HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 3 May 1983

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes set forth in the Supplementary Estimates of Payments for the financial year 1982-83 and the Appropriation Bill (No. 1) 1983.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments of the Public Service of the Government of South Australia during the year ending 30 June 1984.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 2),
Racing Act Amendment, (1983),
River Murray Waters,
South-Eastern Drainage Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard:* 68, 72, 73, 82, 91, 97, 122, 124, 129, 130, 135, 136, 140, 143, 150, 152, 154, 159, 172, 173, 178, 181 to 185, 188, 197, 198 and 201.

PETITION: PRESCRIBED CONCENTRATION OF ALCOHOL

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to reduce the prescribed concentration of alcohol to .05 per cent was presented by the Hon. W.E. Chapman.

Petition received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following interim reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works:

Stirling-Heathfield Water Supply Augmentation,
North Adelaide School of Art and Crafts Upgrading.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee, together with minutes of evidence:

Hackham South Primary School—Stage II.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Minister of Public Works): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition made certain statements about the operation of the Public Buildings Department and the cost to both the private sector and the Government of using Public Service facilities.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Are there any spare copies of the statement?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Yes. The messenger is distributing them.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Well, we haven't got any.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I am not going to walk across the Chamber to distribute them. The honourable member is criticising the Chamber messengers.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Public Works.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I return to my statement. As is unfortunately the case with the Opposition Leader, on this occasion he was more interested in chasing headlines than in establishing the facts. The Leader's statement is either one of gross hypocrisy or one of ignorance. Either way he was wrong in almost all areas on which he touched. The one area in which he was correct was in quoting from the Premier's memorandum regarding the use of Public Buildings Department resources. That is true and we have never hidden our intention to do that. It was an openly publicised section of our election policy to stop the rot that the Liberals had begun in the Public Service and to try to restore the morale of our public servants.

I remind members opposite that we, not they, were elected to Government so presumably the people of South Australia saw nothing too sinister in that policy. In fact, the Liberal Government itself saw the need to use the resources of the department. In a memo issued on 20 October last year, weeks before the Liberals were thrown out of Government, the then Premier told his Ministers that it was 'important in times of financial constraint that Government resources be fully utilised'. The memo continued: 'Where suitable projects can be identified in the funded programmes of departments and agencies, Public Buildings Department resources should be utilised.'

The Premier said no more and no less than that in his memorandum quoted by the Leader yesterday. Why is it then such a source of outrage to the Leader of the Opposition? As I said, the Leader was either ignorant or guilty of hypocrisy. As for the proposition that using departmental resources is costing the taxpayer money and bleeding the private sector, let us look at the facts. In 1981-82, the latest year for which we have precise figures, the total expenditure by the Public Buildings Department on Loan works was $74 600 000 and expenditure of the Operational Services Division was $10 000 000. What the Leader failed to detail and what the public should understand is that very little of the total expenditure actually stays in the Public Buildings Department. For instance, all materials are bought from the private sector. The former Minister of Industrial Affairs would know that.

Nearly all contracts, such as electrical work, plumbing, bricklaying, and so on, flow back to the private sector. Of the $74 600 000 total programme, less than $4 000 000 is attributable to P.B.D. day labour. Surely this figure, which represents only 5 per cent of the loans works programme, is not going to cause the collapse of the private sector, irrespective of what the Leader of the Opposition said. The alternative, of course, is to do what the Opposition did

when it briefly occupied the Government benches. It rushed through tenders before the recent election, giving them to the private sector. Far from saving the taxpayers money (as the Leader suggested yesterday), such a course cost the taxpayers a great amount. The reason is so simple that even the Opposition Leader should be able to understand it.

If you have a work force capable of doing the job (as we have in the P.B.D.) and you give the job to someone else, you have a work force sitting around doing nothing. In effect, the Government, and therefore the taxpayer, is paying twice: hardly an economic way of running the State. In fact, by using the surplus labour available in the P.B.D. we have managed to save money.

In 1981-82, the cost of so-called surplus labour in the P.B.D. (that is, people who were employed but had no work to do) was $3 600 000. And the Leader talks about saving money! By making sure we have given those people work, the cost of under-utilised labour this year is expected to be $2 100 000, a saving of $1 500 000 compared to last year. The Opposition Leader claims our policies are costing money and damaging the private sector.

During the three years the Opposition was in power, the Public Service was allowed to run down to an alarming extent. The much vaunted policy of attrition was indiscriminately applied. The trade mix that had been carefully built up was distorted. Departments, through no fault of their own, became inefficient, and morale plummeted. Our policy is helping to raise morale and therefore improve the output of the P.B.D. as well as giving the taxpayers better value for money.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Public Service Act, 1967-1981—Regulations—Certificate for Contagious Illness.

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Supplementary Estimates of Payments, 1982-83.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning Act, 1982— South Australian Planning Commission—Crown Development Reports on—

i. Proposed extensions to Angle Vale Primary School.
ii. Acquisition and transfer of land for road purposes.
iii. Proposed division of land for future road purposes, Potts Road, Evanston Gardens.
iv. Proposed police residence at Berri.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Declared hospital for blood analysis (Riverton).

By the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Forestry Act, 1950-1981—Proclamation—Hundred of Penola—Forest reserve resumed.
ii. Salisbury College of Advanced Education—Report, 1981.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Correctional Services, Department of—Report, 1980-81.
ii. Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1981—Regulations—Restrictions on Poisons.

Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1975—Amendments of general laws.

iii. National Health Services Association of South Australia.
iv. Independent Order of Odd Fellows Grand Lodge of South Australia.
v. Independent Order of Rechabites Albert District No. 83.
vi. Friendly Societies Medical Association Inc.
vii. Foresters Friendly Society.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Community Welfare Act, 1972-1981—General regulations, 1983.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Stony Point (Liquids Projects) Ratification Act, 1981—Regulations—Borrow pit extension.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Local Government Act 1934-1982—Jolley's Boathouse—Memorandum of lease.
ii. City of Tea Tree Gully—By-law No. 12—Garbage.
iii. District Council of Mount Barker—By-law No. 11—Garbage.

QUESTION TIME

MINISTER'S RESIGNATION

Mr OLSEN: Did the Premier accept the resignation of the Minister of Agriculture because of differences with the Minister over Government policy on farm projects in the Middle East and North Africa, because the Minister's wife has failed to obtain Government funded employment, or because of the Minister's desire to replace two senior officers in the Department of Agriculture, and, if not, why did the Premier accept the Minister's resignation?

In his letter of resignation, the former Minister of Agriculture said that the Premier had withdrawn support for expansion of overseas farm projects. The Premier has denied this. The Premier has also denied that the resignation had anything to do with the publicly expressed desire of the former Minister's wife to obtain a Government position. In this respect, I have been informed that the Premier failed to receive the support of Cabinet late last year when he attempted to prevent Mrs Chatterton from accompanying the Minister, at Government expense, on his visit to the Middle East. The Minister recommended to Cabinet that his wife accompany him. The Premier objected and wrote on the Cabinet docket that another departmental officer should go with the Minister, but Cabinet over-ruled the Premier. Mrs Chatterton has also revealed that the Minister wanted to replace the Director-General of Agriculture, Mr McColl, and the General Manager of the department's overseas projects unit, Mr Hogarth. Again, the Premier has said that this was not relevant to the Minister's resignation. I understand that the doubts over and conflicting reasons given for the Minister's resignation have forced the Government to dispatch urgently to Algeria, a Director in the Department of Agriculture, Dr Pat Harvey. I therefore ask the Premier to tell the House, in clear and specific terms, exactly why he accepted the resignation of the Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader's question is one thing and, of course, his explanation contained yet another series of allegations. Why did I accept the resignation of the former Minister of Agriculture? Because he tendered it and gave me clear understanding that that is what he intended to do. The reasons that the Minister of Agriculture gave were set out in his letter which is a public document and publicly released.

I do not accept the statements that were made by the Minister of Agriculture at the time and I made that quite clear. I believe that in fact adequate and full support was

given to him in his efforts to ensure the revitalisation of the overseas projects. However, the Minister clearly felt that he was not getting such support because that is what he said in his letter and that is what he gave as his reason for resignation. That is on the record and that is how it happened.

Included in his explanation, the Leader has contained a number of allegations. He purports to have some deep inside knowledge of not only the proceedings of Cabinet but what is written on Cabinet dockets. That is absolute nonsense. Mrs Chatterton accompanied the Minister of Agriculture on his overseas trip, as is the case quite often on such overseas trips, when a Minister's spouse may accompany him. Indeed, it was the case with at least one of the trips of the previous Minister of Agriculture in the Tonkin Government—nothing unusual about that, it is quite an appropriate procedure and in fact that took place.

Secondly, as to the urgent dispatch of persons to Algeria, I point out that, as part of the Algerian contract, it was necessary, particularly following the report of Mr Chatterton, for officers to go to the Middle East in pursuance of the contracts. That has taken place and those officers are quite senior officers who have been actively and closely concerned with those projects. I believe that their efforts will be successful. I know that the new Minister of Agriculture has eagerly taken up his responsibilities and overseas projects, and their importance is very high on his agenda.

VIETNAMESE MATRICULATION EXAMINATION

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Education say what measures are being taken to ensure that the problems which occurred with the Vietnamese Matriculation examinations in 1982 do not occur in 1983?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: This matter, of course, has previously come before the Parliament as a result of certain allegations that were raised last year. Those allegations were made in a report to the House and were thoroughly investigated and, indeed, involved police investigation of them.

Since that time, the Public Examinations Board has been aware of the fact that despite the fact that the allegations were not substantiated as a result of the police inquiry there were, nevertheless, areas of procedures that could perhaps be improved this year to take beyond any reasonable doubt the sorts of qualms that have been raised in some people's minds. I repeat what I said to this House on an earlier occasion, that the police investigation of that matter did not substantiate any of the allegations that had been made. Nevertheless, as a result of that incident of trying to avoid the rife speculation which occurred at that time, the Public Examinations Board, contrary to its normal practice, has determined that for the Vietnamese examination this year there will be no assessors of Vietnamese who are from schools.

It is normal practice for the P.E.B. to ensure that a practising teacher is amongst the assessors. A letter from Mr Van Ly Luong and Mr Peter Jackson which has asked for a full investigation to be conducted by the board has just been referred to the Vietnamese subject committee of the Public Examinations Board and a report will be brought back for the standing committee of the board to consider when it is completed. Therefore, I believe that the procedure undertaken by the board in this exercise against the background of no substantiation for the allegations is an appropriate course of action for them to have taken.

