business.

However, if the Corporation cannot be satisfied in this area, if there are gaps in the programmes which cannot or will not be filled by existing institutions, it is empowered to develop programmes itself and, if necessary, conduct appropriate in-house training courses. But I would see that, as it was also perceived by the working party, as being very much a second stage process to be implemented as a last resort in a situation where a need is not being met and

where there seems to be no other way of meeting it. The training function is very important; the encouragement and development of training courses is very important. Of secondary importance is the actual conduct of such courses, secondary only in the sense that it is available to the Corporation to do that if it cannot be done by some other means.

Mr INGERSON: Clause 10 (2) *(d)* is very broad in definition. Does this provision or any other provision in the Bill enable the Corporation to make a direct loan other than by guarantee?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Under clause 14 a grant can be made and under clause 13 a loan can be made. They are the only circumstances in which loans or grants can be made, as empowered under the provisions. Clause 10 (2) *(b)* refers to contracts or arrangements of kinds other than loans or financial grants. That is part of the standard powers that any corporation has.

Clause passed.

Clause 11—'Corporation subject to control and direction of Minister.'

Mr BAKER: The member for Mawson referred to the setting up of regional offices in the metropolitan area. If that is so, when will these offices be set up in the metropolitan area and will any priority be given to areas such as Whyalla and Mount Gambier?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It will depend on two things: the desires of the Corporation and the availability of appropriate funds. Certainly in principle we do not see the Corporation as being simply a centralised operation. It is desirable for it to operate in the community and be accessible to small business. Small business men usually live in the area in which they operate and are probably less willing to track into town to the central city area to take advantage of services or facilities than are people who live in the city. I hope that over time the Corporation can establish a regional presence. It may even be able to use existing facilities. As you, Mr Chairman, would be well aware (in fact, this matter was discussed only yesterday) we hope in the not too distant future to have a State development presence in Whyalla. The Small Business Corporation probably would be able to use that kind of facility on a delegated basis to assist in its contact with small business. The way that those regional contacts are developed would be very much up to the Corporation.

Clause passed.

Clause 12 passed.

Clause 13—'Power of Corporation to give guarantees in respect of small businesses.'

Mr OLSEN: I move:

Page 6, after line 8—Insert paragraph as follows:

(ab) where the total amount of the person's liabilities under the loan exceeds fifty thousand dollars, the liabilities shall not be guaranteed by the Corporation unless it has referred the matter to the Industries Development Committee and that committee has approved the giving of the guarantee;

The purpose of this amendment is to seek to ensure that, in respect of any one loan taken out by a small business or an individual seeking to start a small business or to obtain assistance from the Government, in fact there is a check mechanism in relation to funds made available to that business. There have been numerous experiences in the past, during the 1970s, where Government guarantees were allowed for a business or an individual and where the South Australian taxpayer has had to bear the brunt of bad debts and bankruptcy proceedings. The South Australian Development Corporation can cite example after example of where, for a number of reasons, loans and guarantees have been given, in many instances for political purposes, for propping up the so-called lame duck.

I acknowledge that the Premier, in announcing the Small Business Corporation, indicated that it was not the intention of the Corporation to prop up lame ducks. We seek to ensure that there is not a repetition of the SADC and misuse and loss such as those that I highlighted in my second reading speech last night and early this morning. The Opposition wants the legislation to spell out clearly how much the Corporation can guarantee for any one individual or business. The Corporation still maintains flexibility up to $50 000 with the capacity to make a determination, but amounts in excess of that figure we believe should be referred to the IDC, which has among its membership members of both major Parties and a representative from State Treasury. This puts a control mechanism on granting guarantees of more than $50 000. It is an area of influence by Parliament which I trust the Government would agree is an appropriate move, and perhaps a necessary one.

Although the Premier assures us that lame ducks will not be propped up, assurances in Parliament are one thing and the Corporation's activities in practice is another. The State should not get into the position of having instrumentalities which have had funds allocated to them, as has occurred in the past for political reasons, propping up those lame duck industries. This amendment will allow the IDC, along with Treasury involvement on that committee, to review decisions and make recommendations to the Small Business Corporation. If the project is viable then endorsing the grant of whatever amount can proceed. The amendment is basically a check mechanism to ensure that the taxpayers of South Australia do not bear the brunt of inappropriate decisions.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The insertion of an actual figure into the Bill creates inflexibility. This power is to give the Corporation the ability, to use a jargon term, on a fast track basis to provide loans. However, limitations, as provided in the Act, will be fixed from time to time by the Treasurer and the reason is the scourge of inflation over time, where the upper limit fixed is eroded, necessitating an adjustment. If we have to come back to Parliament and amend the Bill in order to allow the small loan function of the Corporation to be exercised, it would be very cumbersome.

The level of $50 000 is perhaps too low. The Small Business Working Party contemplated about $75 000. I, as Treasurer, will take advice as to whether that is the appropriate level, not only from the Small Business Corporation, although its advice would be most important, because I hope that it would have a feel for the level and type of loan necessary, but equally from Treasury, and in fixing that limit ensure that it is a limit that will meet the type of case that the Corporation has in mind, but certainly will not enter into the realm of the IDC's support activities.

The Government does not support the amendment. The limitation will be based on the best advice and the most effective use of funds, but one that is variable to meet changing circumstances. It must be borne in mind that the nature of the businesses coming before the Corporation must meet the definition of small business. There will be nothing like some of the larger exercises that the SADC dealt with. It is appropriate that the cut-off point would be between $50 000 and $75 000, but it may be, on the Corporation's and Treasury advice, that it could be higher. It may be that in five years time an adjustment would be necessary. It is better to have a flexible provision than to bring the matter back into Parliament each time.

Mr OLSEN: The Premier has not indicated the upper limit and, whilst $50 000 to $75 000 is envisaged as the average guarantee, there is nothing inhibiting the Corporation from granting substantial loans running into quite significant amounts of money. One example that has plagued successive

Governments is the Riverland Cannery, which was an initial investment by the SADC, and it is fair to say that Governments of all political persuasions have had enormous problems with that cannery.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It's $26 million; you're talking about $50 000.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed it is. That problem goes back to some decisions made by the SADC in the initial stage. We do not want the Corporation financing a project such as that that would go on and sap, as my colleague indicated, some $26 million out of State Treasury from taxpayers to prop up an industry such as that. The Corporation must not get into that sort of bind of decision making which is not in the best interests of the State or small business generally. There is no clear upper limit, no parameters apply. I accept that the $50 000 to $75 000 may in five years time as a result of inflation need changing. There is no upper limit that would stop the Corporation from starting off another Riverland Cannery project.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That would not meet the definition of small business. However, there is a limitation and that is the total amount of the person's liabilities which must not exceed the limit as fixed by the Treasurer, and equally under clause 13 (2) *(b)* the total amount of all liabilities must not exceed a limit fixed by the Treasurer. The Treasurer has control, and I can give an assurance that the Treasurer would exercise control.

Mr OLSEN: The Premier is highlighting the point I made: the final decision comes back to the Treasurer. In many instances the Treasurer of the day has made political decisions that are in the interests of the Treasurer or his Government to agree to a substantive loan. It is well documented that because of political considerations loans have been given when they should not have been, and that creates difficulties down the track. It has been seen as a result of some of the SADC's decisions. The Premier's response that a limit has been placed is not the case, because it leaves the matter to the discretion of the Treasurer of the day, and any Treasurer of the day has political considerations to take into account as well as viability considerations of a project that has been put forward. In any event, it is obvious that the Government will not accept the amendment in this place so, rather than take it to a division, we will persist with the amendment in another place.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I would like to refer to a phrase in clause 13 (2) *(c)* (ii) which provides that the Corporation must be satisfied that it is in the public interest for the Corporation to give the guarantee. I am particularly concerned about the phrase 'in the public interest' and I ask how the Premier believes the Corporation will interpret that.

The background to the question relates to the fact that 'in the public interest' is a key phrase in the Industries Development Committee Act which governs the deliberations of the IDC in determining whether guarantees will be made available. It has been put to me by many tourist operators who have had their applications for guarantees rejected that the interpretation of that phrase 'in the public interest' was actually the downfall of their application because of the way in which it was interpreted by the Committee. As the Premier may recall from my second reading speech, the tourism industry is composed mainly of small business. Despite the fact that the working party suggests that lack of access to capital is not a real problem for small business, it is a very real problem for tourism operators, and it is accepted throughout the State and in the metropolitan area that that is a serious problem. If the Premier has had the same representations from the industry about schemes to provide access to capital as we had in Government, he would be familiar with this problem. Much could depend on the interpretation of that phrase 'in the public interest' in regard to the composition of the Corporation.

If there are people on the Corporation who are sensitive to the needs of tourism and aware of the potential of tourism, then public interest might be interpreted in one way, but there is nothing in the legislation to guarantee that. The Government states that it is its policy to assist tourism development and yet in the past 18 months, or since the Government was elected, there has been no evidence of any scheme that will assist financially tourism development either by way of deferred interest loan schemes or whatever. I presume the Premier will be referring to the ASER Bill and other major projects, but I am talking about assistance to businesses which want to expand or further develop, and there has been nothing whatsoever along those lines. I do not say that in the sense that the Government has failed, because I do not even know that it has tried, but the fact is there is nothing, and the West Lakes Resort Hotel announced yesterday is a classic example of a project that was knocked back by the IDC. It is now proceeding, thank goodness—

Mr Ashenden: That is not correct. It was a completely different development.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The West Lakes Resort Hotel claims that the original proposal for the West Lakes hotel was knocked back by the IDC and the proponents of it claim that the public interest phrase was instrumental in ensuring that that occurred. I ask the Premier how he believes that the public interest will be interpreted by the Corporation in terms of assisting tourism development through guarantees.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member is right in referring to the IDC as being the source of this clause. What has to satisfy the Corporation is in fact copied from what has to satisfy the IDC, which has proved to be a fairly successful test. Of course, in some instances I guess applicants feel that something is in the public interest and the IDC, let us say, has said that it is not or has found that it is not. It is really up to the body concerned. There is no way we can redefine, hedge or put restrictions or firm definitions on that phrase; it is a matter of judgment by the responsible body—on the one hand, the IDC, and in this instance, the Small Business Corporation itself.

I take the point that the member is making, but one of the purposes of the Small Business Corporation is, in this much more limited loan area, to have a bit more flexibility in some ways than has the IDC as it operates, because the IDC will tend to concentrate on some of the larger projects. The project mentioned by the honourable member just perhaps scrapes into the definition of small business, but only just. I am not too sure where the line can be drawn in that case, although I doubt that it would meet the assets test limitations provided in clause 13. In fact, I am sure it would not, so we are not really talking about that sort of project; we are talking about guarantees of small loans of the order of an upper limit of $50 000 to $75 000, with a number of variations in between. It is a matter for judgment by the Corporation. I do not think the Parliament or the Act should circumscribe how it will apply the principles of public interest.

Mr ASHENDEN: I would like to raise two matters. I am concerned about two aspects of the reply given by the Premier to the Leader of the Opposition. It is obvious that the Government intends this Bill to pass soon, and it then could be proclaimed within a few weeks, yet the Premier, as Treasurer, still cannot give this Committee an indication of the upper limit that he believes he will be placing in relation to the size of guarantees able to be given by this new Corporation. Either the Premier has not done his homework or my first and my worst fears are to be realised, in

that a very high level will be set and the Corporation will be in the same position as is the SADC to make some shocking business decisions, decisions based on political patronage, which is what I am trying to avoid at all costs. I ask the Premier to give an indication of the figure that he is looking at for the maximum limit.