CHATTERTONS' OVERSEAS EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Is the Premier aware of any plans for Mr and Mrs Chatterton to take employment with an overseas organisation, either directly or indirectly associated with the Algerian Government, and, if so, what are the details of those plans, when were they negotiated and when will the Chattertons take up their new positions?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not aware of any such plans and I have no information to give the House on them.

SPORTS INSTITUTE BOARD

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport indicate whether he is giving consideration to the appointment of additional members to the Sports Institute Board?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The answer is, 'Yes'. The matter is under consideration and I point out that, in doing so, there is certainly no reflection on the current board members or the institute itself, because the institute is doing excellent work on behalf of sport in South Australia. However, I believe that the institute and the board would benefit from some expansion to provide further input, expertise and administrative ability and I would expect that one or both of the appointments will be women who are representative of that area of sporting activity in South Australia.

OVERSEAS PROJECTS DIVISION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether, prior to the resignation of the former Minister of Agriculture, the Minister proposed that the Overseas Projects Division should be transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Premier's Department so that Mrs Lynn Chatterton could be appointed to the division and, if so, what was the Premier's response?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: There seems to be an exercise in wild speculation going on by the Opposition. I am not aware of any such proposals. I am aware, and it is public record, that the Minister was concerned about the future of overseas projects and, indeed, discussions ensued about it. A review of the Sagric operation was in fact commissioned. That has already been referred to in the press and that review will be going ahead. I cannot add anything further than that.

BUSHFIRE STRESS SERVICE

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister representing the Minister of Health inform the House whether the South Australian Health Commission would be prepared to investigate the possibility of expanding the recently established bushfire stress service to assist other people suffering from long-term stress problems, particularly associated with stress in industry? Many people in industry are suffering from stress symptoms because of the rapidly changing nature of their employment. The introduction of new technology and technological change has created a problem area for people in industry who have been unable to either physically or emotionally meet the difficulties of the change. Many of these people have been forced to drop out of industry, usually after receiving lump sum payments for workers compensation. A greater effort by decision makers, Governments and unions, with the assistance of special help, may prove to be worth while, both for a reduction in workers compensation payments and for the general good of the people concerned.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member raises a matter of some importance and one which is of great concern to the community of South Australia. I will

be happy to take up the matter with my colleague to seek an early report for the honourable member.

MINISTER'S RESIGNATION

The Hon. Michael WILSON: My question is supplementary to that asked by the Leader of the Opposition. Other than those reasons given by the former Minister of Agriculture in his letter of resignation to the Premier, is the Premier aware of any facts or incidents or information bearing on the former Minister's resignation and, if so, will he tell them to the House?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think I have covered this matter already in answer to the question that was asked by the Leader. The stated public reasons for Mr Chatterton's resignation are contained in his letter, and my response to that has been given. There has been a multitude of press commentary and, indeed, I think there is some sort of dispute occurring among various branches of the media as to what are the real reasons, was the reason given the only one, or is something else involved. I do not think there is any point at all in my getting involved in such speculation. I do not think it will advance either the agricultural policy of this State or the conduct of public affairs—

The Hon. W.E. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—to canvass such issues in this House. Therefore, all I can say is that, like the member for Torrens, I read the newspapers, and like the member for Torrens, I have been aware of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—problems and events that have taken place both in past years and quite recently. However, I do not think they are proper matters for canvassing in this forum.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WATER METER READINGS

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Water Resources say why the Engineering and Water Supply Department is altering the dates on which water meters are read to determine whether additional water rates are payable? I understand that a number of consumers have complained either directly to the E. & W.S. Department or through their local member about the late or early reading of their meters. This has disadvantaged some ratepayers in that it has prevented them from matching precisely consumption with their water allowance, with the result that they have exceeded their allowance. Will the Minister advise the House of the reasons for the variation in the reading of water meters?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Engineering and Water Supply Department policy is, over a number of years, to introduce concurrent billing of normal quarterly water base rates and additional water rates on a State-wide basis. The intention is gradually to alter reading dates to match the normal billing cycle. When a reading date meets the concurrent billing requirement future meter readings will be made as near as possible to the same time each year. The main advantages in concurrent billing are, first, that it will assist in containing rate and charge increases. For example, in 1981-82 there were 250 000 additional water rate accounts levied throughout the State. By processing these accounts together with a quarterly rate account would establish a saving both to the consumers and to the department.

Secondly, ratepayers, because they will need to make only one payment instead of two will reduce their costs in regard to bank charges, postage and other charges. By simplifying the administrative procedures, misunderstandings which now occur and complaints from ratepayers should be reduced. I point out that the concurrent billing dates are being introduced in stages to minimise the effect on consumers. Normally, the final meter reading dates are altered by no more than a maximum of two weeks from one year to the next. In some cases this has been exceeded slightly due to certain factors, including the renumbering of the assessments by the Valuer-General.

Mr Becker: Up to a month—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The member for Hanson is not quite correct. His constituents have not been ripped-off at all. If he listens to the explanation, I am sure that he is intelligent enough to understand and appreciate it. The variation to the consumption year could disadvantage some consumers to a minor extent; that is appreciated. A few would be advantaged, of course, by the shortening of the consumption year, with a reduction in the amount of additional water charges levied that year. However, overall the policy will be advantageous in the long term to both the consumer and the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Premier say whether the Government will financially compensate any individual, partnership or group which had contracts cancelled as a result of the Government's direction that all professional and building work must be offered initially to the Public Buildings Department? Furthermore, will the Premier now admit that he misled the public by claiming that no contracts were cancelled?

Yesterday, the Premier told the news media that no contracts were cancelled, but there were people who expected to receive contracts which did not eventuate. Last evening information came to my attention which reveals that the Premier's claim is not true. I will outline the details of that information, which concerns the contractual details for the Technology Park multi-tenancy building. On 5 January 1983 Hassell and Partners received from the South Australian Housing Trust a proposal for the design, documentation and contract administration for this project. The letter was signed by Mr Barry Specht of the South Australian Housing Trust. I am glad that the Minister has been to the gallery to try to get an answer to this question, and I hope that the Premier is listening to the details because he was obviously wrong yesterday. On 21 January 1983, a proposal went from Hassell and Partners back to the South Australian Housing Trust with details they were proposing for this contract, including details relating to subcontractors. On 7 February last, a letter of commission was received by Hassell and Partners from the South Australian Housing Trust to provide full service for the project, that is, a formal contractual relationship was established between the Housing Trust and Hassell and Partners. On 31 March, seven weeks later, Hassell and Partners were advised verbally by the Housing Trust that the Public Buildings Department would be taking over the project.

On 5 April 1983 a letter was sent by Hassell and Partners to the South Australian Housing Trust requesting clarification of the contractual position following that telephone conversation. On 7 April, eight weeks after the original contractual letter from the Housing Trust, Hassell and Partners received a letter from the trust stating that they were no longer

handling the project and that it was being taken over by the Public Buildings Department. Incidentally, Hassell and Partners are not the source of my information. Clearly, a contractual relationship did exist, and I therefore ask the Premier to now admit that he misled the public yesterday and to request that financial compensation be paid to parties disadvantaged because of the cancellation of contracts.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I stand by exactly what I said yesterday: I did not mislead the public. Our advice is that no contracts were in place which were cancelled as a result of any change of policy. The honourable member has referred to one specific case, with which I will deal in a second, but I am just saying that as a matter of general policy that would not be my Government's intention. Why on earth would the Opposition think it would be? It would not be a question of our deciding whether or not to compensate; we would be required to do so by law if in fact we cancelled contractual obligations. That is a simple fact of life, and no Governments should be in the position of doing that. Let us have that formally on the record. Let us now deal with the case cited of the building at Technology Park.

Again, as I understand it (and from the advice we have received), no question of compensation or broken contracts arises. Hassell designed the preliminary work for which it has been paid. Hassell's agreement was with the Housing Trust, but the trust is no longer acting as the project authority. The work of the project authority is being done by the Technology Park Corporation through the Public Buildings Department. That position has been fully explained.

I am not surprised that the honourable member has to disclaim his information coming from Hassell, because Hassell understands the situation perfectly and, indeed, could well be embarrassed by the honourable member's raising this matter in this forum. Concerning that project, there has been no breach of contract and there is no question of any breach. That is not to say that Hassell did not have expectations that it might get a contract at a further stage of development. I have not denied that, and I clearly said that there would be some people expecting contracts arising from either work they were doing or work they were capable of doing, who would be disappointed. However, the cost to the Government of paying those people to carry out their contract, as well as paying an idle work force within the Public Buildings Department, would have been against the public interest and the use of taxpayers' funds. We have not broken contracts and, if any of these firms believe that we have, they have recourse to us or to the courts.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CONTRACTORS

Mr PETERSON: Has the Government a policy of preference for contractors based within South Australia in respect of the supply of goods or services to the State Government and, if it has, is such a policy reflected in an allowance of a percentage of the contract price in favour of South Australian contractors? In discussions with people in several industries I have been told that some other State Governments allow a percentage of the contract price by way of preference to a contractor from that State. I also understand from discussions with people in Government departments that this does not seem to apply in South Australia. It has been further suggested to me that this lack of preference has resulted in people being put out of work in this State while at the same time creating employment in other States. Can the Premier say whether there is a policy in respect of such preference and, if there is, what percentage of preference may be involved?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question on this important topic, which has been subject to considerable debate recently. The matter of such preference is a two-edged sword. It is especially worth bearing that in mind when considering this State. We are a net exporter of services. In terms of our population South Australia represents only about 9 per cent of Australia, and the big areas in which we hope to sell our manufactured goods and services are in other States.

If every State adopted a closed-door preferential policy, some South Australian industries might gain but, overall, South Australian industries would miss out. In recent months there have been blatant examples of this. At present, the New South Wales Government is enforcing a strict and rigid State preference that has disadvantaged some South Australian manufacturing outlets which can produce an excellent product at a competitive cost but which cannot get those contracts. That has caused problems and has resulted in a loss of employment that would not otherwise have occurred. We have a policy of preference in South Australia, and a margin of up to 10 per cent on top of any interstate bid is given to local producers. I must qualify that by saying that we have an agreement with the State of Victoria to progressively abolish preference between the two States. I have recently been renegotiating that arrangement, and it has value on the basis I have described: that, if we are a net exporter as opposed to a net user of our services, it is in our interests to have better access to Victorian markets than for Victorians to have better access to our markets.

We have agreed that it is to our mutual benefit to lower and try to abolish these preference barriers. Unfortunately, we have not been able to secure such agreements with other States, most notably New South Wales, which has just recently been providing a fairly rigid preference with detrimental effects to South Australian industry. So, at present I am negotiating with Ministers. I have already had preliminary talks with my interstate colleagues about this matter to try to find some way of reducing the need for State preference and still protect the interests of employment in this State.

Our approach is to emphasise a 'buy Australian' campaign rather than specifically relate it to South Australia. If we have a fairly rigid Federal preference, both for Federal Government purchasing and for all States purchasing, I believe that South Australia will definitely be a net beneficiary from that. Therefore, we have to try to aim at that. In the absence of that, however, we have to protect ourselves against those other States that are discriminating, and we will continue to operate the margin I have just described of up to 10 per cent.

NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I direct my question to the Minister of Water Resources. Since the future of the Murray/Darling salinity control programme has been thrown into doubt by the Hawke Government, has the Minister sought the support of Victoria and New South Wales to bring pressure to bear on the Federal Government in an endeavour to have the Prime Minister honour the financial commitment to the National Water Resources Development Programme and, if not, why not? Last week the Minister admitted that the money was desperately needed in South Australia for the Happy Valley and northern towns water filtration plants and the multi-million dollar salinity project between lock 2 and lock 3 on the Murray River. I would also remind the Minister of the present Government's statement while in Opposition that water filtration is essential in controlling ameobic meningitis in the northern towns. Since much of

the salinity mitigation work must be undertaken in Victoria and New South Wales, what action has the Government taken?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I had discussions with the Federal Minister for Energy and Resources, Senator Walsh, last week. The outcome of those discussions is that the National Water Resources Programme proposed by the previous Liberal Government will be reviewed. The reasons for that review are economic reasons brought about by the previous Federal Liberal Administration. The other reasons are that this wide range of proposals involved national and not only South Australian proposals, and included among them were what I might describe as some wild cat schemes. One that comes readily to mind is the Bradfield scheme, in northern Queensland. It was accepted by the Federal Minister that the South Australian projects are certainly not wild cat schemes. I agree with the comment made by the member for Chaffey that those projects are essential to South Australia, namely, the Morgan and Happy Valley filtration plants and the salinity control project between lock 2 and lock 3.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Then they'll be approved?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I would hope that they would be approved. There will be a review of the whole programme. That review is expected to be completed in May. I would suggest that they should be accepted in the interests of South Australia, and I would be seeking the support of the member for Chaffey.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: You have it 100 per cent.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I appreciate that. In the interests of South Australia, I am happy that that is the case, as I believe that the projects are absolutely essential.

Mr Mathwin: Well, get on with the business.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am doing my best. The whole matter has to be reviewed on the basis of the problem facing the Federal Government, both economically and also in light of the fact that the previous programme contained some schemes which were not viable and reasonable. I will advise the House and the member for Chaffey when that review has been completed.

CHILDHOOD SERVICES COUNCIL

Mr MAYES: Can the Minister of Education say how the State Government plans to maximise sound economic management of State and Federal funds to children's services, therefore fulfilling Federal and State Labor policies on children's services? In asking that question, I raise the following points. First, the policy should enable adequate services, delivery, and consideration of services to consumers; secondly, the policy will enable equitability of funding to services; thirdly, maximising the funds available from the Federal Government children's services programme to our State; fourthly, prevention of competition between agencies because of the disparities in the funding mechanisms at present and the various funding bodies; fifthly, assessment of how services provided are meeting the needs of the community; sixthly, community development through involving the community in the processes; seventhly, flexibility to reflect the real needs of the community; eighthly, proper industrial conditions for all workers in the industry; and ninthly, adequate funding to ensure sound and equitable education for workers.

This matter is of great concern to the community of South Australia, especially those people involved in children's services. Committees now operate under State Government departments that deal with children's services, and there have been several occasions where there have been conflicts and dis-agreements between those committees. In order to alleviate those problems I think that it is important that this State Government makes a clear policy direction in regard to children's services. For example, during the International Year of the Child—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the honourable member is straying into the area of debate.

Mr MAYES: I leave my question at that.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the member for Unley for his important question. Members will know that under the former Government the Childhood Services Council, which had a significant oversight over various areas of early childhood responsibility, was disbanded and replaced by several other structures one of which in my own department is known in a rather unusual way as ECHEAC (Early Childhood Education Advisory Committee). A similar organisation exists within the portfolio of the Minister of Community Welfare, and other aspects that were controlled by the Childhood Services Council were taken over by other Ministers.

The Government was conscious of the loss of interaction and liaison by abolishing the Childhood Services Council. We must make sure to use Federal and State resources to maximum effect and not end up with a pigeon hole kind of approach to the important needs that must be met in an integrated way in aspects of early childhood.

Accordingly, the Human Services Subcommittee of Cabinet asked the Minister of Community Welfare, the Minister of Health and me to prepare a report to go to a later meeting of the subcommittee to consider what new structure should be formed and what new system of communication and liaison should exist to ensure that there is no duplication and no un-met needs.

It is expected that at a forthcoming meeting of the Human Services Subcommittee a report will be presented by those of us who are on that subcommittee. It is most important that we have this unified approach to early childhood matters. So many needs could well be forgotten, because it is too easy for one person to say to another person 'That is not my responsibility, let somebody else do it.' In the final analysis it then seems to be no-one's direct responsibility.

When in Opposition we argued that the Childhood Services Council, which did exist, had many faults and that it did need modification to the way in which it operated. We did not believe that its problems would be resolved by chopping off its head. Now that that has happened, we hope that some new arrangements could be made that will re-establish effective communication in this important area.

MURRAY RIVER POLLUTION

Mr RODDA: What action has the Minister of Water Resources taken on behalf of South Australia against the Victorian Government for its decision to allow a wool processing company to discharge waste water into the Murray River?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am grateful to the honourable member for the question, because I was amazed to be informed last week that the firm of G.H. Michell was given a licence by the Victorian Environmental Council to proceed with establishing a wool scouring plant near Wodonga, on the Murray River. I was amazed because Governments (specifically the South Australian Government) spend much money on pollution and quality control of the Murray River waters.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: What have you done?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: If the honourable member will be patient, I will answer the question in my own way in my own time. I point out to the member for Victoria and

the House that the River Murray Commission has lodged an appeal. I certainly support that appeal, and I understand that the New South Wales Government will do the same.

In addition to that, the Premier will, on the State's behalf, write to the Victorian Premier (Mr Cain) in the strongest terms to ensure that we can do as much as possible to stop the pollution of the Murray River in this way. As honourable members are all probably aware, G.H. Michell is a South Australian based company, and it would not get away with this sort of project in South Australia with waste flowing directly into the Murray River or into any other stream.

However, it utilises about 20 per cent of the facilities available at Bolivar, and it also had an establishment in Botany Bay, Sydney, which was closed for environmental reasons. It is most unfair to South Australia and the people downstream that this project should be considered and allowed. It is a decision against which the River Murray Commission has appealed. We, as a State, will be writing to Victoria expressing our strongest opposition to that project.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Chaffey and the Minister can have their private summit. At the moment I am listening only to the Minister.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: To conclude the reply to the question, it is not within my power to take any action. However, I suggest that we will express our strongest opposition to both the River Murray Commission and the Premier of Victoria in the hope that that decision will be reversed.

PARLIAMENTARY CUSTOM

Mr TRAINER: I address a question to you, Mr Speaker, about adherence to Parliamentary custom. Is it your opinion Sir, as Speaker, that the House of Commons tradition does not strictly apply to Australian and South Australian Parliamentary procedures and, accordingly, that there is no likelihood that the member for Light should be expected to resign? I cite a few paragraphs of a press report that appeared in the *News* on 21 April, following the resignation of Sir Billy Snedden, as follows:

Sir Billy told a hushed House of Representatives he wished to abide by the Westminster Parliamentary practice in which Speakers are independent, and automatically leave Parliament at a change of Government.

Sir Billy said it was essential the incoming Speaker should not be handicapped in carrying out his 'onerous task'.

'There should be no focal point in the House which may be seen as a potential challenge to the Speaker, and certainly there must not be any capacity to politicise his rulings,' he said.

'The presence in this Chamber of a former Speaker would increase enormously the load the new Speaker has to bear.

'I do not want to see that happen and I will not see it happen. 'My presence could only subtract from the role of the Speaker.'

The SPEAKER: I begin by saying that it is all very well for that practice to apply in the House of Commons, which has about 635 members. I have it on fairly good authority that there may have been other reasons that affected Sir Billy's decision. Leaving that aspect aside, I also have it on fairly good authority that some members of each Party in the Federal Parliament are not pleased by this precedent. However, in a small Parliament like that of South Australia I believe that the precedent does not and never has applied.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The member for Light is safe forever.

The SPEAKER: I point out that I do not feel overborne by the presence of the member for Light and, in fact, I feel happy to have him here so that I can draw on his experience from time to time.

MURRAY RIVER POLLUTION

Mr MEIER: Further to the reply given by the Minister of Water Resources to the member for Victoria, will the Minister say what specific support the South Australian Government will give to the River Murray Commission in its appeal against the issuing of a licence by the Victorian Government to a wool processing company to discharge waste water into the Murray River? A report in the Melbourne *Sun*, dated 28 April 1983, states:

The commission said yesterday the appeal would be the first major test of its new responsibility to improve the quality of the Murray water. A spokesman said it was illogical to use taxpayers' money to fight the growing salinity of the river, and then approve the discharge of treated industrial waste water containing salt. Commission president, Mr T.A. O'Brien, said the licensing of a relatively small discharge was 'pollution by stealth' which would be disastrous for the long-term future of the Murray.

As the future of the new River Murray Waters Agreement and the salinity level in South Australia in coming years could depend on the support the commission receives from this State and the Commonwealth at this time, what specific support will the South Australian Government be giving the commission?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I think I have already answered the question in my reply to the member for Victoria. However, this is a major test case for the River Murray Commission in regard to its powers concerning quality control. I believe that, even though this is only what I might describe as the thin end of the wedge, if the commission is not successful in this case other industries (perhaps in Victoria at least) may establish operations along the river, and we do not want that to happen. I will give whatever support I can to the appeal: I cannot say more than that at present. I assure the honourable member and the House that I will do everything possible in this regard. It will be a tragic situation if the River Murray Commission does not win that appeal.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I said a few moments ago that I have no individual powers and neither had the member for Chaffey when he was Minister for three years.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I point out again for the information of the member for Goyder and the House that I will be doing everything possible on a State basis to assist in this particular appeal.