Secondly, the Premier has said that he does not want to hamper the new Corporation and he wants to give it 'a fast track'. I trust that the Premier is not inferring from that that the IDC has been slow in considering matters when funds have been required by businesses both to expand and attract new business into South Australia. I ask the Premier to clarify that point, because I am sure that if he were to speak to his own colleagues he would find that they would assure him that the IDC has never been slow in considering matters. In fact, where urgency was required, as I mentioned, we have even met between Christmas and the New Year, something that I doubt this Corporation would do. I trust the Premier was not inferring that the IDC does not give a fast track to applications which come before it.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: My point really related to the size and nature of the guarantees that would be issued here. Of their nature, the IDC applications are often quite complicated and require a considerable amount of back-up and documentation. I would envisage that the procedures under this type of loan granting would not have that same kind of complication, so on occasions obviously decisions could be made more quickly than the provisions of the IDC Act allow. Certainly, I appreciate the way in which the committee is working and its very ready and rapid response, so there was absolutely no reflection implied on the committee itself.

The member is really expressing in advance a complete lack of confidence in the composition of the Corporation. It is not a case of my not having done my homework or intending to set a high level. In the case of my having done my homework, what I have said is that, until I can get advice from the Small Business Corporation about the level it thinks appropriate, I think it would be wrong for me to set one. I think it would be quite unreasonable for me to tell the Corporation that the limit is, say, $50 000, and that it will have to make the best of that. I want to get its best advice on what its members think is an appropriate level and the reasons for it, and as Treasurer I will consider that. I will also consider that, of course, in conjunction with advice from the Treasury. I think that is a perfectly reasonable way of doing it.

I do not intend to set the limit at an extremely high level. We are talking about amounts between $50 000 and $75 000. If the limit is set too high the purpose of the legislation will be defeated because only so much money in total can be extended in the form of guarantees. So to set the limit too high would limit the number of businesses that can be assisted. The limit will be kept as low as is reasonable and commensurate with the needs of small business. I will consider the advice of Treasury Officers in this respect.

Mr ASHENDEN: Does the Bill as it is presently drafted give the Treasurer the power, if he so wishes, to lift the limit to any level?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I acknowledge that it is a matter for the Treasurer to determine. Such a power is reflected in other legislation administered by the Treasurer. However, he is answerable to the Government and to Parliament. If he is so irresponsible as to raise the limit to an exceedingly high level, and if the Corporation is so irresponsible as to lend up to that limit, sufficient safeguards exist in control by Parliament. However, it is unlikely that a business wanting as much as, say, $26 million would fit within the definition provided in the Bill. That is another safeguard, so the honourable member should not be greatly concerned about that aspect.

Mr BAKER: Earlier, the member for Hanson referred to the use of statutory reserve deposits as a means of financing small business at a lower rate of interest. He also suggested that the Federal Treasurer might be approached to see whether some of these funds could be released to finance small businesses.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Some suggestions have been made along those lines, including the use of such funds for housing loans. It is a matter for the Federal Treasury. The purpose of statutory reserve deposits is to provide a measure of control and liquidity for the banks, which is very much a prerogative of the Federal Government. This suggestion could be considered in conjunction with the advocacy role of the Corporation.

Mr INGERSON: What total sum will be made available by way of guarantees and loans?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We are talking about guarantees of amounts of less than $100 000 in respect of seeding or development capital. The total pool will determine the number of guarantees that can be made. We have no specific figure in mind at this stage. The Corporation's advice will be necessary, and we will see whether we can match that in the light of Treasury demands. We can look at the range of applications currently made under the EPS schemes that might go to the Industries Development Committee. I will get the Corporation to review all of those and to assess the need. The figure will go to the Treasury and we will see whether we can meet it. We see a substantial number of loans being made so that the legislation will be effective, but it depends on what the Corporation recommends.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 14 to 21 passed.

New clause 21a—'Information furnished by applicants to be kept confidential.'

Mr OLSEN: I move:

After line 29—Insert new clause as follows:

21a. No person who is or has been engaged in the administration of this Act shall disclose information as to a person's affairs furnished by the person in connection with an application for a guarantee or grant under this Act unless the disclosure is required in the administration of this Act or made with the consent of the person.

Penalty: One thousand dollars.

The new clause ensures that any information given to the board of the Corporation or to its administrative personnel shall not be disclosed: it shall remain confidential. My amendment is necessary to ensure confidentiality. Any information given to the Corporation in confidence should be kept within the bounds of that organisation. This is merely normal business practice: confidentiality is expected at all levels. The new clause applies not only to members of the staff but also to members of the board of the Corporation.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Government is prepared to accept this amendment. However, there is no corresponding provision in similar Acts of this nature, or even in the Industries Development Act. There are certain provisions in some areas. If this clause can reduce apprehension in people who may approach the Corporation, that would be valuable. For instance, in small business it may possibly be a larger factor than in the case of others more familiar with commercial dealings. People may be confident that the officer or whoever is dealing with the matter can point to a particular provision and say, 'Don't worry, your information is totally safeguarded by the Act.' So, we accept the Opposition's amendment.

New clause inserted.

Clauses 22 and 23 passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATE LIBRARY UPGRADING

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on the upgrading of the Jervois Wing of the State Library.

Ordered that report be printed.

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 December. Page 2481.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Whilst this Bill is not particularly controversial, there are a number of matters which I believe should be canvassed. We need a clear picture from the Government as to its attitude in this respect. One of the areas about which the Opposition is concerned relates to the Waterworks Act, section 35, which requires a standard fee to be charged for all water services supplied. This is now to be amended, and the charge is to be provided for in the regulations. That will give the opportunity for either setting the fee by regulation or for the Minister himself to determine that charge.

Whilst I appreciate the problems that have occurred, particularly relating to 50 mm services and above, because of inherent difficulties in the conditions under which meter connections might be made, by the same token it gives the Minister an open cheque, if you like, to charge just whatever he likes, and the Opposition wants to know how the public will be protected. I believe that the Minister cannot simply, on departmental advice, determine a charge for that particular connection and say that the person so charged should have to like it or lump it. In other words, if a person does not accept the fee determined by the Minister for a connection, there is nowhere else he can go. The Government has a monopoly service, and he cannot go down the street to another company and get a service from somewhere else.

This legislation was proposed to me by the Department in 1981. As I said, it is not particularly controversial but there is this problem with it. There is one way of overcoming this, whereby the Minister would not set the fee by regulation. It is clearly laid down that where the Minister intends to exercise an option to determine a charge that would apply in any given circumstance, and if the person requiring that service is dissatisfied, or feels that the charge being made by the Department is exorbitant, he or she should be able to approach the Minister to seek a detailed breakdown of costs incurred and the job specifications and should have an opportunity to ascertain from a qualified person or company in the private sector the cost of that installation.

I can see that as an alternative. Whilst the installation would have to be made according to EWS specifications and inspected by the Department, there would be no check whatsoever under this Bill. It hands total responsibility to the Minister, which could create a grave abuse and certainly a grave economic or financial disadvantage to consumers. As I say, the public does not have anywhere to go for a water supply other than to the EWS Department. I am looking for a very clear undertaking by the Minister as to just where the Government stands regarding this problem, which I identified some years ago. The only way to overcome it is for the Minister to provide specifications of the job and for costing to be assessed by an independent body or contractor so that a comparison can be made. I await the Minister's reply with interest.

The Opposition basically supports the Bill. We have had discussions with the Master Plumbers Association, the Mechanical Services Association, the Housing Association and the Master Builders Association, all of which support the principles contained in the Bill. Other requirements relate to proper fittings and installation standards. It is necessary that those standards be kept at a high level for the purpose of protection and so that South Australian manufacturers maintain uniform practices. The only controversy concerning the Opposition relates to charges that the Minister may decide to apply, and the fact that they are not stipulated in the regulations. The Bill also provides for installations, particularly of irrigation equipment, being operated from the public water supply and acknowledges the possibility that there could be a back flow or siphoning back of water from an irrigation system.

The concern certainly arises where one is injecting chemicals and fertilisers into an irrigation distribution system. I have no objection to that, and it is necessary that the necessary steps be taken to protect the system. However, by the same token, we do not want to see the equipment that will have to be installed with these modern irrigation systems being so complicated and expensive that it makes it virtually impossible or totally uneconomical for a person to use the modern irrigation systems that are now available. Certainly, we have to do everything we can to encourage irrigators to use the modern irrigation systems, equipment, and techniques available today, not only in the interests of water conservation in this State but also in the efficient use of water, which certainly has a big bearing on salinity going back into the Murray River in the irrigation areas of this State.

We have been endeavouring for a long time to encourage modern irrigation practices, not only in South Australia but also in Victoria and New South Wales, because by far the biggest single contributor to the salt problem in our water supply is inefficient irrigation. If that provision in the Bill were to get out of hand and the departmental inspectors were to lay down conditions and requirements that made it so expensive for the non-return valve type equipment to be installed, and it was no longer a proposition to have that modern irrigation system installed, then we are certainly doing a disservice not only to the irrigators but also to the rest of the people in South Australia because of the water conservation and water quality components of using modern irrigation systems.

Therefore, the Opposition fundamentally supports the legislation, but we are extremely concerned about the effects that clause 4 will have. I refer to clause 4 under Part V, which amends section 10 of the principal Act and which states that the Govenor may make regulations for fixing or empower the Minister to fix charges and fees. That is the area about which we are concerned. If the Minister can indicate that the public will be protected and have some redress against an unreal charge that has been imposed by the Minister, then we can proceed with this legislation. The other area about which I was concerned I think can be dealt with in the Committee stage of this Bill, depending on the response that the Minister makes.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): From the outset, I endorse what my colleague the member for Chaffey has said. As I think this House fully realises, the honourable member was a superb Minister of Water Resources, and is probably one of the few, if not the only, Minister of Water Resources who really understood exactly what he was talking about. He has to live with the situation on the river and he understands it. He has to represent people who live in that situation, so I fully endorse what he said. I rise this afternoon to refer specifically to clause 12, which relates to section 46 of the principal Act. This is the section of the Act which gives the Minister certain powers to approve of certain devices for use.

I bring to the Minister's attention a particular product that that is on the market and for sale at present. It is a product I think is possibly bordering on being a fraudulent product in terms of what its makers claim. Pursuant to that section, as I understand it, we are giving the Minister specific approval to approve of certain devices that might be attached to the system. I ask the Minister to perhaps investigate the facts that I will bring to the attention of the House shortly and to decide whether or not the powers of the Act under that specific section should be broadened so that it could possibly cover approval of the sort of device I am talking about.

The product to which I specifically refer is called a Care-Free water conditioner. It is manufactured in New South Wales by Care-Free Conditioners Australia of Box 681, Wagga Wagga, New South Wales, and is on sale in South Australia. I have a pamphlet here and I would be only too happy to give the Minister a copy of the material contained in this pamphlet. This water conditioner, which sells I might add for about $280 a unit, I understand, has particularly been sold interstate. I appreciate that, whilst the Minister is not responsible for sales interstate, he might like to take up this matter with his colleagues, particularly in New South Wales and Queensland, where I understand this product is being sold widely. Briefly, the product claims the following: apparently it has some special metal over which the water runs, and by running over this metal, the quality of the water is suddenly improved dramatically. It has these effects:

DRINKING WATER: Removes distasteful gases, chlorine and other similar elements.

PIPES: Inhibits new and reduces existing water scale build up in all systems and tanks.

PLUMBING FIXTURES: Removes stains, water scale and rust deposits.

LAUNDRY: Rinses clothes cleaner—

It is almost like a soap advertisement—

and requires less soap. Water saturates and cleans better.

BATH TUB AND SHOWER WALLS: Helps keep wall tiles clean—soap film rinses away. No more scraping and scrubbing with abrasives.

HOT WATER HEATERS AND BOILERS: Dissolves scale sediment. Extends the life of your equipment.

SWIMMING POOLS: Inhibits algae and fungus growth. Reduces the need for chemical treatment by approximately 50 per cent.

It claims that it does not reduce the water pressure through the system at all. For our rural colleagues in the House, it makes the following claims in relation to irrigation, plants and gardens:

Greener and healthier growth; greater yields. Nutrients are absorbed more quickly into plant roots. Prevents soil compaction.

SOLAR HEATING: Reduces corrosion and adds years of life to metal solar collectors.

HEAT EXCHANGERS, CONDENSERS AND EVAPORATIVE AIR CONDITIONERS, ETC.: Cleans without costly shutdown time and repair. Inhibits corrosive build up.