LAND LEASES

Mr KLUNDER: Is the Minister of Lands aware of an article on pages 1 and 27 of the *Farmer and Stockowner* of April 1983 entitled 'Governments to Alter Land Lease Acts', which details possible changes to the lands administration in this State? Does this article represent the Minister's position?

The SPEAKER: I have to rule the question out of order, the reason being that the question asked 'was the report accurate?' The honourable member will have to give it further consideration.

COUNCIL OF TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION

Mr BLACKER: Will the Minister of Education and the Government reconsider the composition of the Interim Council of Technical and Further Education and add to or change the composition to include personnel who have non-

metropolitan interests? If a change is not possible at this stage, will the Minister ensure that provision is made for personnel, as suggested, to be included in the final composition of the SACOTAFE? Colleges of technical and further education have been advised recently of the establishment of the interim council. The terms of reference include:

(1) To advise the Director-General on matters relating to the provision of programmes of technical and further education for the South Australian community. More particularly, to assist with the identification of changing trends in industry, commerce, government and in the wider community affecting the design and delivery of the educational programmes of the Department of Technical and Further Education.

There are two other criteria which I will not read. The interim council has been formed and the Chairman is Mr T. Morris. The council comprises 17 members but the Port Lincoln Community College of Technical and Further Education is somewhat concerned that there is no-one with non-metropolitan expertise who could relate to either agricultural or fishing industries and, more particularly, the travel and communication problems that exist in non-metropolitan colleges.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The interim council of the Department of Technical and Further Education is indeed just that, and it was a deliberate choice by me that it should be termed 'interim' so that we could examine its membership to determine whether or not all aspects have been picked up in its representation and furthermore to re-examine its way of operation. There will have to be at some stage a legislative change to the Act for a number of reasons. The present Further Education Act is in itself not a correct reflection of the name that is now being used, which is technical and further education. At that time the Legislature will be asked to consider what will be the permanent structure of the South Australian council and I will certainly take on board the points raised by the member for Flinders because indeed country education requirements do have special features which do not reflect themselves in city education circumstances. Also, we have another very important aspect, namely, the rural studies programme in its various manifestations, so I will certainly take on board the concern of the member for Flinders and it will be taken into consideration when the formal structure of the council is resolved.

LAND LEASES

Mr KLUNDER: My question is to the Minister of Lands, and I will try to ask it in a way that does not transgress Standing Orders. What is the Minister's position in regard to possible changes to the Land Lease Act? I am asking the Minister whether he is aware of an article on pages 1 and 27 of the *Farmer and Stockowner* of April 1983 entitled 'Governments to Alter Land Lease Acts' which of course concerns those possible changes.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, and I must say I was a little surprised to see the article, because I had assumed that there was some understanding of confidentiality in relation to the consultation I had with the people concerned with this particular matter. However, I am not particularly fussed by the premature disclosure of the contents of these discussions. What I put to the United Farmers and Stockowners was that we should look at amending legislation to do away with the Land Board and the Pastoral Board and that we should set up a consultative committee which would be broadly representative of the people who are concerned not only with the pastoral industry but also with the general use of Crown lands. Further to that proposition, I have made available the Director-General of Lands and the Assistant Director-General of Lands to discuss the proposition with representatives of the U.F.S., and that took place either earlier this week or late last week. It was left that the matter would be further discussed by that body and they would then report back to me.

COST OF ELECTRICITY

Mr BAKER: My question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy. In view of the previous Labor Administration's gross neglect in contracting for gas supplies from the Cooper Basin beyond 1987, what positive action will the Minister take to secure cheap energy for the State? We are aware that New South Wales has contracted gas supplies to the year 2006 from the Cooper Basin and that the previous Labor Administration contracted for our gas supplies until 1987. We are now paying $1.10 per gigajoule for the gas from the Cooper Basin, which was fathered by the Government of the day in South Australia. Currently, New South Wales is paying 70 cents a gigajoule for gas which was in fact part of the South Australian section. We are getting into a situation where the supplies of electricity are becoming quite critical and the Minister will be aware that in a newspaper recently the Electricity Trust—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is lapsing into a debate on the situation. He was going very well on the facts; if he could get back to the facts he could proceed.

Mr BAKER: I understand that in the paper recently—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: No, that is not—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will decide whether the explanation is in order or not.

Mr BAKER: It was reported in the paper recently that the Electricity Trust was having to consider options concerning the future of our energy supplies. It had to consider using South Australian coal, which was inferior in quality, or black coal imported from another State. We are now coming into an expensive electricity generation proposition and the question goes back to the original proposition that the previous Labor Administration failed to secure cheap supplies.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: It seems to me that the honourable member who has just asked the question on three or four occasions referred to the question of an option. I think if he had the option of being given another question in future he would get a better one which might be somewhat easier to read when standing. What the honourable member said or misread, perhaps, or what he was supplied with, was wrong, because he tried to show that New South Wales was paying more for a gigajoule of gas at the moment than South Australia is paying but he actually said that South Australia was paying less than New South Wales.

However, I understood the import of the honourable member's question. He also said that South Australia is paying $1.10 a gigajoule but I would have thought that he would gloss over that part of the question because the price now being paid by South Australia was negotiated by the former Minister who is now sitting on the same Opposition benches as the honourable member. What the honourabale member has used as a justification for his question was that he is a professor of hindsight and he can always indicate where other courses of action should have been followed some years before, in this case even before he was a member of this House. The history of the development of the Cooper Basin is well known to most members who have been in this House for some time and I do not intend to take up time retelling that history, except to say that the Cooper Basin and all the benefits that it will bring to South Australia in excess of the benefits it has already provided are due entirely to the way in which the contracts referred to by the honourable member were negotiated at that time, and it is easy for anyone to be wise after the event. The honourable

member asked what I intended to do about it, and I answer that by saying: 'More than the former Minister'.

KINGSTON HOUSE

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister for Environment and Planning outline the plans of the Heritage Department for the future of historic Kingston House at Kingston Park? This house is of special historic significance and has been placed on the State heritage and national heritage lists. Charles Cameron Kingston was involved in the framing of the Australian Constitution, so the restoration of Kingston House is significant not only to the people of my district but to the people of South Australia as a whole.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: This matter has been the subject of controversy for some time. I recall that the honourable member, when a Labor Party candidate for the district of Mawson last year, was actively involved in ensuring that this property was preserved.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I draw to your attention Question on Notice 139 on the Notice Paper.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order, because it seems to me that the explanation of the honourable member for Mawson covers the terms of Question 139.

At 3.12 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the further appropriation of moneys from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 1983 and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In doing so, I shall give a brief outline of the State's general financial position before explaining the items in the Supplementary Estimates. I will give a more detailed account of the financial activities of 1982-83 when I introduce the 1983-84 Budget to the House later this year. Members will recall that the Budget introduced in the House last August by the former Government claimed that it provided for a balance on the operations of the Consolidated Account for 1982-83. It allowed for a deficit of $42 000 000 on recurrent operations which was to be offset by a diversion of $42 000 000 from capital works funds. Achievement of that result would have left the accumulated deficit of $6 100 000 on the Consolidated Account as at 30 June 1982, unchanged as at 30 June 1983.

Members will also recall that, on coming into Government last November, I ordered an immediate review of the Budget position. That review was carried out by the Treasury and the report provided by the Under Treasurer was tabled in this House on 14 December 1982. It was far worse than we could possibly have anticipated from the financial statement of the former Premier and Treasurer at the time he brought in the 1982-83 Budget. Indeed, at no time did the former Government inform this House or the people of South Australia of the gravity of the financial situation which has been developing over the past few years, even though they were advised by Treasury of the serious difficulties that lay ahead.

It is clear to my Government that the Budget presented in August 1982 was both incomplete and dishonest, and that it was never intended to meet its planned target of a balance on Consolidated Account. As the review by Treasury showed, that claimed balance had in just three months deteriorated to a likely deficit on recurrent operations of between $72 000 000 and $97 000 000 which would have meant a deficit on Consolidated Account of between $30 000 000 and $55 000 000, even allowing for the proposed diversion of capital funds. This rapidly deteriorating situation was the legacy which the Tonkin Administration left to future Governments and to the people of South Australia. It has meant that my Government has not been able to proceed with the implementation of its programme at the pace it would have wished: we have, however, honoured the most urgent of our election promises, the cost of which is now expected to increase the deficit by $8 000 000. This is a modest figure, and virtually identical to the costings made by the former Government of similar commitments. Nevertheless, we were confronted with a deficit on recurrent operations of around $104 000 000 in 1982-83. For capital works, the estimated surplus of $42 000 000 remained unchanged at that stage, subject to the outcome of a review of the Government's capital works programmes.

In summary, on the basis of the December review, my Government inherited a situation in which the most likely 1982-83 deficit on Consolidated Account would have been about $62 000 000. In that case, the accumulated deficit would have increased to some $68 000 000 as at 30 June 1983.

The position now needs to be considered against the background of three major factors which have occurred subsequently:

First—the Ash Wednesday bushfires, with the resultant tragic loss of life and the devastation of private and public property and the recent flooding, particularly in the Barossa Valley area, have placed further unavoidable demands on the State's recurrent resources.

Second—Treasury has had the opportunity to undertake a more detailed review of the recurrent side of the Budget, based on actual results to 31 March 1983.

Third—a detailed review of the Government's capital works programme has been completed and some changes have been made.

As to the recurrent side of the Budget, Treasury's latest review suggests that the deficit on recurrent operations could now be about $115 000 000 for 1982-83: that is, a deterioration of about $73 000 000 on the original Budget as put to Parliament.

That deterioration of $73 000 000 is made up of an overall increase in gross payments of $145 000 000, offset partly by an increase in gross receipts of $72 000 000. For gross payments, the increase is the result of a number of factors:

- The destructive effects of natural disasters which have beset this State in recent times. I believe that South Australia has never before had to cope with three major disasters (drought, fire and flood) in the one year. While there is some difficulty in assessing accurately the extent of the need for carry-on finance and other relief measures for both the bushfire and the flood, the present expectation is that the payments for drought, fire and flood relief and restoration of public assets under the natural disasters programme are likely to total about $81 000 000 (and on the basis of present sharing arrangements, the Commonwealth Government will contribute about $58 000 000 of that expenditure).
- Additional costs of pumping water from the Murray River are expected to exceed the Budget estimate,

including the amount provided in the round-sum allowance for price increases by some $8 000 000.

- The overall estimate of the cost of new salary and wage awards has increased further, despite the wage pause. The cost is now likely to exceed the round-sum allowance provided in the Budget by about $14 000 000.
- The establishment of a job creation programme has a cost of $5 000 000 in 1982-83 (Commonwealth funds are available).
- After the Budget was presented, the previous Government granted a remission of the gas levy paid by the South Australian Gas Company under the Gas Act. The cost in 1982-83 is $4 000 000.
- Two election promises—that is to say, the holding of the number of teachers in primary and secondary schools to allow a reduction in class sizes, and concessions to pensioners for electricity bills, are estimated to cost about $3 000 000 and $4 000 000, respectively.
- Departmental expenditures and advances are running ahead of Budget estimates in many areas and overall are likely to exceed Budget by about $26 000 000 for reasons other than higher levels of costs. This may be broken into Health Commission $17 000 000 and all other $9 000 000.

Three main factors are relevant in the deterioration relating to the Health Commission:

First, there has been an increase in the number of uninsured patients receiving hospital care. This, and a reduction in the overall number of bed days utilised, means that receipts of the Health Commission are now likely to be $21 000 000 below the original Budget estimate, despite an increase in hospital fees from 1 February 1983.

Secondly, health units have been unable to hold their staffing levels at the original Budget levels, and there has been a need to support their budgets to the extent of an additional $5 000 000.

Thirdly, a further $2 000 000 is likely to be required in this financial year for the settlement of past workmen's compensation claims which are being managed by the State Government Insurance Commission as part of a new insurance arrangement entered into by the Health Commission from 1 July 1982.

Under the hospital cost-sharing arrangements, the impact on the State Budget of the additional expenditure is expected to be about $17 000 000. That estimated impact takes into account that not all of the $28 000 000 deterioration relates to recognised health units under the hospital cost-sharing arrangements, and some shift in expenditure from recognised to non-recognised (community health) units since the Budget was formulated.

Members will recall that the Government earlier this year authorised a review of the overall health area and also a separate review of the administrative machinery of the commission's central organisation. The Government received the report of the latter review group last month. However, it must be noted that the major deterioration in the health area is directly related to the economic recession which has gripped the whole of the nation. It has meant that more people are unable or unwilling to meet the cost of the health care which the Government provides through the Health Commission.

As to gross receipts, the expected increase arises from an expected recovery of $58 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government under the national disaster relief programme; a special grant of $10 500 000 from the Commonwealth Government to partly offset the impact on the State Budget of the Ash Wednesday bushfires; and, a contribution of $5 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government for a job creation programme.

At this juncture, I would add that there have been some extraordinary statements from the Leader of the Opposition which have been repeated by certain sections of the media, that the State Government has received almost $100 000 000 from the Commonwealth in recent months for disaster relief and from wage pause savings in the Commonwealth Public Service. This, of course, is a gross distortion of the actual position. As I have just outlined, the State Government expects to recover $58 000 000 from the Commonwealth in the national disaster relief programme. However, the total cost of relief is expected to be $81 000 000, leaving a net impact on the Budget of $23 000 000.

The only funds that we have received from the Commonwealth for general budgetary assistance is the special grant of $10 500 000 which, as I have outlined, is to partly offset the impact of the bushfires on our finances. The other moneys received for job creation schemes and welfare housing have absolutely no impact on the Budget outcome. They are given for specific purposes and will be fully spent on those specific purposes. Indeed, if there is any effect at all on the Budget, it is to slightly increase our expenditure as the cost of administering those job creation schemes has to be borne by the State.

To return to an explanation of the State's current financial position, a decrease overall of about $1 500 000 in other receipts, where a number of variations both above and below Budget are emerging, is expected. The major variations include water charges (up $5 000 000 mainly as a result of seasonal conditions), other departmental fees and recoveries (up $5 000 000), marine and harbor charges (down $3 000 000 mainly because of seasonal conditions), the contribution from the Woods and Forests Department (down $6 000 000 of which about $4 000 000 arises from the consequences of the bushfires), and State taxation (down $2 500 000). As to State taxation, the expected downturn reflects mainly the implementation of two election promises; that is to say, an increase in the stamp duty exemption level for the first home buyer from $30 000 to $40 000 with effect from 1 December 1982, and an increase in the pay-roll tax exemption level from $125 000 to $140 000 with effect from 1 January 1983. The cost in 1982-83, in terms of revenue forgone, is almost $1 500 000.

From the above explanation, members will see that there are some factors (such as natural disaster relief) common to both recurrent receipts and recurrent payments. Also, some of the adverse effects of the shocking season are shown separately. Adjusting for these factors and bringing them together, it can be said that, in net terms, the expected deterioration of $73 000 000 derives from the following major variations (to the nearest million dollars).

	$ million	$ million
Natural Disasters:		
Relief and restoration (81 gross expenditure, 58 recovery from Commonwealth)	23	
Pumping water (8 gross cost, 5 additional revenue)	3	
Loss of Woods and Forests Department contribution	4	
Loss of harbor revenues	3	
	33	
Less special budget assistance	10	23

Salary and wage increases	14	
Remission of gas levy	4	
Spillovers in departmental expenditures and advances	26	
Cost of election promises (with both revenue and expenditure impact)	8	
	52	
Less increase in receipts (other than above)	2	50
Total		73

As I have explained, spillovers in departmental expenditures and advances are comprised mainly of additional payments to the Health Commission to finance as short-fall in fees.

That is quite simply because people cannot or will not pay their bills for hospital services. It would be wrong to conclude from the explanation that the net cost to the State of the recent natural disasters will be contained at $33 000 000. There could well be some further costs in 1983-84 as final assessments of bushfire losses are made. In addition, it is unlikely that the Woods and Forests Department will be in a position to make any contribution to the Consolidated Account in 1983-84 and possibly for a year or two beyond that.

Mr Ashenden: Two pages ago it was $23 000 000.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is $33 000 000 total less $10 000 000 special assistance from the Commonwealth. The cost to the State Budget could be as much as $6 000 000 a year in present values.

Regarding capital works, the review of the programme had regard to the effectiveness and economic justification of major projects planned for development during the period up to and including 1985-86. Cabinet has accepted in principle the recommendations flowing from that review, which include:

The deletion of three major projects from the programme. They are:

The rehabilitation of the Cobdogla irrigation area.

The establishment of a sewage treatment plant at Finger Point in the South-East.

The establishment of an aquatic centre on the old brewery site in Hindley Street. Options are being considered to attract the funds which the Commonwealth included in its 1982-83 Budget for this project.

Rescheduling of the north-east busway programme to permit:

The opening and operation of the Park Terrace-Darley Road sector in 1986.

A review of other options for the sector beyond Darley Road after 1986.

Some rescheduling of the Museum redevelopment project to enable options to be considered in order to:

Give greater effect in Stage 1 to the most urgent needs of the Museum.

Minimise as far as practicable the recurrent costs associated with the redevelopment.

The changes proposed in the review will have little effect in 1982-83. However, they will provide the Government with some flexibility in the immediate years beyond to address urgent problems, although flexibility in 1983-84 is likely to be restricted as a result of previous commitments.

My Government hopes that the support announced by the previous Commonwealth Government, under a water resources programme, will be confirmed by the new Government. If confirmed, this will enable us to proceed with the filtration of the northern towns water supply and the Happy Valley reservoir system simultaneously.

The Commonwealth Government has also provided for 1982-83 an interest-free loan of $11 000 000, repayable at the end of three years, to assist in the salvage and storage of logs from the Woods and Forests Department's plantations damaged in the recent bush fires. In addition, it will support at the June 1983 Loan Council meeting a special temporary addition of $22 000 000 to South Australia's semi-government borrowing programme for 1983-84.

For 1982-83, the present expectation is that there is likely to be some slight improvement in capital receipts and some small deferments in capital payments. That expectation takes into account the receipt of $11 000 000 from the Commonwealth and a corresponding payment to the Woods and Forests Department. A surplus of some $43 000 000 could now occur on capital works—$1 000 000 more than the original Budget forecast.

A deficit of $115 000 000 on recurrent operations and a surplus of $43 000 000 on capital works would give an overall deficit on the operations of the Consolidated Account for 1982-83 of $72 000 000. However, I stress that a small percentage variation in either receipts or payments on either recurrent operations or capital works could vary the final result now forecast by many millions of dollars. A deficit of $72 000 000 would increase the accumulated deficit of $6 100 000 on the Consolidated Account as at 30 June 1982 to some $78 000 000 as at 30 June 1983.

I have no need to stress to members the seriousness of such a position. Even allowing for the one-time effect of the drought, the fire and the flood, and even allowing for some modest improvements in the economy, the underlying deficit is such that, if left unchecked, it could result in an accumulated deficit on the Consolidated Account approaching $400 000 000 by 30 June 1986. This is a situation that any Government in office today would have to face regardless of Party affiliation. It is a situation in which any Government would have few options.

Taxes and charges can be raised. Government employees could be retrenched. The State's cash reserves might be used in the short term to fund the deficit, but would quickly be exhausted. Funds could be raised by borrowing, but such borrowings have to be serviced. Community services, increasingly regarded as essential in the current economic climate, could be cut back or abolished. None of these options is palatable or even desirable.

Our community now finds itself facing a very difficult period in which economic growth will be minimal and in which all industries will have to strive to maintain as much employment as possible. It would simply not make economic sense to put more people out of work, and my Government's firm commitment to a policy of no retrenchments will not be altered. I do not believe that the South Australian people would want the Government to add to unemployment. Nor do I believe that the community would want the Government to turn its back on the increasing demand for welfare and other services.

As for the other options which imply a degree of financial recklessness, let me simply say that, regardless of political cost, I will not allow this State to be weakened by the destruction of its reserves, nor will I allow the problems to be put off, with future administrations being made to pick up the bill.

While my Government is fully prepared to take on the task of extracting South Australia from the financial crisis in which it now finds itself, let me make clear that I do not intend to allow the former Government to evade responsibility for what took place while it occupied this side of the House.

As I reported to the House last December, it is inconceivable that a Budget that was so much in tatters after just three months was honestly framed. The evidence is now more clear. The former Government was advised that major financial problems were looming. The former Treasurer and

in particular the Budget Review Committee, of which the Deputy Leader and the member for Davenport were members, were given briefings and written advice on the likely difficulties. The former Cabinet was told that the position could be improved only by a substantial inflow of funds by way of increased taxation or by a substantial reduction in funds for school buildings, hospitals, housing and so on. Clearly, the former Government were planning either major increases in taxation or major cutbacks in services if it had survived last November's election. As members already know, the former Premier made clear at the Premier's Conference in June 1982 that he was planning major increases in taxation and charges.