I will not go through the entire pamphlet, but I think that it is fair to say that this pamphlet claims the following about this product: the product needs no service whatsoever; no maintenance; no chemicals,; no cartridges; no electricity; no salt; and no moving parts. One starts to question as to how the whole system operates. It appears to be the magical product that does not require anything, yet it does all these things to the water going through it. As I said earlier, I can make available this pamphlet to the Minister. It also claims that when the water comes in, just before running through this series of metal elements running through the pipe, suddenly the water enters, adhesive compounds surround mineral particles, and as the water comes out the other side of this vent it exits free of mineral particles of adhesive compounds, and there is no pressure loss at all. I understand that the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories (and I hope that the Minister hears this particular point) has carried out a detailed analysis of the water that goes into and comes out of this particular product.

I have before me a report dated 7 March 1984 from Amdel signed by Brian S. Hickman, Managing Director. Amdel carried out a series of tests analysing both the water that went through a water softener and water that had not gone through a water softener. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*, without my reading them, tables detailing the chemical water analysis for calcium, magnesium, sodium, potassium, sulphate ion, chloride ion and the carbonate ion. It is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

Chemical Water Analysis

The results of the ICP analyses are as shown below:

Concentration (mg/L)

	Ca	Mg	Na	K	SO_4	Cl	HCO_3
Sample C	20	16	67	5.9	23	120	82
Sample D	20	16	67	5.9	23	120	79

	pH	Conductivity (μS/cm)
Sample C	7.5	620
Sample D	7.4	620

Electron Probe Microanalysis Results on the residue from samples C and D

Compound	Sampe C (Area 1)	Sample C (Area 2)	Sample D (Area 1)	Sample D (Area 2)
P_2O_5	0.94	0.95	0.56	0.67
SiO_2	36.66	36.75	35.01	35.88
TiO_2	0.61	0.61	0.43	0.44
Al_2O_3	16.99	16.33	16.31	16.50
FeO	13.44	13.10	10.89	11.15
MgO	1.76	1.61	1.52	1.62
CaO	0.99	0.97	0.77	0.78
K_2O	1.49	1.43	1.20	1.26
Na_2O	0.38	0.30	0.41	0.60
SO_3	1.14	0.20	—	0.21
Cl	0.21	0.15	0.09	0.25
MnO	0.87	0.35	—	0.12
Total	74.47	72.75	67.18	69.48

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: The first table indicates that there was absolutely no difference whatsoever in regard to the chemical composition of the two samples of water, except that in regard to carbonate ions, the only difference was that in the untreated water there were 82 carbona ions and in the treated water there were 79. In regard t the others, dealing in parts per million, for calcium there were 20; magnesium, 16; sodium, 67; potassium, 5.9; sulphate ion 23; and chloride ion, 120. They remained constant and identical for both samples. Amdel's initial investigation, forming the substance of the report was as follows:

The Care-Free water conditioner unit was evaluated for its effect on an untreated domestic water supply in the Blackwood area. After allowing water to run from a domestic tap for approximately two minutes, water was collected in 250 mL plastic bottles as follows:

Sample C—Without Care-Free water conditioner

Sample D—After passing through Care-Free water conditioner

With regard to discussion of the findings, the report states:

Chemical analysis of water both before and after passage through the Care-Free water conditioner has revealed no significant differences. Filtration and examination of the residues by electron probe microanalysis also has revealed no significant differences between untreated water and water that has passed through the Care-Free water conditioner.

The conclusions reached are as follows:

Chemical water analyses and electron probe microanalysis of residues collected on 0.45 μm filters has failed to detect any significant differences between untreated water and water after passage through the Care-Free water conditioner unit.

This appears to be a fairly serious matter in that a product is being sold to be attached to our water system in this State about which very extravagant claims are being made as to what it can achieve. It is claimed that the water softener

needs no maintenance (they are probably being realistic there), no service, chemicals, cartridges, moving parts, salt or electricity, and it would appear, from looking at the results, has no effect whatsoever. So, all the consumers who buy this product are being well and truly conned for $280. I have the highest regard for Amdel as a research body. I think no-one would doubt its impartiality and integrity, and the level of scientific expertise it has developed as a body with a reputation on which it is accepted throughout Australia.

I ask the Minister whether he has any powers to in fact approve a product such as this and whether he will investigate the claims made by the manufacturer of this product and therefore any retail outlet for it, and whether, in fact, those who are promoting the product are being fraudulent in their claims. It would appear to me that they are. I have been unable to contact a distributor here in South Australia. I do not intend to say who the distributor is. It may well be that he is not aware that these sorts of claims have been made, or that the product has no effect whatsoever. So, I do not want to in any way rubbish any person here in South Australia. However, the product is on the market and I think it is time we had a careful investigation of whether this is a con trick and whether the Minister has any power he can use under the provisions of the principal Act, or the Act as it will be amended if the Bill before us is passed, to take some action against the promoters of this product. Following his investigations, if the Minister agrees with the conclusions I have come to, namely, that it is nothing but a con trick and that the claims are fraudulent, can the Minister issue an appropriate warning to the public of South Australia?

I have been fairly cautious about making these claims in the House in checking that they could be substantiated. If the manufacturer can come forward with some evidence that shows that what Amdel has come up with is false, or that there are basic mistakes in the techniques it has used, I will be the first to stand in this House and withdraw my accusations. However, from the evidence I have and from my reading of the detailed report (and I have read only a fraction of the Amdel report here today), I believe that there is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that the product is a con trick on the public, and that this should be stopped as quickly as possible. I ask the Minister to take up the matter as a matter of urgency.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I refer briefly to several matters in regard to this Bill. It provides the Minister with certain new powers and his officers with some new responsibilities. I ask what action the Minister will take in regard to quality of water, particularly in the Hills. In a recent letter to me the Minister stated that it is not the intention to at any time filter the water in the Hills area, and that the area will have to suffer indefinitely with the water that it has at the moment. People in the area do not put their clothes in the mains water to wash them but to get them dirty, because the water is a dirty orange colour. Perhaps because of the rain that has fallen in the past few days, there having been not quite as big a drain on the supplies of water in the area, the water coming from the Heathfield tank has been much cleaner. I hope that that was not done just as a privilege to me. I take it that it has been pumped back from the Happy Valley area through the Iron Bank tank to the Heathfield tank.

I am led to believe that Bridgewater and Aldgate residents are still suffering a serious injustice in regard to the fact that in his letter the Minister stated that the water as it is presently is better for people as far as their hot water services and so on are concerned, because if the water is softened and the salts taken out of it their hot water services are more likely to corrode. The point was made that if the mineral salts were taken out of the water by a water softener there is a greater chance of appliances rusting or corroding and that it is a benefit to the community to have the water they use now because their appliances will last longer.

People with water softeners have been getting between 17 and 18 years use from their hot water services, and those without have been getting only six to seven years service out of their appliances. Is the Minister telling the Hills community that they can have the filthy stuff they are getting, which is like sludge, because it will make their appliances last longer, that their clothes will end up orange if they are supposed to be white, and that other colours will become duller? It is an utter disgrace that people with young families are supplied with water of such quality when they are paying top price for it. They have been told that they will never get a filtered supply. It is not a joke to a mother when she takes a drink to a young child in the morning and that child says, 'I want a drink of water, not orange juice', because that is the colour comparison.

Under the previous Minister the Act was changed. If a person wants a main extended or connected to a block they have to pay the cost of connection. This would be all right if that person were able to obtain a price from a private contractor to have the job done. However, people are asked to pay between $3 000 and $5 000 for 150 m or less of 100 mm water main extension, which is outrageous. One could dig the trench for such an extension with a teaspoon, supply material and achieve the end result for a lesser cost. I know the age-old argument that the Department has to inspect an area to make sure that a job is done properly, and that contractors are liable to cheat the system: I do not accept that argument. Will the Minister allow individuals to employ contractors to perform this work? The Minister could charge an inspection fee to see that the work is done according to standard. If private contractors were employed to do a $3 000 extension they would be in and out within 24 hours. An inspection would not take long; modern equipment gives them that opportunity. However, I know that crossing roads would be more difficult.

People might say that it costs more to pump water to the Hills and the Minister might argue that at times it is a burden to the Department. Let me say that that community carries the burden for the Engineering and Water Supply Department which implements this Act. People have their homes knocked down, in some cases compulsorily acquired, total townships bought out and demolished, or restrictions are put on activities on land to try and supply better quality water to the inner metropolitan area. The people who carry that burden in the Hills are surely entitled to a supply of reasonable water similar to that supplied to people on the plains. There is an understanding by Hills people of the cost of pumping water, but it is also pumped to the metropolitan area. It has to be pumped over the ranges to reach the metropolitan area and quite often the water is reticulated from a high point in the hills to a lower point on the plains when it would be cheaper to pump back than to pump from the Murray. Mount Bold water could be pumped to the Hills from the Happy Valley area, as is being done at Heathfield at the moment, or it could be picked up earlier by the pumping station at Mount Bold before it goes through the Clarendon weir. The same could apply to the northern reservoirs. I note that there is a larger penalty included in this amendment and I support that. I raised the matter with the Minister of people who used a short piece of pipe to take—

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr EVANS: It did not take long. Once one person could find out how to cheat the Department, that person did not take long to tell his mates about that. I thought it wise to

make sure that the Minister or his Department move quickly to introduce this amendment. It is simple to take a meter out of the whole line: undo two nuts, put in a piece of pipe at the waterline and water one's lawn or fill a swimming pool overnight and not have the supply register. When water was cheap it did not matter, but now that it has become so expensive under the present Government there is an incentive for people to cheat. I am glad that the penalties have been increased so as to make it less lucrative for those who want to cheat.

Later, the Minister might like to inform the House whether there will be a standard fee for connecting services to allotments, or will that vary according to the Minister's whim. Where a main is on the opposite side of the road to a property that wants connection, will the connection charge be the same as for a property on the same side of the road as the main. If it is more, I have a violent objection to that because it is not fair or proper. If it is only an opportunity for the Minister to set charges for larger connections to the main for irrigation or industrial purposes, and he wants to vary that rate according to the application, then I do not have a strong objection. I would only have a strong objection if I had a pecuniary interest and I was paying the bill. It is fair that the Minister has the opportunity to vary charges in that way, but not in the case of normal household connections.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: As long as the consumer is not being taken for a ride.

Mr EVANS: I made that point earlier. When Mr Corcoran was the relevant Minister I took up the challenge with him when I was asked to pay about $10 000 for a loopline in a road. There was some problem about me being a member of Parliament, but I wanted to put that work through private contractors who would have performed the work at less than half the price. Had the Department charged me full rates for an engineer to be present full time, it still would have been cheaper. So, I am conscious of the problem of excessive charging for water. Where small contractors are not allowed to perform small connections (even though they are allowed to connect the big subdivisions) there is an opportunity for people to be hoodwinked about the amount that a connection costs. The Department finds this a way of subsidising its operations. I support the second reading.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): There are two issues involved here, the first being the quality of water. The Minister has been inundated with a vast number of letters about the quality of water in South Australia, but there has been no satisfactory explanation given about this matter. The deterioration in 1983 was worse in my memory than at any other stage in the provision of water to Adelaide. There has been some attempt to explain it as being caused by turbidity in the Murray River system or the rain causing water flows into the Happy Valley reservoir. I do not believe that the whole truth is being told in these circumstances. I have asked the Minister for a full explanation. The conditions this year were very abnormal, but I do not think that reservoirs take nine months to settle. There must be some difficulty which has accumulated over time that has not been revealed. I would appreciate it being revealed and, if it has to be tackled, it should be tackled front on.