My Government also has to now face the need to raise more revenue. However, we have attempted to honestly put before the people of South Australia the true state of our finances, and we have not attempted to avoid the responsibility that any Government in our situation has to take on. We are now considering the most appropriate course of action to follow. It would not, however, be appropriate to canvass these options in too much detail. For example, as members would know, many of the revenue measures available to State Governments involve business franchise licences. It is not desirable to speculate on changes in advance of the actual introduction of legislation.

Overall, we will try to ensure that the measures chosen will have as little impact as possible on the State's economy and level of employment. In this regard, I can say that the Government does not intend to introduce a surcharge on pay-roll tax as has been done in other States, even though that option would provide substantial revenue. Indeed, legislation which I shall introduce later today gives further concessions in this area consistent with our election promises and our belief that pay-roll tax is effectively a tax on employment, the burden of which should be alleviated as much as possible.

Let me also make it clear that we do not propose to reintroduce State succession duties. The Government does not expect to overcome the State's financial problems in a single year. The neglect of our finances has been allowed to go on for so long that it will take a number of years to retrieve the situation. Last week, I released to a meeting of business men and trade unionists, called to discuss the outcome of the national economic summit, a Treasury briefing paper on the State's finances. That paper has now been more widely circulated and will be made available to members. It does not represent Government policies, but does outline the extent to which revenue will have to be raised to cover the State's deficit. In order to give some comparison, it shows that the average family in South Australia would be affected to the extent of approximately $3.20 per week. It also makes the point that this amount will increase each year until the deficit is removed as the State will also be required to cover the interest payments on the increasing debt.

The obvious conclusion is that the sooner we move the less will be the burden on all South Australians. However, I would stress that, until next year's financial arrangements with the Commonwealth are worked out at the Premier's Conference in June, it may not be possible to be more precise. This will mean that revenue measures will most likely be introduced as part of the Budget later this year.

The Government will also establish, as a matter of priority, an inquiry into the State's revenue base and its ability to raise the revenue required to fulfil the demands placed on the Government sector by the community. This inquiry formed part of our election platform. The terms of reference have now been finalised, and I expect that they, and the composition of the inquiry, will be announced within the next few weeks.

The House has my assurance that the Government will take a firm and responsible line on all expenditure and ensure that only expenditures of high priority will be allowed to continue. Indeed, as the financial details in this statement make clear, we have already had some success in restraining expenditure levels which were beginning to run over budget at the time we came into office.

We will also have to review the timing of many of our election promises. We have committed ourselves to maintaining employment in the public sector at July 1982 levels. However, at this stage, we do not intend to expand the overall employment levels beyond that figure. We hope that all sections of the community will assist us and by so doing assist South Australia by taking a balanced community view, by not pressing individual sectional interests, and by not resorting to pressure to achieve their own ends.

I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

Appropriation

Turning now to the question of Appropriation, members will be aware that, early in each financial year, Parliament grants the Government of the day Appropriation by means of the principal Appropriation Act supported by the Estimates of Payments. If these allocations prove insufficient, there are four other sources of authority which provide for supplementary expenditure, namely, a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund, a transfer of Appropriation from another purpose and a further Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates.

Appropriation Act—Special Section 5 (1) and (2)

The main Appropriation Act contains a provision which gives additional authority to meet increased costs resulting from wage awards. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover most of the cost of salary and wage determinations, with a small amount being met from within the original appropriations. However, it is available only to cover increases in salary and wage rates which are formally handed down by a recognised wage-fixing authority and which are payable in the current financial year.

The main Appropriation Act also contains a provision which gives additional authority to meet increased electricity charges for pumping water. The drought has led to increased pumping from the Murray River. Also, tariffs have increased at a rate greater than that provided for in the Budget.

Governor's Appropriation Fund

Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund which, in terms of the Public Finance Act, may be used to cover additional expenditure. The operation of the fund has been explained to the House several times previously. The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover most of the individual increases above allocations.

Transfer of Appropriation

The Public Finance Act provides for adjustments within the amount of moneys appropriated from Consolidated Account so that excess money for one purpose may be transferred to another purpose where there is a deficiency. Any transfers made are expected to be relatively small.

Supplementary Estimates

Where payments additional to the Budget Estimates cannot be met from the special section of the Appropriation Act or covered by savings in other areas or are too large to be

met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund, Supplementary Estimates are presented. They may also be used as a means of informing Parliament of particularly significant Budget developments, even though extra Appropriation authority is not technically required.

The details of the Supplementary Estimates are as follows:

I. Payments of a Recurrent Nature

Treasurer—Miscellaneous

Following a sharp increase in the price of Cooper Basin gas, the previous Government approved a remission of the levy paid by the South Australian Gas Company in accordance with sections 5d and 5e of the Gas Act in order to assist SAGASCO to avoid too large an increase in its tariffs to consumers. The remission is effective from 1 January 1982 and is for the period up to and including 30 June 1983.

The appropriation of $4 100 000 now sought represents the amount credited to recurrent receipts since 1 January 1982.

Education

We have taken action, in accordance with an election promise, to hold the number of teachers in primary and secondary schools to allow a reduction in class sizes. This has resulted in a requirement for additional funds, beyond the budget provision for 231 teachers and some ancillary staff.

An appropriation of $2 900 000 is now sought for that purpose.

Agriculture—Miscellaneous

Gross payments for carry-on finance and other relief measures to support persons affected by the drought, the bushfires and the floods are expected to be about $40 000 000, $37 000 000 and $4 000 000 respectively in 1982-83. There may be some carry-over into and further payments in 1983-84.

An appropriation of $81 000 000 is sought for this purpose. Some $58 000 000 will be recovered from the Commonwealth Government under the natural disaster relief programme.

Community Welfare—Miscellaneous

We have taken action, in accordance with an election promise, to provide a concession to pensioners of up to $50 a year on their electricity bills. This measure came into effect on 30 November 1982. The appropriation of $4 000 000 now sought is the expected cost of this measure in 1982-83.

Health

As I outlined earlier, the present expectation is that the Health Commission will exceed its Budget allocation by about $17 000 000 for reasons other than increased levels of costs. The appropriation now sought is in line with that expectation.

II. Payments of a Capital Nature

Woods and Forests Department

As mentioned earlier, the Commonwealth Government has provided an interest-free loan of $11 000 000 to assist in the salvaging and storage of logs from the Woods and Forests Department's plantations damaged in the recent bushfires. The loan is repayable at the end of three years.

The appropriation now sought is to enable the payment of that amount (credited to capital receipts) to be made to the Woods and Forests Department. The clauses of the Appropriation Bill (No. 1) (1983) are in an identical form and give the same kinds of authority as the Act of last year.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply out of Consolidated Account the sum of $320 000 000 for the Public Service of the State for the financial year ending 30 June 1984. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the appropriation of $320 000 000 to enable the Public Service of the State to be carried on during the early part of next financial year. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no Parliamentary authority for payments required between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. It is customary for the Government to present two Supply Bills each year, the first covering estimated expenditure during July and August and the second covering the remainder of the period prior to the Appropriation Bill becoming law.

Members will notice that this Bill provides for an amount about 10 per cent greater than the $290 000 000 provided by the first Supply Act last year. The increase of $30 000 000 is needed to provide for the higher levels of costs faced by the Government. I believe that this Bill should suffice until the latter part of August, when it will be necessary to introduce a second Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the issue and application of up to $320 000 000. Clause 4 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount. Clauses 5 and 6 provide the normal borrowing powers for the capital works programme and for temporary purposes, if required.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1983)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pay-roll Tax Act, 1971-1982. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Prior to the election last year, the Labor Party, then in Opposition, gave an undertaking to raise the exemption level for pay-roll tax purposes to $160 000 and to increase it thereafter to $250 000 by the end of three years. As a first step which, in fact, went further than was necessary in honouring that commitment, the Act was amended late last year to raise the exemption level to $140 000 from 1 January 1983.

The main purpose of this Bill is to incorporate in legislation the timetable which the Government has set for that commitment to be honoured in full. Increases will take effect as from 1 July of each of the next three financial years, culminating in an exemption level of $250 000 for the year 1985-86. The cost of this measure, when fully effective, is expected to be about $10 500 000 per annum in dollars of the present day. In order to offset part of this very considerable cost, the Government has decided to abolish the minimum exemption of $37 800 and to allow the tapering of the exemption to continue until it reaches zero. This is

expected to produce about $2 000 000 extra revenue per annum. The most that this change will cost any individual employer will be about $1 890 per annum, and so it is difficult to see how it can have any effect on employment. The change will also bring South Australia into line with New South Wales, Tasmania, the A.C.T. and the Northern Territory. The other three States retain a minimum exemption level.

The Government has also decided to abolish the pay-roll tax refund and exemption scheme introduced by the previous Government to encourage youth employment. Under the exemption arrangements, pay-roll tax is waived for extra full-time employees under 20 years of age where the firm's total work force also increases while, under the refund arrangements, a $600 refund of tax is paid for one teenager employed, and a $1 800 refund is paid for two or more teenagers employed, where an employer adds to the number of his employees. Studies carried out by the Department of Labour indicate that, on average, companies achieve a reduction of less than 3 per cent in the unit labour costs of additional employees as a result of the scheme. Furthermore, where the companies concerned are profitable, 46 per cent of any saving goes to the Commonwealth Government as company tax, while the scheme is of absolutely no benefit to small employers who do not incur pay-roll tax. The initial allocation for the refund was $2 000 000, but expenditure in 1982-83 is expected to be about $230 000 only. The Government is therefore convinced that the scheme is not achieving its objectives and should be discontinued.

The Government intends that the savings generated be used to promote youth employment by increasing the staff of Community Improvement Through Youth, establishing the Job Creation Unit, employing 50 extra apprentices in Government departments and establishing a training programme for the Self Employment Ventures Scheme. Consideration will be given to the introduction of these measures at the time the 1983-84 Budget is being formulated.

Community health and domiciliary care services provided from hospitals are exempt from pay-roll tax. Similar services provided in other ways (for example, by incorporated community health centres) are not exempted under the present provisions of the Act. In August 1982, the former Minister of Health initiated moves to have this anomaly corrected. She pointed out that the services provided were basically the same and suggested that the Pay-roll Tax Act had not kept pace with changes which had occurred in the delivery of health services.