The other issue I wish to raise is the time it takes to provide a service. I mentioned today in the Small Business Corporation debate that the reaction time of the E&WS in the provision of services has become slower. I can certainly appreciate that the demands being placed on the E&WS are growing because of the uplift in demand for housing and we can be thankful that the housing industry is experiencing some reversal in its fortunes and that it is looking a lot healthier than it has done since about 1977. However, I add that if the E&WS can possibly improve the way in which it reacts to demands for its services that increase in building activity will not be stifled because of the inability of the Government to provide the necessary services. Obviously I would be interested in seeing whether private contractors could do much of the excavation work and some of the engineering work associated with laying pipes, because that is the essence of a good partnership.

If the day-labour force is insufficient to handle the load, or equipment is being fully utilised in some other area, we should not hold up the production process because of that. I am aware of the fact that at present the civil engineering profession is going through a depressed period. There is a mammoth amount of unused equipment in that area and it seems feasible to me that some of this equipment could be used to overcome some of the shortfalls being experienced in the housing industry. We all remember 1974 when the then Minister of Works, Mr Corcoran, increased the day-labour force to a massive extent to cater for the boom period and then we were left with a wholesale excess of labour in that particular area. Both Governments since then have had somehow to rationalise the situation and many people have been affected during that rationalisation process. We certainly do not want that to happen again. I believe it is important that services are provided when they are needed, and, if the E&WS does not have the capacity to perform certain works because of increased demand, then let us use the services of private contractors. We are not asking for them to be allowed to perform in the highly technical area, if that is not the area of their expertise, but other basic tasks could be undertaken by the utilisation of private contractors, and probably at a cheaper cost.

I believe that attention needs to be drawn to some parts of this Bill. My first cause of concern is the increased power of the Minister to determine charges. I think that my colleague, the shadow Minister of Water Resources, has already pointed out that if this Bill is passed the Minister will have far more power than he has ever had before and that there could well be an opportunity for the Minister, without reference to Parliament, to increase all charges associated with water supply. I have received a letter from the Minister in which he explains what has happened to standard services over a period of time and in which he states:

> The water meter is still provided at the normal fee which currently is $190 for a 20 mm water service.

In his second reading explanation the Minister said that we are using this amendment to accommodate the extra engineering costs associated with the 50 mm units. We can certainly appreciate that that is a difficulty and that if there is only one standard charge the people getting a 50 mm or above service are being subsidised by those provided with a 20 mm service. The difficulty is that the amendment allows the Minister, on all occasions, to determine fees that will be charged, even on the 20 mm service. We will certainly be asking for some clarification on this point, because we do not want to see wholesale increases in charges which do not have the scrutiny of Parliament.

The member for Fisher referred to the increase in penalties. The minimum increase in penalties announced in 1978 was five-fold and the maximum increase was 20-fold under various areas of the Water and Sewerage Act. Under these amendments the average increase is a further 10-fold. Certainly, inflation has not increased 10-fold since 1978. There are certain areas where anomalies have arisen and where people have abused the system because of the high costs associated with water charges and it seemed to be more beneficial to try to beat the system than to pay the costs that have been incurred. There is no justification for a 10-fold increase. We certainly support an increase in penalties. The Minister referred to New South Wales and other States

which have far heavier penalties. However, there is an anomaly in penalties, because in the criminal jurisdiction penalties have been decreased. Whilst members on this side of the House support the Bill, there does seem to be a movement towards legal sanctions which are very expensive for certain sectors of the community and far less expensive for other sectors. It is affecting some areas where people (and I am pleased to see the Minister has amended one of the clauses), through good faith, could face some very heavy and serious penalties.

The other clauses of the Bill have our support. We look forward to the way in which the Minister will control the sale of fittings and appliances and which do not reach the standards they should reach. In South Australia we have had a long history of defective equipment being used in the water supply system. Again, we believe the mooted change in the control of water devices which do not properly stop a flow-back into the water supply system of additives to the water supply is a useful and necessary change. I support the Bill.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): I have listened with interest to the comments of members opposite and in particular to the member for Chaffey who said, firstly, that the amendments are supported strongly by the plumbing industry and the suppliers and manufacturers of fittings and apparatus for the plumbing industry. The real purpose of the Waterworks Act, and these amendments, is to protect public health. We have a good record in South Australia in this regard. Other parts of the world do have great difficulties with water-borne diseases. Even the United States from time to time has problems in relation to water-borne disease. We have a good record in this State and we wish to maintain that record. Certainly, it is important that we do so. Many matters were raised during the second reading debate by members opposite and I will endeavour to deal with them briefly in my reply and perhaps in more detail when we move into the Committee stages.

The member for Chaffey referred to clause 4, which amends section 10 of the principal Act, which in turn provides for the making of regulations. The new paragraph will enable certain charges to be fixed by regulation. In this respect, I remind members that the regulations already contain a scale of fees. For instance, the estimated cost of a service of a size above 50 mm has been in the regulations since 1977. The Bill merely formalises an existing arrangement. The Minister is being given no additional power. After all, regulations must come to Parliament for ratification.

The prices of services will still be regulated according to size. Take such a large service as that provided by a 50 mm main. It is impracticable to set a standard fee for a service larger than 50 mm because of the cost of the components and the variations in installation techniques. For example, a major high-rise development or a group of age cottage homes may require services greater than 50mm in size, as well as the installation provided for fire prevention. Large services are provided by large diameter mains and the practical aspects of such installations are important. The larger mains are usually laid beneath arterial roads that are required to bear a great volume of traffic. Indeed, extensive restoration work must be performed in such instances. Obviously, it is impracticable for the Department to have a standard fee for such a connection, so an estimated cost is required and that is provided for at present.

Regarding matters raised by the member for Mitcham and other members, some penalties have existed for years. They are being increased in an effort to deter people who may be thinking of making illegal alterations to their water meters. Indeed, the cost to the E & WS in following up such activities is substantial, hence the increase in the penalty to be imposed for the illegal use of water. Those penalties have not been altered for some years.

The member for Davenport referred to a certain water conditioner which is claimed by the manufacturer to have all sorts of magical properties. We already have powers relating to trade standards applying to the prevention of contamination and pollution of the water supply. From the honourable member's remarks it would seem that the device referred to does nothing useful, so the claims of the manufactuer on its behalf seem to be suspect. The honourable member even had the usefulness of this device assessed by Amdel. My officers will investigate this matter to see whether we have power to deal with it.

From time to time people doing their own plumbing create problems and in this regard one of our big concerns is the installation of water heaters by private householders. During the past 12 months, two disasters have occurred in this respect. One concerned the explosion of a water heater that had been installed privately. Fortunately, no-one was injured in that instance, but the house was blown to pieces. The other instance occurred about six months ago at a holiday shack at, I think, Port Broughton where a water heater fell off its fixtures and a person nearby was killed. So, it is important to ensure that water-heating or water-conditioning devices are installed so as to comply with safety requirements. We try to ensure that such devices are not installed by people who have neither the expertise nor the ability to do so. Although there was no question of safety involved in the case referred to by the member for Davenport, we will take up the matter because it is important that the public get value for money and that the claims of the manufacturer be soundly based.

The member for Fisher referred to the nature of the water supplied to residents in the Adelaide Hills. The honourable member may recall that last week I was asked a question by the member for Whyalla about water quality in that area. The problem in the Hills is similar to that in Whyalla. Two very heavy floods have occurred in north-western New South Wales and parts of Queensland and that water, which is very yellow and murky, has flowed down the Darling River into the Murray River. I understand that that is the worst water quality we have had for 25 years. It was turbid and the Department had little or no control over that.

However, in parts of the metropolitan area we have a filtered supply which assists water quality considerably. Although water from the Darling River is high in turbidity it is low in salinity. Our problem is to try to deliver the best, most adequate and palatable water supply for domestic purposes that we can under the circumstances. Of course, the Hills area, to which the member for Fisher referred, does not have a filtered supply. I am sympathetic towards this problem because, prior to filtration plants being established at Hope Valley and Anstey Hill, I know that at my home, and from complaints made to me at the homes of people in my electorate, the same situation used to prevail from time to time. The obvious answer to the problem, of course, is to filter all of the water supply. But, that is a very costly exercise, as we all know. However, it is a worthwhile proposition and, as I commented last week, we want to achieve that as quickly as possible.

Mr Lewis: Why can't we supply country centres that haven't got it?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That is another problem. Country centres which are not dependent on the Murray River for their water supply do not have the same problems. However, I refer basically to the supply in the Adelaide Hills and the metropolitan area. We have had considerable problems with turbidity in that supply this year. I have been advised that, depending on seasonal conditions, if further

rains of that magnitude occur in those areas we will suffer the same problem.

Mr Lewis: Give them a rainwater tank.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Installation of a rainwater tank is up to the individual in the metropolitan area, but I think they are absolutely essential in country areas. Although some problems are associated with rainwater tanks, as long as they are maintained and kept clean one should be assured of a reasonable supply for domestic purposes.

I now refer to the letter which the member for Fisher mentioned about a water heater. Apparently, very hard water (not softened water) causes carbonate deposits on water heater tubes so failure due to poor heat transfer from the heating element and over-heating of the element may cause failure of the heating element sleeve. However, the scale deposit on the general body of the heater greatly reduces the corrosion rate, due to the protective carbonate scale that is laid down. Softened South Australian water containing high mineral content, on the other hand, does not provide a protective scale, and so corrosion rates of metal surfaces are greatly increased.

So, all the problems that we have relate to water quality in the first place and to the source of our supply which, basically, is the Murray River. In the year before last, a bad year, 80 per cent of the metropolitan supply came from the Murray River. This year, of course, it is not quite as much. Some of the metropolitan reservoirs have held a good supply and consequently, in some cases, people have reasonable quality water. I turn to other matters in the Bill to which other speakers have spoken. I have already mentioned the scale of fees, which was raised by the member for Fisher. The question of a firm quotation and estimated costs was raised. That is obviously for administrative efficiency so far as the Department is concerned, to give the customer an opportunity to make an assessment of cost based on that firm quotation and estimate. Of course, there is nothing to stop that consumer questioning that cost. I believe that that should be the case. Consumers should not just accept the departmental quote. Consumers have an opportunity to obtain advice and negotiate with the Department in regard to that quotation and cost. I think that is fair, because the 50 mm service will certainly be very expensive. I do not deny the customer an opportunity to ensure that the estimate or firm quotation given by the Department is fair and reasonable.

The member for Mitcham raised the matter of the Department's not keeping up with demand in regard to requests, particularly in the building industry, which have escalated considerably in the past nine months and which and are good indicators of economic circumstances. The Department has had difficulty because that happened so suddenly, but it is addressing the situation. It will employ more inspectors to ensure that minimum delays occur in the housing industry. I am aware of this problem, and I want to ensure that no undue delays occur in the housing industry, because if they do the cost is borne by the person purchasing a house. I assure the honourable member that the Government is doing its best to try to address the problem as quickly as possible, to ensure that these inspections occur without a great deal of delay. I will reserve any further comment for questions raised in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr BAKER: My reading of subclause (2), which refers to connection or disconnection of water works and includes a reference to connection, caused me to speak with the Parliamentary Counsel. As the paragraph of the clause does not read correctly, to my mind, I ask the Minister whether he is happy with the clause as it stands.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: My information is that it does clarify the meaning of 'connection to' and 'disconnection from' any waterworks. New section 4 (2) provides:

> For the purposes of this Act a reference to connection to or disconnection from the waterworks includes a reference to connection to or disconnection from a pipe or fitting through which water is supplied from the waterworks.

I am told that the provision is meant more for clarification than for problems existing under the principal Act.

Mr BAKER: The words 'a reference' second occurring should really be struck out, but I will not press the point.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Regulations.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: This clause gives the Minister the power to fix charges. The Minister has said that a citizen can go to the private sector and get a price in regard to the Minister's specifications of a particular job and then come back and negotiate with the Minister, but ultimately what the Minister says will stand. If the person is not prepared to accept the final decision of the Minister, he has to make up his mind whether or not he wants a water service. In other words, there is nowhere else for him to go.

If that person gets from the private sector a quote on those specifications which is only 50 per cent of the figure given by the Minister, then comes back to the Minister who is not prepared to significantly come down to the figure provided by the public sector, I believe that there is a need to protect the citizen so that he gets the job done at a fair and reasonable price. That work should be undertaken by the private sector if the Department cannot give a satisfactory undertaking.

We have certainly seen in the Riverland (as the Minister would be well aware) the situation regarding rehabilitation, when a contract was let to do a certain section of pipe laying alongside the departmental pipe laying team. Suddenly the performance of the E&WS team increased by about 95 per cent. The consumer has to accept the Minister's final decision. What will be the position? Is the Government prepared to let the private contractor install a connection if the private contractor is prepared to do so for a figure significantly lower than that of the Department?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The point I was making involved getting a quote from a private consultant rather than the work being undertaken by a private contractor. As I mentioned earlier, the important thing is the protection of the system in regard to public health. A 50 mm service or water connection is a pretty large connection and applies mostly to multi-storey buildings, possibly industrial premises, or a multiplicity of dwellings on one block. It is, therefore, an important undertaking.

Under the Act the Department is required to provide a certain standard of service. Comparisons might be made as to the cost involved, and the member for Chaffey mentioned an example in relation to irrigation. However, the provision of a water supply to a private dwelling is quite different from the example he mentioned. The member for Chaffey claimed that a private contractor can do the job much more cheaply than the Department can. I do not take issue with him about that, because a private contractor may not have to work to the standard required by the E & WS Department. To answer the honourable member's question, I do not foresee that private contractors will perform the work. I suggested that an individual could obtain a quote, which can then be negotiated with the Department.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The Minister is now entrenching a provision in legislation, and that is different from making a regulation, which must be laid on the table of the House

and be subject to a simple motion of disallowance. The Minister dodged around my question. I referred to irrigation rehabilitation. The Minister would be well aware that the Department has laid down specifications that any work done by contractors must be to a standard laid down by the E & WS Department and that it is subject to inspection by the Department. If it is not up to the standard laid down by the Department and its inspectors the contractor is not paid: it is as simple as that.

I am saying that the matter I have outlined is vital to consumers, whether it involves a business or household supply, or a very costly supply for a large industry. The cost can be virtually double what might be the case if the work had been done by a private contractor. The Government has an absolute monopoly in this area. We now have a guarantee that the household 20 mm service will be a standard price, because the amendment allows the Minister to fix charges for meters in excess of 50 mm and it also enables him, almost overnight, to vary the charge in relation to 20 mm services.

It is just not on, and it is not good business. The fact that this practice has gone on in the past does not mean that it has to go in the future. We are trying to help the public contain costs, while at the same time making industry efficient and payable. In this situation the Minister has the final say. If the receiver of the service does not like what the Minister says, he has no alternative whatsoever if he does not want to accept the Minister's price. If a private contractor quotes a price that is in line with the Department's specifications, he meets the standards and requirements required by the Department's inspectors, and the contractor can do the work for half the price quoted by the Department, the Department should either get its act together or allow the work to be done by the private contractor.

Mr BAKER: Will the Minister give the Committee an undertaking that he will not use the power vested in him to change the process of fixing the cost of service below the 50 mm level? This provision now gives the Minister that power. Secondly, will the Minister give consideration to the provision of a fully costed estimate on each occasion that a 50 mm water supply is to be provided so that the person receiving that supply can see what the costs associated with it are?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Regulations of services of 50 mm and under are provided for a fixed fee regardless of circumstances.

Mr Baker: This Bill changes that principle.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Now I can change the regulations, but as in any other situation the regulations have to pass through the processes of this Parliament, and any member can move for disallowance of those regulations. In regard to 50 mm services, the question was raised as to whether the provision of such a service would be considered on a firm quotation of estimated cost. Yes, that is the intent of the whole exercise, simply because of the difficulties involved in setting a firm fee, because of the variation of so many circumstances and the amount of work involved in providing a 50 mm service. I do not know how often they will be required, but I would think not very regularly. With regard to people involved with fairly large development projects, no doubt in many cases they would have at their disposal consultants involved with the project who would be able to provide the necessary expertise and knowledge in regard to what the cost is likely to be. I do not agree with the member for Chaffey's point of view on this matter, because, as I said, the Department has the knowledge, expertise and opportunity to provide the service to the public. Okay, it might be a monopoly—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: At what price?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It is a service to the community. The honourable member's argument does not hold very strongly, because we provide a service which is based on what it will cost the Department. It is not a profit making concern. Cost is based on what it costs the Department to supply a service. As I said, in regard to services of 50 mm and above, I think it will be found that the cost will be commensurate with what it costs the Department to provide such a service.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Supply of water.'

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

Page 3, lines 31 to 36—Leave out subsection (1a) and insert the following subsections:

(1a) The Minister—

(a) may, upon payment of the fee fixed by or under this Act, provide and lay down additional services to land where he has been requested to do so by the owner or occupier of the land;

or

(b) may, without being requested to do so by the owner or occupier of land, provide and lay down additional services to the land so that the number of services to that land will comply with the prescribed ratio.

(1aa) The Minister's costs in providing and laying down a service pursuant to subsection (1a) *(b)* shall be paid by the owner or occupier of the land concerned.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: This amendment, or even the section that it is amending in the Bill, is of considerable concern to me, in particular proposed new subsections (1a) *(b)* and (1aa). The amendment provides that the Minister can go ahead without the agreement of the landholder, put in that service and send the landholder the account. The landholder may have no idea what the charges are likely to be. Once again, we return to what we were talking about in clause 4, namely, that the landholder or person responsible for that land could suddenly be confronted with an account from the E & WS Department for virtually any figure whatsoever because there is nothing to say what the cost will be.

The Minister can just go ahead, put in the services, and whatever he considers the cost run-out to be will be what the consumer will pay, without that consumer's agreement having been obtained. Once again, that is a Draconian provision whereby the public has no alternative but to like it or lump it. How does the Minister see that as being fair or just as far as the community is concerned?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: First, the amendment to clause 6 is designed to clarify and improve the drafting: it is not intended to change the meaning of the provisions. Clause 6 provides that service rents are applied to additional services which are provided to properties in excess of the one service normally allowed. It is required that the fee for service rent be set by notice in the *Government Gazette* in the same manner as water rates are declared, instead of being set by regulation, which is currently the requirement. So, it will be published in the *Government Gazette.* The amendment is intended basically for administrative efficiency and will have no adverse effects on consumers.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: What indication does the Department give to a consumer that it intends to move in on his property and provide these services, even though the consumer may not have requested them and may not want them?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: There are two parts to the amendment. Proposed new subsection (1a) *(b)* I would take to be referring to one block on which there are strata title units and where it may be necessary to make provision for the Department to act on behalf of one of the strata title owners. I do not see it as an adverse situation for the consumer but rather the opposite—to assist as much as

possible in regard to service rents applied to additional services over the normal service provided.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 7 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Interference with meter.'

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

Page 4, lines 15 to 21—Leave out all words in clause 10 after 'the principal Act is' and insert 'repealed and the following section is substituted:

43. (1) Where the Minister is unable to determine the quantity of water that he has supplied to any land because—

(a) the meter installed for measuring that water has been removed;

(b) the water, or part of the water, has been supplied by means of a pipe that by-passes the meter;

or

(c) the meter has been altered, interfered with or damaged, the person who removed, altered, interfered with or damaged the meter or who installed a pipe by-passing the meter and the owner and occupier of the land so supplied with water shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Two thousand dollars.

(2) It shall be a defence to a prosecution for an offence under subsection (1) for the defendant to prove—

(a) that the person who removed, altered, interfered with or damaged the meter or who installed a pipe by-passing the meter did so with the authority of the Minister;

(b) in the case of a defendant who is the owner or occupier of the land concerned—

(i) that he did not know and had no reason to suspect that the commission of an offence under subsection (1) had occurred or was likely;

or

(ii) that immediately after he first became aware or suspected that an offence under subsection (1) had occurred or was likely he informed the Minister in writing of that fact'.

(3) A person convicted of an offence under subsection (1) is liable to pay to the Minister his costs arising from the offence in replacing the meter, removing a pipe by-passing the meter or repairing or reinstating the meter to its original condition.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 11 to 27 passed.

Clause 28—'Recovery of moneys by Minister.'

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

Page 6, lines 17 and 18—Leave out these lines and insert 'subsection (1) the passage "any by-law or"' and substituting the word 'a'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 29 to 32 passed.

Clause 33—'Persons liable to penalties.'

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

Page 7, line 11—Leave out 'in default' and substitute 'actually in breach of this Act'.

This amendment is designed to correct drafting deficiencies.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Hon. J. W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 December. Page 2483.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The provisions in this legislation embody the same principles that were debated in the Waterworks Act Amendment Bill. Basically, the Opposition has no argument with the Bill. It deals mainly with the same area of the increase in penalties and the anomaly that exists whereby the Minister was advised by Crown Law opinion that the issuing of directions under the regulations (which has been the case for many years) is not authorised under the current legislation, and therefore this Bill seeks to clarify the legal status of regulation 16. Quite obviously, it is necessary to do that, and the Bill principally sets standards with which we have no argument. It was a measure that was put forward to me in about 1981, but there was no time in the legislative programme at that stage to introduce it in to the Parliament.

The Opposition is happy to support this measure. Once again, we have discussed this matter with the Master Builders Association, Master Plumbers and Mechanical Services Association, local government, and the housing industry, and we have not encountered any real objection to the Bill. However, the Master Plumbers and Mechanical Services Association drew attention to the magnitude of some increases in penalties. The association did not oppose the increases, but drew attention to them in the same way as the member for Mitcham drew attention to the magnitude of the increases in penalties under the Waterworks Act Amendment Bill.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): I thank honourable members for their support. This Bill will tighten up legislation in relation to protection of public health, as the major part of the Bill deals with waste in the sewer system and penalties. The member for Chaffey referred to the substantial increases in penalties, but I point out that most of these penalties have not been amended since 1929, so there is certainly reason to bring them up to modern day standards.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Regulations.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: This clause provides a similar provision to that under clause 4 of the previous Bill. It relates to the Minister's power to fix charges and fees, and to the minimum fee. Is this provision the same as that under the Waterworks Act Amendment Bill? In 1978, in relation to the Waterworks Act, the Minister was given power to fix charges for services over 50 millimetres, but the regulations under this Act did not give that power. I thought that the charges were set by regulation and that the flexibility provided under the Waterworks Act did not apply to the Sewerage Act.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Yes, there was a power similar to that under the Waterworks Act.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Power to disconnect drains.'

The CHAIRMAN: I bring to the attention of the Committee that 'section 61' in line 39 should read 'section 60'.

Clause passed.

Clauses 17 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—'Certified plan to be evidence of drain.'

The CHAIRMAN: Again, I bring to the attention of the Committee that there is an error in the title of the Engineer-in-Chief. It should read 'to be certified by the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief'. This amendment has been made.

Clause 21 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1984

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 March. Page 2671.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I indicate from the outset that the Opposition supports this Bill. Also, it appreciates the discussions that have taken place in a number of different ways, as they led to amendments to be moved in due course which will improve the Bill. I refer to the Minister's second reading explanation in which he said that at a special general meeting of the Association held on 19 August 1983 endorsement was given to a recommended plan designed by the task force, and that the Minister of Local Government was requested to implement legislative backing required to give effect to the proposed scheme. Of course, the Association referred to here was the Local Government Association, and there had been ongoing dialogue since the late 1970s leading to a series of working papers and, subsequently, the creation of a task force, which involved not only members of the Minister's staff, the Local Government Association, and the Public Actuary but also an actuary who had been provided to the task force by the private enterprise insurance companies that had been providing superannuation benefits for local government up to that time.

It is common knowledge that superannuation moved into the local government sphere only late on the scene compared to industry and, in actual fact, its relative universal acceptance and involvement as part of the Local Government Act gave it a measure of imprimatur by Government as recently as 1972, with a series of guidelines for implementation being brought down in 1973.