The Government accepts these arguments and has included provisions in this Bill to remedy the situation. The change will be retrospective to July 1982. There should be no net cost to the Budget. During 1982, the Vice-Chancellor of Flinders University wrote to the former Minister of Industrial Affairs seeking an exemption from pay-roll tax in respect of wages paid to young people employed under a scheme known as Work Experience Training in Commonwealth Establishments (WETICE). The scheme is fully funded by the Commonwealth Government and is designed to provide work experience for young people in blocks of 17 weeks. Most of the institutions involved do not pay pay-roll tax because of their close association with the Commonwealth Government, but universities and colleges of advanced education are exceptions to this rule. They are, therefore, in the unfortunate position of being required to meet extra pay-roll tax costs if they wish to take advantage of the scheme. Given the tight budgetary constraints under which tertiary education institutions are operating and the advantages offered by work experience programmes, the Government is prepared to exempt from pay-roll tax wages paid under this scheme by universities and colleges of advanced education. The loss of revenue in a full year is expected to be about $30 000.

In December 1982 the Master Builders Association sought exemption from payment of pay-roll tax in respect of the wages of apprentices employed under the M.B.A. group apprenticeship scheme. There are at least three strong arguments in favour of granting the exemption:

Group apprenticeship schemes train young people who would not otherwise acquire a skill and so add to the stock of skilled tradespeople in the State.

A considerable number of employees who hire apprentices from group schemes have annual payrolls which would not attract pay-roll tax under normal circumstances.

The States of New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland all have a system of rebates or exemptions for group apprenticeship schemes.

The Government has therefore agreed to amend the Act to exempt from tax wages paid to an apprentice employed under a group apprenticeship scheme. The cost to revenue is not expected to be significant. The Kindergarten Union of South Australia has never registered as an employer under the Pay-roll Tax Act and has never been asked to pay tax. However, there is at present no legal sanction for this situation. As child care centres and independent schools and colleges providing education up to and including secondary level are not liable for tax, it would be illogical to impose tax on employers who conduct kindergartens. Accordingly, the Government has decided to exempt the Kindergarten Union and any other employer who conducts a kindergarten, otherwise than for profit, from liability for tax. There should be no cost to revenue. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act and, in particular, by subclause (3) provides for the retrospective commencement of the provisions exempting health care centres from payment of tax. Clause 3 amends section 11a of the principal Act. Paragraph *(a)* amends the definition of 'minimum amount' to mean nought after 30 July 1983. The effect will be that after that date the minimum exemption level provided by section 11a will cease to exist. Paragraph *(b)* extends the definition of 'prescribed amount' to increase the maximum exemption in each of the next three years. The amounts specified are appropriate to monthly returns. When multiplied by 12 they give a little less than the annual exemptions specified later in the Bill.

Clause 4 amends section 12 of the principal Act. Paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)* provide exemptions to employers as described previously. New paragraph *(dab)* will exempt a group apprentice scheme run by an organisation that represents employers in a particular industry. Paragraph *(c)* adds a subsection to section 12 which will terminate the benefit given by subsection (2) in relation to young employees after 30 June 1983. Paragraph *(d)* provides a definition of 'health service' which includes in paragraph *(d)* a reference to domiciliary care services.

Clause 5 amends section 13a of the principal Act which provides definitions for the annual averaging provisions in relation to individual employers. Subsection (2) sets out a complicated formula for the determination of the 'prescribed amount' and clause 5 amends the definition of certain elements of the formula so that the exemption levels promised by the Government will be achieved. The maximum exemption level for 1983-84 will be $160 000, for 1984-85 it will be $200 000 and for 1985-86 and thereafter it will be

$250 000. The new amounts included in the principal Act by this Bill apply by reason of the formula for either the first half or second half of the year and therefore are half of the above-stated amounts. The clause also reduces the minimum exemption level to nought.

Clause 6 makes consequential amendments to section 14 of the principal Act which provides the level of weekly wages above which a monthly return must be lodged. Clause 7 amends section 18k of the principal Act which provides definitions for the annual averaging provisions relating to group employers. The amendments correspond to those made to section 13a by clause 5. Clause 8 adds a subsection to section 56a of the principal Act which provides for refunds to taxpayers who employ young workers. The effect of the new subsection will be that the refunds will not be payable in respect of employment after 30 June 1983.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act, 1974-1981. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for a number of amendments to the principal Act, the Superannuation Act, 1974-1981. One of the amendments revises the structure of the Superannuation Board; the other amendments arose out of recommendations made by the Superannuation Board. The amendments have been developed after consultation with the Public Service Association and the South Australian Government Employees Superannuation Federation, both of whom have concurred with the proposed amendments. Their purpose is to remove anomalies or improve the operation of the Act. Only two of the amendments could affect Government costs, and then to only a minor extent. These costs are mentioned in the summary of the amendments. I seek to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

Under the present Act, as soon as a contributor has been in receipt of a higher duties allowance for 12 months he must decide whether to elect to have that allowance taken into account for superannuation purposes. It has proved administratively very difficult to ensure, firstly, that contributors are aware of this provision, and, secondly, that they understand the sometimes complex issues involved in deciding which way they should elect. The Bill provides for these allowances to be counted in calculating benefits in all cases where they were being received at (or just prior to) retirement or death and had been payable continuously for at least 12 months.

At present, the spouse of a pensioner who married the pensioner after his retirement cannot qualify for a pension upon the pensioner's death. The Commonwealth Superannuation Fund, however, pays a spouse pension in these cases as long as the marriage existed for at least five years. The Bill provides that a spouse pension will be payable on the death of a pensioner not only where the marriage occurred before retirement (the present arrangement), but also where a legal marriage occurred at least five years prior to the pensioner's death. This amendment will increase by a small proportion the number of spouses who qualify for a pension. On the basis of the very sparse statistics that are available in this area, the Public Actuary has estimated that the extra cost will build up gradually but will eventually approximate to about 0.4 per cent of the Government's total pension cost. The amendment makes the change retrospective to 1 December 1982.

In 1980 an amendment was made to the Act to allow for the cost of carrying out prescribed functions of the Superannuation fund Investment Trust to be paid out of the fund. It was intended that the costs incurred in managing most investments of the fund should in future be borne by the fund rather than the Government. A legal problem was encountered in putting this intention into effect. The Bill overcomes this problem.

The Superannuation Board at present consists of three members—one elected by the contributors and contributor pensioners, one being appointed by the Governor, with the other being the Public Actuary. In order to give contributors better representation on the board, the Bill enlarges the number of elected members to two. The Bill also increases by one the number of members appointed by the Governor. Furthermore, the Bill reduces the term of membership for new members from seven years to five years.

The Bill provides that the cost of medical examinations will be paid out of the fund. This will restore the position, as far as contributors are concerned, to that which applied up to two years ago when the Health Commission provided free examinations.

On entry to the fund, practically all contributors elect to contribute at the full rate to receive 'higher benefits'. However, a small minority of contributors elect to pay contributions at half the full rate to receive 'lower benefits'. At present, such an election, once made, cannot be reversed. The Bill will allow a lower-benefit contributor an option each year of switching to higher benefits. This amendment will increase Government pension costs to the extent that transfers occur, but the effect will be relatively insignificant as only 3 per cent of contributors are on lower benefits and only a fraction of these are expected to transfer. The cost to the Government will remain less than it would have been if these contributors had originally opted for higher benefits.

The Bill allows a contributor to elect at any time to purchase additional benefits by way of increased fortnightly contributions. At present, such an election is only available at the time of joining the fund. This amendment will not affect Government costs as the whole of the cost of such additional benefits is financed by the contributor.

Under the present Act, a contributor pensioner or spouse pensioner may, within a limited period after the commencement of that pension, commute up to 30 per cent of the basic pension for a lump-sum payment. The Act presently provides that the commutation rate (that is, the amount of the lump sum receivable for each dollar of pension given up) shall be determined by the Public Actuary and effectively requires him to keep that rate under continuous review in the light of changes to relevant factors. The most dominant factor in the actuarial determination of a commutation rate is the current rate of interest, and the recent highly volatile nature of interest rates has caused considerable practical difficulties and uncertainty. The Bill provides that commutation rates will be determined by the Public Actuary once a year. On 31 March prior to any financial year, the Public Actuary will fix rates which will apply to all pensions commencing during that financial year. The Bill provides that the interest rate used by the Public Actuary will be the rate applying to investments of a prescribed class as at the preceding 24 March. It is intended that the class which will be prescribed will be 10-year private semi-government loans. These changes will allow contributors to plan their financial position on retirement with more certainty.

Membership of the Provident Account is available to the very small proportion of employees whose state of health

is such as to exclude them from contributing to the fund. At the present time, the anomalous position exists that a retiring Provident Account member must take a lump sum if he retires under age 60 and must take a pension if he retires at 60 or over. The Bill provides that a member of the Provident Account retiring at any time on the grounds of age will have the option of receiving a pension or a lump-sum benefit. The Bill also corrects some figures and removes some obsolete references.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure, apart from clause 3 *(c)*, is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation but that the operation of specific provisions may be suspended by the proclamation. Clause 3 *(c)* (which alters the definition of 'spouse') is to be deemed to have come into operation on 1 December 1982. Clause 3 amends the definition section, section 5. Paragraph *(a)* of the clause amends the definition of 'final salary'. This definition fixes the amount of the salary of a contributor by reference to which the amount of pension is determined. Under paragraph *(a)*, remuneration of a class prescribed by regulation (such as a higher duties allowance that has been paid for a stipulated period) may be treated as salary for the purposes of arriving at the amount of 'final salary'. Paragraph *(b)* of the clause removes from the definition of 'prescribed deduction' the reference to a lump sum paid under section 45 during the period of five years preceding the pension vesting day of a commutable pension.

As a result of this amendment, the amount of pension that may be commuted will not be reduced by the amount of a lump sum paid for the purchase of contribution months during the five years preceding the commencement of the pension. Paragraph *(c)* of this clause amends the definition of 'spouse'. Under the amendment, a person who is lawfully married to a pensioner at the death of the pensioner and who was married to the pensioner before he commenced to receive the pension or has been married to the pensioner for not less than five years preceding his death will qualify for a spouse's pension. At present, in order to qualify for a spouse's pension upon the death of a pensioner a person must be married to the pensioner and have been married to the pensioner before he became a pensioner.

Clause 4 amends section 6 by removing obsolete references. The clause is of a drafting nature only. Clause 5 amends subsection (1a) of section 10 of the principal Act which was designed to enable certain costs associated with the operations of the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust to be met by payments from the South Australian Superannuation Fund. The clause rewords this provision to make it clear that such payments may be made in relation to the cost of any services and facilities of a class to be prescribed by regulation employed by the trust in the performance of its functions.