The variations on the theme which have been undertaken by local governing bodies since that time are a problem in the sense that one does not have the degree of uniformity that would be desirable and, more specifically, there has been no availability of portability so far as the transference of members of the local government fraternity from one employment to another in local government is concerned. That is one of the more important measures to be effected by the Bill. I again refer again to the point mentioned by the Minister in introducing the Bill that in its present form the Local Government Act gives no absolute prescription of the level and type of superannuation that must be provided.

It is further stated that any scheme dealing with superannuation for local government employees must be approved by the Minister of Local Government. That is the situation as it has been. The effectiveness of the task force has been to come forward with a document that is satisfactory for local government. It may well need some fine tuning as time goes on. It is inevitable that a new scheme of this nature requires a period of time in which to settle down, but once it settles down, if it should come back to Parliament for that fine tuning, I am sure the Opposition will be as responsible then as it is now in regard to this matter.

It is interesting to point out (and I take the opportunity to repeat statements which have already been made by the Minister in this case) the ambit of the superannuation scheme. In regard to membership, it will be offered to all permanent employees without discrimination with regard to sex or type of employment and, more importantly, membership will not be compulsory. Also, inquiries have found that, whilst a member may decide to opt in, once a member opts out that member will have no opportunity of returning to the scheme. The Opposition finds no difficulty with that. Further, the council contribution, at least in the first instance (one would hope for a considerable period, if not forever), will be 7.5 per cent of salaries of all employees who join the scheme, whilst members themselves will be able to choose contribution levels ranging from 2.5 per cent to 10 per cent of salary.

Benefit levels will vary according to the level of contribution chosen. That is quite understandable and, at the lowest contribution level, employees will receive a lump-sum retirement benefit after 40 years of service of 4.8 times their average annual salary during their last three years of service, with a maximum retirement benefit being seven times final average annual salary.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: That is on the highest percentage.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Yes, that is on the highest percentage, and the person in the scheme has the opportunity to elect by paying up to 10 per cent to benefit to the greatest degree. It should also be pointed out that there are a number of people involved with local government in schemes that are more beneficial than the scheme provided for them under the provisions of the new enactment. Under a transitional phase those persons who are currently in a system will benefit as they have contracted to do and there will be no alteration of the benefits for those people. Those arrangements have been fixed within the overall undertakings that have been given by all of the participating bodies and that, in itself, should effectively overcome any resistance within the industry in the field.

Also, we note that this measure at present is virtually an enabling provision. It does not seek to prescribe in total terms all of the provisions necessary and it gives an indication that those matters associated with the detail of the scheme will be in a document known as 'The Scheme' which will be tabled in Parliament and which will be subject to normal disallowance similar to by-laws and regulations. I suspect that that is breaking rather new ground and is quite commendable. I have to say (although I do not want to transgress at great length) that a review of this scheme along with the review of by-laws and regulations, if necessary, requires major alterations to our current Standing Orders so that members are not impeded in that review by virtue of the fact that review in this House at least can be undertaken only during private members' time, except if a matter is taken up by the Government.

There is a strong case for a disallowance motion in respect of regulations, or now a scheme that they be able to be called on when they are current or pertinent. A group of members is looking at that feature. I feel sure, with the discussions that have taken place, that that reality will become effective in the not too distant future. It must be beneficial for the scheme arrangement and for by-laws and regulations. That aside, in discussions with the proponents of the scheme it is agreed that the provisions of this enactment are not quite tight or prescriptive enough. The amendments that will come before the House in a few minutes seek to give a clear indication of what the board of the scheme will be and to set out what an actuary will be—more particularly, the actuary who will have a part to play in this arrangement. It is wise that those concerns have been met by the agreement to put them into the Act itself so that they are there for change only by the Parliament. I commend the Minister and his advisers for accepting the reality of that situation.

One of the other features of the scheme, not yet totally clear—certainly not within the Bill, but within the arrangements that have taken place in the background—is that the scheme for local government will be managed by the private sector. In fact, those companies that have had an involvement with superannuation for local governing bodies in the past are joining together in arrangements that will give to the local government superannuation scheme a value and continuing benefit that is in the best interests of local government. I am pleased that the various bodies have been able to come together in this way. There can only be one manager, and it might be a disappointment to others that they are not the manager and somebody else is. As I understand the situation, there is a clear indication between the

organisations that have played a part in the superannuation of local government in the past that they each will be able to continue an involvement in the superannuation scheme in the cross-referencing that takes place and in the conduct of the portfolios that will give the backing to the superannuation scheme.

Finally, I draw the attention of the House to the fact that what we are passing today in relation to this amendment to the Local Government Act, 1934 (which is Bill 103 on our files), is replicated in the major Bill (104) that we will be discussing next week. The replication is because of the restructuring of the Local Government Act and an isolation, if one likes, of the superannuation features of the Act into their own division. That is very wise; it will make it much easier for those who are hunting through the Local Government Act to pick up the areas of responsibility.

The reason for seeking to have the same measure passed by the Parliament in quick succession in two Bills recognises the reality that, in the best interests of local government, the superannuation scheme should come into effect by 1 July. With all the work—the creation of regulations, distribution and subsequent proclamation of the Bill (which is currently before us as 104) perhaps going on beyond 1 July—there is abundant caution in relation to the passage of this Bill so that the local government scheme can come into effect when it is desired or when it is most responsible to come into effect on 1 July. For those who will seek the link between this and other areas of the new Local Government Act, whilst we are talking of the introduction of a series of new sections 157a to 157f, the purists will be able to find the clauses, in Division IV of Part VI of the new Act, the proposals will be, as currently structured, clauses 73 and 78. They will, as I say, be there under their own heading of 'Superannuation'—therefore there is a totality on that issue. There are brief aspects of the measures which should be considered in Committee and I will take the opportunity to raise them at that time.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I rise to support this Bill. As a former President of the Australian Workers Union and metropolitan organiser responsible for some 2 000 council workers I have had some experience in dealing with the day-to-day problems associated with superannuation scheme arrangements currently operating in South Australia. As a union official I was constantly plagued by members complaining bitterly about the discriminatory nature of their council superannuation scheme. Discrimination broadly occurs in two areas: first, outside workers, members of the Australian Workers Union, are discriminated against by comparison with male office staff who are members of the Municipal Officers Association. In nearly all councils the superannuation scheme arrangement benefits offered to inside staff are far superior to those offered to outside workers. Secondly, the current scheme discriminates on the grounds of sex—female clerical employees are offered inferior benefits to those offered male employees.

With respect to clerical employees, the proposed scheme which has been negotiated between the Local Government Association and the unions removes all discriminatory aspects of existing schemes. A task force comprising representatives from the Municipal Officers Association, the Australian Workers Union, local and State Government (including a representative of the Public Actuary), have reached agreement on the final details of the new scheme to be implemented on 1 July 1984. I am pleased to say that the discriminatory nature of the existing scheme has been removed. The single most important feature of this new scheme is that all people will be treated as equals, irrespective of their sex or employment positions within the council. I feel sure that all members of the House will applaud that move. As a union official I had extreme difficulty in coming to grips with the fact that written into the existing arrangements was a class distinction component. This two-tiered system of benefits often meant that a widow and her beneficiaries received tens of thousands of dollars less than if her deceased husband had been fortunate enough to have been classified under the MOA award.

It also needs to be placed on record and recognised that all representative parties who comprised the task force have worked long and hard to reach an agreement on all aspects of the superannuation scheme. This augurs well for future industrial relations and the future of local government. Currently, in local government in South Australia there are some 300 different superannuation schemes, which is administratively messy and extremely costly. Under the new arrangements there will be a single superannuation scheme which will apply to all councils. There will be significant cost savings in this. Some important features of the new scheme are that there will be a board of trustees comprising equal representatives from the trade union movement, the Local Government Association and the Public Actuary. The Chairman will be appointed by the Minister of Local Government. The Local Government Association and unions should be congratulated on recognising the importance of establishing a sound working basis for handling superannuation matters in the future. Another important feature of this scheme is that the workers will be granted vesting rights, unlike many schemes operating in private enterprise where, if workers leave before retirement date, all they receive back from their own superannuation scheme is their contribution plus compound interest.

Provisions have also been made for flexible contributions by members without affecting the contribution from employers, enabling young people to enter the scheme at a lower level of contributions and, as their financial commitments are reduced later on in life, to increase their contributions to provide properly for their retirement. It is not appropriate to canvass all the improved features of the new superannuation scheme. It is sufficient to say that, because of the co-operative approach that was developed, a scheme has been arrived at to satisfy the needs of all parties, councils, Government and workers employed in the industry. In conclusion, I impress upon the House that it is vital that this enabling legislation be passed without delay. The new superannuation scheme is to be introduced to operate from 1 July 1984. It is essential that this Bill goes through Parliament in order that there be no delays to the scheme. Owing to the enormous complexity of setting up a superannuation scheme of this size, invariably delays have occurred already. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to have the opportunity to make a few comments in regard to this Bill. I think that it is pleasing to see, as the Minister said in his second reading explanation, that the aim is to establish legislative framework for a single superannuation scheme for all local government employees in lieu of the multiple schemes currently operated by individual councils. I think that that is a very important thing that will come to fruition here. I am aware that some councils were not terribly happy in the earlier days to leave the schemes that they were operating. I guess that that mainly involved those councils that felt that they had a very good scheme in hand. However, it seems to me that this is covered in the new Bill, where the Minister has said that membership will not be compulsory and that there will be full portability of superannuation. The Minister also said:

> Members of existing council schemes will not be disadvantaged. They can choose to remain with their present contribution levels and benefit entitlements or else transfer to the new contribution benefits, with their accrued benefits being preserved.

That is a positive thing, so at least no-one will be disadvantaged in this scheme. I know that some councils felt that they were possibly being bulldozed into having to go into this scheme. I remember earlier days when the former Minister of Local Government (the Hon. Mr Hemmings) apparently gave the ultimatum that, if they did not join this particular scheme, they would join the South Australian Superannuation Fund. I did some research on behalf of some concerned people with the Public Actuary's Office and the Department of Local Government. Both those bodies were very helpful in providing specific details. If we compare the South Australian superannuation scheme with the new scheme fairly briefly, it seems that a contributor to the South Australian superannuation scheme would pay between 5 per cent and 6 per cent of his salary, depending on his age.

Under the local government scheme it is between 2.5 per cent and 10 per cent. Therefore, there is flexibility. In fact, it appears that the new scheme has some real advantages. What does it cost the employer, and local government in particular? I refer to a letter that I received from the Superannuation Advisory Officer of the Public Actuary's Office, dated 20 December 1983, as follows:

> ... the Government does not fund in advance for its accruing superannuation liabilities but rather pays its share of the cost of pensions as they arise. Thus the critical point with regard to the cost to the Government is to distinguish between the cost which the Government would incur if it did fund in advance and the cost which it does incur by paying its share of pensions.

The letter goes on to state that, if it did have to fund an advance, it would be about 18 per cent of the salary of fund members, and then states:

> On the other hand, in practice, the cost to the Government of paying its share of pensions has over the past few years been about 12 per cent of the salary of fund members or about 4 per cent of the salary of all employees.

Therefore, it seems to me that the contribution rates based on those figures probably would tally fairly closely with the 7.5 per cent that is being suggested as the fixed rate for local government bodies.

I think that we need to look a little further. I will be interested to hear the Minister's comments about the number of members of the scheme, although that may be crystal-ball gazing. Another reply from the Superannuation Advisory Officer dated 30 November 1983 states:

> As the average age at entry into the scheme is about 35, this results in an average Government contribution during membership of about 17.5 per cent of the pay-roll of members. However, the average age at entry into Government service would appear to be much lower (say age 25) and only about 30 per cent of those eligible are currently contributors to the fund.

Thirty per cent is a fairly low figure. Only 30 per cent of those eligible are contributing to the South Australian Superannuation Fund, according to the letter. If we take that as being indicative of what occurs in local government (perhaps even going as high as 50 per cent) the probable cost to local government will not be 7.5 per cent per contributing member (and, unless I have read it incorrectly, it is per contributing member); it will be less than that, if it is taken across all employees. Therefore, it seems to be an inexpensive scheme. In his second reading explanation, the Minister states:

> At the lowest level of contributions employees will receive a lump sum retirement benefit after 40 years of service of 4.8 times their average salary during their last three years of service.

Again, I will be pleased if the Minister will comment in due course on how that will compare with the South Australian Superannuation Fund. I was not able to locate that information. I know that there are varying figures which do not relate exactly to that specific example, which referred to a lump sum. How will it compare if it is taken in the form of a pension?

I am perfectly aware that it depends on the time at which a person enters and the time at which they leave. A general figure would be helpful to all concerned so that we could see to what extent employees are at an advantage, a disadvantage, or at the same level under the new scheme compared with the South Australian Superannuation Fund. I do not intend to go over other details of the Bill. I think that the shadow Minister, the member for Light, has touched on many of the relevant matters. I repeat that it seems to me that it is a positive move to have a single superannuation scheme, certainly where transferability is available to employees of the Local Government Association.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Local Government): I shall be brief in answering three or four points that were raised. First, I thank members who spoke in the debate for their support of the legislation and for their contributions. In response to a query raised by the member for Light (although I know that he knows the answer to it), I point out that the involvement of Government in the superannuation scheme is merely enabling to provide legislation under which the Minister can appoint a person to be Chairman of the board. That is for the sake of independence. The other positions are statutory positions, and are spelt out in the Act.

The member for Goyder asked a number of questions about how many people would be likely to join the new scheme, and made comparisons in regard to the number of employees who joined the old scheme. He also referred to the cost involved and the benefits applying to superannuants in the local government scheme as opposed to those provided for people in the Public Service scheme. I am unable to give the honourable member firm figures in regard to either of those schemes, and I will explain why. First, I should say that there are a number of workers within local government in South Australia who have not joined the current superannuation scheme because they saw no real benefit in it for them. Many differing schemes have been in operation, varying from council to council. Some councils have a high percentage of employees in the superannuation scheme and other councils a low percentage, depending on how the people working at a council view the superannuation scheme. The reason I am unable to give the honourable member the figures he has asked for is because, in a sense, I see this as a matter of the State Government's merely being involved in the processing of enabling legislation rather than its being involved in making judgments as to the superannuation scheme that has been agreed upon between the Local Government Association and people who work within local government. In a sense, I would liken it to people in Canberra telling the State Government of South Australia what sort of superannuation scheme it should provide for people working for the State Government. In a sense I see it that way, and I think that that comparison would be quite obvious to the honourable member.

Therefore, I have not sought to criticise or question the report of the working party, because it is a report that has been agreed upon, and I think that it is the role of Government to support local government and the unions involved as well as the Public Actuary in the determination they are seeking from us. So, that is what we are doing here today. I thank honourable members for their contributions. I understand that some matters will be raised in Committee, and we will address them as they arise.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am, in fact, opposing my own clause. The reason for that is to ensure that the Parlia-

ment will have the statutory time to consider the documentation when it is placed before us, namely, 14 days. The best way we can achieve that is to ensure that, when the Bill is assented to, it immediately comes into effect. By opposing clause 2 we will achieve that and so provide the Parliament with a 14-day period in which to take whatever action it wishes in relation to the documentation.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I support the action taken by the Minister. He highlights the fact that it is a rather unusual procedure. I trust that when we come to Bill No. 104 at a later stage the Minister will see fit to remove some of those clauses which are obnoxious to other organisations. However, in relation to this matter the clause is being deleted from the Bill for sound reasons. It will give a great deal of confidence to people in another place and, more specifically, to a number of members of local government who have that inbuilt fear that the document may not be the one that they last saw. The other place is the only place that has an ongoing role to bring about disallowance during the course of this Parliamentary session. Standing Orders presently provide that we can only disallow *in toto* and not alter one simple word or phrase. That area will be considered in another context, but we support the measure being proposed.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Local Government superannuation scheme.'

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: New section 157a provides that the Minister 'may'—I trust that on all occasions the Minister 'will' or 'shall'. I am not seeking necessarily to change the wording as 'may' applies more when we come to paragraph *(b)*. Certainly, if the board, which is structured over the length and breadth of the industry, was of the opinion that a particular scheme should have credence, I would hope that on every occasion the Minister of the day would meet the board's request. It may be that the Minister would see fit to accept an amendment at a later stage if it becomes a point at issue.

More specifically, I ask the Minister to indicate whether an officer or employee of a council means an officer or employee of a class declared by the superannuation scheme to be someone to whom the scheme applies. We find that, for this purpose, the scheme can apply to people other than those who are direct council employees. Which other organisation does the Minister have under contemplation?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In regard to new section 157a and the question of whether the Minister 'may'—of course the Minister 'will'. The word 'may' would apply in the unusual circumstances where there is complete disagreement amongst the members of the board. It provides for those unusual circumstances but, in this case, the Minister 'will'—there is absolutely no doubt about that. The definition of 'employee' includes all employees except those employed on a casual basis.

In relation to the Authorities and bodies to which the scheme will apply, there are a number of organisations that cut across single councils and where three or four councils may be joined together; for instance, the Pest Plant Board, regional organisations and local government organisations. I have mentioned one or two others which would include a number of councils. There are a number of councils involved, and it covers all those organisations that are basically local government.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a typographical error on page 2, subclause (3), line 9, where the word 'without' should read 'within'.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

Page 2, after line 39—Insert sub-clause as follows:
(2a) The Board shall consist of six members of whom—
(a) five shall be persons appointed by the Governor—
(i) one being a person nominated by the Minister, who shall be the chairman of the Board;
(ii) two being persons nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia;
(iii) one being a person nominated by the Municipal Officers Association of Australia (South Australian Branch);
and
(iv) one being a person nominated by the Australian Workers Union (South Australian Branch);
and
(b) one shall be the person holding or acting in the office of the Public Actuary or his nominee.

This amendment writes into the Bill, and consequently the Act, exactly who shall be the persons appointed by the Governor. There will be a person nominated by the Minister, who will be the Chairman of the Board, two persons nominated by the Local Government Association of South Australia, one person nominated by the Municipal Officers Association of Australia, which represents clerical officers within local government, one person nominated by the Australian Workers Union, which covers the overwhelmingly majority of workers within local government, and one person holding or acting in the office of the public actuary or nominee. This has been a subject of discussion with the Opposition and, in fairness to the honourable member for Light, it was an amendment suggested by him that the Government has accepted.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: It is appreciated that the detail involved has been worked out and that this measure is now before the House. It gives a greater degree of clarity to certain matters and will be acceptable to a number of people, not only in local government but within the Parliamentary scene, who accept that it has a distinct advantage over previous legislation. Comment was made that other definitions could be inserted, but I do not think that they will be necessary. It was represented to me today that there should be a clear indication that the maximum that the council will be responsible for is 7.5 per cent. I recognise, with the reality of changing circumstances and payouts, that it may be necessary to make a change to that figure. It will be a change which is effected after due discussion by the board and after being placed before the Local Government Association and individual councils. It therefore does not really need the sort of finality that the Act would place upon it. We have a reasonable proposition before us and, hopefully, it will satisfy all of the needs of those who would question superannuation *per se* and more particularly the effect that it will have on the ongoing expenses of local government, as it has on Government and other organisations beyond.

Amendment carried:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

Page 3, after line 26—Insert sub-clause as follows:
(4) In this section—
'actuary' means a person who is a Fellow of the Institute of Actuaries of Australia.

This amendment is agreed between the Opposition and the Government. It defines 'actuary' as meaning a person who is a Fellow of the Institute of Actuaries of Australia. It was considered important to spell this out in the Bill.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

URBAN LAND TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 December. Page 2499.)

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): This Bill provides the Urban Land Trust with the power to participate on a

joint venture basis with private developers in urban development. The effect of inserting new section 14 (2) *(a)* into the Act is to extend the current powers beyond a land banking role to one which permits joint ventures with developers. As a result of this legislation the Urban Land Trust will not be able to develop land in its own right.

The previous Liberal Government restructured the then Land Commission and, as the House would know, removed the right of the newly formed Land Trust to develop land. The Trust as a land bank sells broad acre land parcels to private developers, who in turn may subdivide the land for housing and other purposes. The Bannon Government considers that the current role of the Trust does not enable it to play an effective role in ensuring urban development, as stated in the second reading explanation. I dispute that argument. As the private sector demonstrated very clearly, it is quite capable of providing sufficient lots for the South Australian market without the interference of Government: that is, other than involvement to the extent necessary to ensure efficient and speedy processing of planning applications. I will say more about that later.

The Golden Grove project, however, is a special case. Commitments have been made in the past that this venture should be a joint venture, and I support that. The former Liberal Government and I as Minister of Planning strongly supported this project, and we intitiated a development package and initial involvement by the private sector. Recently the Government announced its intention that the development should proceed under a joint venture programme, and of course that is what this Bill is all about. I suggest strongly that the private sector is best equipped both in technical and financial resource terms to provide a stable supply of allotments to the South Australian land market. I repeat again—Golden Grove is a special project and, because of its size and urgency and because of the commitments that have been made in the past, it is appropriate that the Urban Land Trust enlist the expertise of the private sector in this venture. But this is a one-off case.

Because of time restrictions, I will not be able to say as much as I would have liked to say, but I indicate very clearly the concern and suspicions of private industry and developers about the width of this measure. I share that concern. I would hate this Bill to be seen as the first leg back to the provisions of the old Land Commission. The Minister might like to allay the concerns of those private developers who have expressed that fear.

I do not really need to remind this House of the disastrous effects of the Land Commission on private developers in this State and on the taxpayers of this State. The House would be aware that the Commission was established in 1973 by both the previous State and Commonwealth Labor Governments. The purpose of the Commission, we were told, was to acquire, manage and develop land for present and future urban expansion, with the primary objective of providing land for persons who were without large financial resources. Apart from small grants, the Commission's activities have been financed by repayable loans from both the Commonwealth Government and the South Australian Government. Loans provided by the Commonwealth Government amounted to $53 million and by the State Government $11 million, of which $8 million had been provided by borrowing from various financial institutions.

As at 30 June 1981 the debt to the Commonwealth, including capitalised interest, amounted to almost $89 million. If the Liberal Government had not stepped in when it first came into office, the existing arrangements would have continued and, that being the case, the debt to the Commonwealth would be something like $122 million by the time the first repayments were due to be made at the beginning of this year. As I mentioned earlier, the previous Liberal Government was not willing to have the taxpayers of this State meet that escalating cost, and much effort was put into reorganising the financial situation with the Commonwealth.

Back in 1973 a working party under the direction of Mr Doug Speechley, Deputy-Director of Planning, was established by the then Government. That working party made a number of comments about the Land Commission, and I would like to refer to some of them. In regard to the problem of future price increases, the following was stated:

> We believe that the price rise could be moderated provided the rate of subdivision responds quickly.

The working party went on to state:

> It is also our opinion that if the Land Commission is dominant in control of broad acres it should not engage directly in land subdivision or land development. We believe that vesting acquisition and development functions in the one organisation could lead to private developers vacating the field because their competitior, the Land Commission, would control the supply of broad acres. Thus the Land Commission would end up as a monopoly developer.

We know what happened to private developers in this State: they moved out in droves as a result of the effect of the Land Commission. The working party went on to state:

> In our view and in the view of the committee it is desirable that private developers continue to operate because they have substantial experience and knowledge of what people want in this State.

A report was also prepared by Mr Bentick, who had some critical points to make about the Land Commission, and I intend to refer to a couple of those points in his report. He stated:

> The present holding by the Land Commission based on 1977 figures of 4 000 allotments represents a burden to other ratepayers in the community of $1.3 million a year.

He goes on to state:

> The main defect of the political process is that public enterprise finds it difficult to respond to consumer demand which has many dimensions, while public enterprise can easily determine and supply the demand for kilowatts of electricity, gallons of water and gross number of allotments. It finds it hard to supply allotments and houses of different types.

He also states:

> The existence of the South Australian Land Commission and the policies it has exercised have perpetuated a situation which runs contrary to the original recommendations of the Speechley Report—

that is the committee to which I referred earlier—

> and which has discouraged the employment of valuable private sector resources.

I could go into more detail on what Mr Bentick had to say in his report. Finally, he said:

> Experience has indicated the view of the Working Party that the private sector cannot survive competition with the Land Commission. The experience in the past six years has demonstrated that the choice is between either a Land Commission monopoly with all the inherent inefficiencies, of which there is now ample evidence, or the private sector developer, subject only to the laws of supply and demand. Land prices will continue to be stable if the planning and subdivision processes are streamlined so as not to impede the creation of allotments in response of the communities' needs.

One only has to look at the report of the South Australian Urban Land Trust for 1983 to recognise the success of the Trust and the marketing arrangements that it has through the private sector. We are told in that report that the Trust sold 441 residential allotments in 1981-82 and 701 in 1982-83, an increase of 59 per cent. The total revenue of $8.48 million from the sale of land included $1.89 million from broad-acre land sales and was 42 per cent above the previous year's figure of $5.95 million. Under the heading, 'Broad-acre land disposal', the report states:

> The Urban Land Trust's development role is restricted to the creation of marketable parcels of broad-acre land by plans of land division to meet market demand. Although the Urban Land Trust

has 414 hectares of deferred urban land at Morphett Vale East suitable for subdivision, some lead time of not less than twelve months will be required to rezone for residential development. The Trust has taken this matter up with the Government.

And I will refer to that later, also. Under 'Marketing', it states:

Effective marketing coupled with rising demand throughout the year for home sites, particularly in southern areas, has lifted sales by 59 per cent. Net sales to individuals and builders for the twelve month period totalled 701 allotments.

It was only because of the involvement of the previous Liberal Government that the private sector was given the opportunity to become involved in the marketing of land through the Urban Land Trust, and that report indicates how successful it has been.

The fact is that the private sector is anxious to get on with the job of producing allotments. At the beginning of March some 3 600 blocks were actually under way, and the only reason why there were not more was the processes associated with planning approvals, which the private sector is very critical of and which that sector believes are not conducive to investing and risk taking.

I believe strongly that tampering with the South Australian Urban Land Trust, which was put in place by our Government, will do nothing to help maintain the confidence in the private sector and with the exception of Golden Grove, which is a special matter, I am perfectly confident that the private sector is able to produce sufficient lots for the South Australian market without Government involvement; that is, other than involvement, as I said before, to the extent necessary to ensure efficient and speedy processing of planning applications.

For some time now the private developers have been urging the Government to do something about rezoning land. Since the beginning of last year statement after statement and request after request have been made of the Minister for Environment and Planning to rezone more land to make more land and more choice available to those who wish to buy land on which to build their own homes. The present Minister for Environment and Planning has taken no heed of warnings that have been provided to him by a number of people. He has refused to do anything about the situation. I would like to refer to a letter that was sent to the Premier following a similar letter to the Minister for Environment and Planning, because the Minister refused to act in the matter. I quote from the letter from the then President of the Urban Development Institute:

I am informed by the President of the Real Estate Institute, Mr John Black, that he has written to you expressing concern that your Government appreciates the critical shortage of residential land (both zoned broadacres and developed allotments) within the metropolitan area of Adelaide and the effect this shortage will continue to have on land prices in general . . .

We estimate that 1984 and 1985 will see a more dramatic increase in the average price which will be attributable to the pressure of relatively high demand for fewer blocks . . .

This Institute is of the firm belief that the key to stable land prices is an adequate supply. This supply should be general throughout the metropolitan area and should offer consumers a fair and reasonable choice of location. My purpose in writing to you today is to emphasise first the seriousness of the supply situation and, secondly, the problems that will need to be overcome before we are able to produce sufficient allotments to satisfy demand.

The letter concludes:

The problem of providing sufficient land to the South Australian public has now become, in our opinion, so critical that we ask that you and your Government make this a matter of the highest priority to ensure that community needs are met as efficiently as possible. With your assistance the private sector can produce the required stock of residential land and further we believe that private sector expertise and efficiency is the only way to ensure the rapid stabilisation of the market.

If I had time I would quote more of that letter. I would particularly have liked to quote from the letter that the Institute sent directly to the Minister. Very recently, I sent a press release to the Minister, which the *Advertiser* picked up, expressing my concern about the lack of action by the Minister and the Government in this regard. The Minister indicated what he was going to do about that, which was to provide more staff in the Lands Titles Office (perhaps a question should be asked about that on another occasion), the redeployment of staff in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, a review of the Planning Act—we are aware that that is going on—and then he was reported to have said:

The convening of a meeting of development industry leaders to ensure that every possible measure was taken to maintain stocks of land at reasonable prices.

As far as I am able to ascertain, when this statement was released by the Minister, the development industry knew nothing about that meeting whatsoever. It does now. I am pleased that the Minister has agreed to have a round-table conference to talk about those problems. What concerned me and many people in this State was the last couple of paragraphs in the article which read:

He said the Liberal Government had moved to prevent the Trust from buying land and producing allotments. The Trust had originally been set up to ensure a steady supply in the market place, which would limit price increases.

Finally, I hope that the evidence that I have been able to provide today would suggest that the Minister's allegation against the Liberal Party is incorrect. We do not want another Land Commission, nor do we need one, with the provisions that the authority has in this State at present or at any time in the future. The Opposition will support the Bill but we will move at the appropriate time to ensure that Golden Grove is a 'one-off' situation where joint venturing can take place but that the Government should not be involved in other situations apart from that.

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

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I do not want to speak at any great length on this matter, but there are one or two matters to which the honourable member referred in his remarks and which I believe I should pick up. The honourable member has again displayed the ideological blinkers that were exercised by the Liberal Party when it dismantled the South Australian Land Commission. I agree entirely that what we are talking about here is a supply of serviced land to people who wish to develop that land basically, of course, for residential purposes and at a price which is within the reasonable pocket particularly of lower and middle income earners.

We must remember that this country has gone through an interesting stage in relation to the land market: a very difficult stage. We had a boom across this country in the early 1970s, which then entered an extremely flat period during the late 1970s and the early 1980s. That now shows every sign of being reversed. We suddenly have a very buoyant market, although there are one or two voices of caution being uttered, suggesting that it may be that the current boom is unlikely to extend much beyond the end of 1985. The Labor Government, which set up the South Australian Land Commission, believed that there was a role for both the public and private sectors in providing stocks of serviced land.

Both the public and private sectors were adversely affected by that drastic downturn in the market through the very late 1970s and the early 1980s. At the critical time, when further stocks of land needed to be produced, and at a time when private enterprise was not providing those stocks

because there was not a quid in it for them, the very agency that could have operated in such a way as to continue to make the supply available (albeit possibly at some cost to the taxpayer, if this was Government's general prescription) was unable to fulfil this function. The Land Commission was dismantled by the previous Government. It is a tenet of conservative philosophy that when (to use their terms) a socialist adventure is dismantled, private enterprise will race in to fill the vacuum that has been created. I ask the House to consider whether that happened on this occasion. Where was the great private enterprise activity, which occurred during the early 1980s, to pick up the slack which the South Australian Land Commission was unable to pick up because there was no longer a Land Commission? Nothing happened in that critical period when the assembly of land, which would now be issued as serviced blocks, could have been undertaken—nothing was happening. There is a lesson to be learnt: that the public sector does have a role to play. No-one can anticipate exactly what the market is likely to be in 12 or 24 months time.

I have already mentioned that there are those voices of caution that are saying that the present boom is unlikely to extend much beyond the end of 1985. Of course, from one viewpoint, I hope that they are wrong. Nonetheless, we simply cannot anticipate. Who would have anticipated, say, in 1974 that in a short space of four years the market would be as flat as it was? Of course, in terms of the philosophy that I am outlining here, this Government should indeed be going further than this Bill does. However, we believe that this is a responsible measure. It is a cautious measure and one which envisages that three forms of activity will carry on from this point, which will enable serviced blocks of land to come on the market. First, there are those broad acres which are in the hands of private enterprise and which private enterprise clearly will put on the market, particularly now that the market advantage is moving in their favour.

There is nothing in the Bill that will interfere with that. If we go further and reinstate the Land Commission, I do not believe that that will interfere with that function of private enterprise. Secondly, the Urban Land Trust will still be able to operate as it has in the past couple of years. The only way that it has been able to operate is by simply selling its broadacres to private enterprise for private subdivision. This Bill envisages a third mechanism so that the joint venture can be undertaken. During the second reading debate it was canvassed that a certain amendment would be moved during the Committee stage. That amendment will vitiate the role that we as a Government believe the Urban Land Trust should carry out. There is still plenty of scope for the function of private enterprise under the Bill. As I said before, private enterprise will still be able to subdivide the broadacres that it owns, and it will be able to purchase and develop broadacres from the Urban Land Trust.

The third method of proceeding is one that I believe should operate. There is also a fourth method that is also operating but will soon run out. There are stocks of land that the Urban Land Trust has been selling for some time that were originally formed as a result of the activities of the Land Commission.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member does not listen. I am not talking about the total stocks: I am talking about those stocks of land that the Urban Land Trust is selling and which were originally produced by the Land Commission. Of course they are running out because the previous Liberal Government did not allow them to be replaced.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: That is rubbish!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: That is true. That was a deliberate decision by that Government.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Rubbish!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Is the honourable member trying to tell us that it would have been possible by amending the Land Commission legislation for the Urban Land Trust to have produced its own stocks of land? Is he in fact saying that? Of course he is not. What is he trying to say? He is just contradicting himself. I do not know what the interjection was supposed to produce. I make the point that within a few months it will no longer be possible for the Land Commission to move blocks of land on its own, because the Land Commission blocks of land, which were reduced many years ago, will have run out. The only way that it will be possible to market it is through private enterprise in one of two ways: either through private enterprise doing the job itself or through the joint venture that this Bill envisages. I strongly urge support for the measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Powers and functions of the Trust.'

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

Page 1, line 17—After 'land' insert 'within the development Area (as defined by the Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Act, 1978'.

As I indicated during the second reading debate, the amendment will make it possible for Golden Grove to proceed on a joint venture basis, but not other developments. As I indicated before, the private sector has proven in recent times its capacity to develop and market land without Government involvement. I strongly urge the Committee to support the amendment.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I strongly urge the Committee to reject the amendment. I do not think that it is sufficient that we should confine this mechanism, which I believe is interesting and promising, purely to Tea Tree Gully and Golden Grove. Why should we do that? It is not intended that all of the operations of the Urban Land Trust that will result in the movement of its current broadacres on to the market should be through this mechanism. But I think it is totally inadequate to suggest that the only area of broadacres that should be subject to this mechanism is that at Tea Tree Gully and Golden Grove.

Mr LEWIS: Because the Golden Grove development is already in the pipeline and people who have made commitments are involved in one way or another, I see no reason why it should not proceed in that instance, but in general I believe that Governments do very badly those things such as this which are best left to the more resilient and flexible mechanisms of the private enterprise part of our economy, because they can move with market demand to take up and provide raw land in a form that is suitable and in compliance with the Act, or, otherwise, withdraw. If public servants are involved that cannot be done; one is stuck. When Governments get involved in trading it invariably costs everyone in the State, including the end users, more one way or another. They are not the mechanisms by which jobs can be done most efficiently. There is no incentive for Public Service employees to perform in anything like the same way as there is in the private sector where, together with the profit motive, there is a desire to demonstrate personal competence in managing an enterprise.

The profit motive is not there in the case of the public sector employee. They may wish to expand their career opportunities and therefore work harder, but there is no necessity compelling them to do so. Consequently, if the market takes a down-turn they are loath to admit it until it is too late and the taxpayers' money has to be put in to bail them out. Members of the Opposition philosophically do not accept that position, and we urge the Committee to accept the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.
Title passed.
Bill read a third time and passed.

VALUATION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Orders of the Day, Government Business, No. 8.

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

That this Order of the Day be discharged.

Order of the Day discharged.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.9 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 3 April at 2 p.m.