Clauses 6, 7 and 8 effect changes designed to enable the membership of the South Australian Superannuation Fund Board to be increased from three members to five members, the two new members to be comprised of one further appointee of the Governor and one further elected representative of contributors and contributor pensioners. The term of office of appointed and elected members is also changed from seven years to five years.

Clause 9 makes amendments to section 26 that are consequential upon the proposed increase in the membership of the board. Clause 10 amends section 43 of the principal Act which provides for the acceptance of employees as contributors to the Superannuation Fund. Under that section, an employee may be required by the board to undergo a medical examination. The clause provides that if the employee commences to contribute to the fund or the Provident Account he shall be entitled to be reimbursed by the board for the cost of the medical examination.

Clause 11 amends section 45 of the principal Act which entitles a contributor to increase the benefits that he may obtain under the scheme by purchasing contribution months either by the payment of a lump sum or the making of fortnightly contributions. Under the present section, an election to purchase contribution months must be made near the beginning or the end of the period during which a person makes contributions to the fund. Under the clause, this time limitation will cease to apply to an election to purchase contribution months by the making of fortnightly contributions. The clause also clarifies several matters relating to the purchase of contribution months that are of a procedural nature only.

Clause 12 inserts a new section 57b to enable a lower benefit contributor to obtain higher benefits under the scheme. Under the clause, a lower benefit contributor may at any time elect to double the level of his future contributions thereby raising the level of his future benefits to one that, depending upon the period for which he may continue to make contributions to the fund, equals or approaches the level of benefits of a higher benefit contributor. Under the clause, the board may reject an election upon medical grounds, in which case, the contributor may, under clause 18, make contributions to the Provident Account, or, under section 65, contribute for limited benefits.

Clause 13 amends section 64 which enables a contributor who suffers a reduction of salary to continue to make contributions at the level at which they would have been if he had not suffered the reduction. The clause amends this section so that it will not apply in the case of a reduction of salary of a kind prescribed by regulation.

Clause 14 amends section 65 which provides that an employee who is refused acceptance as a contributor to the fund upon medical grounds may instead contribute for limited benefits. The section provides, at subsection (2), that an employee who contributes under the section is not entitled to any pension or benefit under the Act other than a pension or benefit arising under that section. The clause amends the limitation imposed by subsection (2) so that it applies only in relation to contributions paid under the section. This amendment is consequential upon the proposal to permit a contributor who makes an election under proposed new section 57b where that election is rejected by the board, instead to make contributions under section 65.

Clause 15 amends section 75 which provides for commutation of a pension by a contributor pensioner. The section presently provides that the amount payable upon an election to commute part of a pension is to be determined by the Public Actuary. The clause amends the section so that it sets out the framework under which such a determination is made. Under the clause, the amount payable by way of commutation is to be determined by reference to commutation rates which are to be determined by the Public Actuary on 31 March in each year. These commutation rates are, under the clause, to be based upon mortality rates which are to be revised by the Public Actuary, if necessary, on 30 September in any year and upon the relevant rate of interest applying on 24 March preceding the determination of the commutation rates. The rate of interest is to be determined by reference to loans of a class prescribed by regulation.

Clause 16 amends section 76 which provides that the board may require an invalid pensioner to satisfy the board as to the state of his health by undergoing a medical examination. The clause amends this section so that it provides that the cost of any such medical examination is to be met by the board.

Clause 17 amends section 84 which provides for commutation of the spouse's pension. The amendment corresponds in all respects to the amendment made by clause 15

in relation to commutation of the pension of a contributor pensioner.

Clause 18 substitutes for sections 100, 101 and 102 new sections 100 and 101 relating to the Provident Account. Under the present provisions an employee may contribute to the Provident Account if he has been refused permission to contribute to the fund. This right is continued under the new section 100 but also extended to a contributor who has made an election to obtain higher benefits under new section 57b where that election has been rejected by the board and the contributor is not permitted to make contributions under section 65. Under the present sections, where a person has been contributing to the Provident Account and subsequently satisfies the board as to the soundness of his health, or attains the age of retirement (that is, 60 years), the person is automatically treated as if his contributions to that account had instead been contributions made as a contributor to the fund. Under new section 101 contributions made by a person to the Provident Account are treated as if they had been contributions to the fund if the person satisfies the board as to the soundness of his health, or, having attained at least the early retirement age (that is, 55 years), he retires and elects to take the benefit of the section.

Clause 19 inserts a new section 130a which empowers the board to rescind a decision made by it as a result of the failure of a person to disclose a material matter relating to the state of his health. Under the new section, where the board rescinds such a decision, the board may recover any amounts paid to or in relation to the person as a result of the decision and is required to refund amounts that it has received from the person as a result of the decision.

Clause 20 amends section 139, the regulation-making provision of the principal Act. The clause adds a further power to make regulations providing for the refund of a prescribed part of contributions paid into the fund and prescribing the circumstances in which such refunds are to be payable. Clause 21 makes two minor corrections to the figures set out in the thirteenth schedule.

Mr EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 20 April. Page 953.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I indicate to the House that the Opposition supports this Bill. In fact, one might describe it as a lift-out of the composite Bill introduced just prior to the last State election. The requirement of a lessee to clear certain native vegetation on his leasehold is a stipulation, as the Minister indicated, that has not been enforced for some considerable time. In fact, that provision in the Crown Lands Act dates back to early days when it was very necessary that a person in South Australia taking up land be required to clear and bring into production a certain amount of that land that had been allotted to him.

However, in this day and age I would certainly readily accept that the need for that has passed. In fact, there are strong moves within the community to support the proposition that vegetation, particularly natural vegetation, be retained. Therefore, as this Bill contains provisions that were in the Bill that I previously introduced in this Chamber, I fully support it. I have no reason to hold up this measure and am happy for it to proceed.

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

SENIOR SECONDARY ASSESSMENT BOARD OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 21 April. Page 1003.)

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): This Bill parallels in most respects the Public Examinations Authority of South Australia Bill introduced by my colleague the Hon. Harold Allison, before the last State election. In fact, in his second reading explanation the Minister admitted that in most respects the Government was following in the steps of that Bill. The Bill is based on the recommendations of the committee of inquiry into year 12 examinations, commonly known as the Jones Committee, and the subsequent committee of inquiry into education, the Keeves Committee.

The Bill remedies the present situation in year 12 whereby there is a Matriculation certificate widely recognised by employers and a secondary school certificate which is not recognised particularly well by employers. The Bill brings into effect a single assessment for year 12 which in some subjects may or may not include the traditional examination. The purposes of the Bill can be summed up under the following three headings: first, a wider range of student interest and abilities will be catered for; secondly, the certificate will provide students with recognition of their abilities in areas other than those regarded as prerequisite tertiary study; and, thirdly, employers will have a better means for selecting students for employment, particularly in subjects more directly related to working life.

The new assessment board will include representation from teachers or administrators from the academic or administrative staff of colleges of advanced education, the Department of Technical and Further Education, the academic or administrative staff of the two universities, as well as representation from employer, trade union and parent organisations. Further, a novel twist in this Bill is that provision is made for there to be a representative of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity.

The new board will conduct the year 12 examination annually: it will also be required to provide candidates with certificates as soon as possible after the examination; to provide results to the South Australian Tertiary Admission Centre; to liaise with educational authorities regarding syllabuses; and to conduct relevant research, etc. The first main difference between this Bill and the previous Liberal Government Bill, apart from the change of name, is that the membership of the board is to be increased from 25 to 29 by adding a nomination of the Commissioner of Equal Opportunity, of the Roseworthy Agricultural College, and a second nomination from both the South Australian Commission for Catholic Schools and the Independent Schools Board of South Australia. The present content of the Public Examination Board is 32 members. The second major change in the Bill is the deletion of the original clause 17 (of which more later) which gave power to universities to control course content and to nominate which subjects should be studied for matriculation. The deletion of this clause is opposed strongly by the universities, especially Adelaide University. One final matter under this section is that the new course content decided on by the new board would not come into effect until 1986, and I will have something more to say about that later.

This would have to be probably the most important Education Bill to come before this House, certainly in my period as a member, because it changes the whole of the present year 12 assessment. I put on record that I support absolutely the concept behind the new year 12 assessment procedures. I believe that the present system, especially with the system of scaling of marks and the like, has led to an

enormous amount of confusion in the community, especially with employers and, most importantly, with those students who for some reason or another are not able to do what we regard as matriculation subjects and receive the Secondary School Certificate and feel that they are being downgraded by receiving that certificate.

I have great sympathy with those students, as we must not lose sight of the fact that the most important persons with whom we are dealing in this measure are the secondary students themselves. It is not the universities; it is not the Department of Education; and it is not the present P.E.B.; It is the secondary school students. I support the concept of the Jones Report and, in fact, in most items that report was supported by the Keeves Report. Surely the Keeves Report recommended various amendments to what was proposed by the Jones Committee. The Keeves Report recommended that there should be on the Secondary Schools Certificate, the new matriculation certificate or whatever the new year 12 certificate will be called, a delineation of which were matriculation subjects and which were not. I support the fact that that is not to be the case with this measure. I think that the unified assessment of students doing the year 12 course at our schools is one that should be supported by all members and will certainly be supported by the Opposition as far as that part of it goes.

I now turn to the time delay that has occurred in the bringing of this measure before Parliament. The Jones Committee reported in 1978, and when the Tonkin Government came into power the recommendations of that committee were referred to the Keeves Committee of Inquiry. Of course, that was a wide-ranging inquiry, and another two years elapsed before we received that report. It was not until just before the recent State election that the Tonkin Government was able to bring before Parliament a Bill based on the recommendations of the Jones Report and the Keeves Committee. In some respects I regret that we were not able to move more quickly on that matter, because I believe the secondary students of this State deserved to have this legislation brought before the House earlier than it has been introduced.

Of course, after the State election last year the Minister considered the Bill and started another round of consultation once again to see whether he should alter it in any respects. Of course, he has done that, and we are now faced with a situation at this late stage in the year, two weeks before the end of this session of Parliament, of having to deal with this most important piece of legislation because of the delay in the Minister bringing it to the House. I have admitted that delays occurred before that, but because of the delay in the Minister bringing it to the House, it seems from what I have been able to ascertain that it will now be impossible to introduce the new syllabuses before 1986.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Nonsense!

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: With the Allison Bill we would have been able to introduce them in 1985. That is the advice that has been given to me by educationalists: the Minister may have his sources, but I am telling him that that is what has been told to me.

Having said that, I want to canvass quickly one other matter before moving on to what we shall call the controversial clauses of the Bill, and that is that the retention rate in year 12, and indeed, in senior secondary school year 11, has gone up over the past few years. I am indebted to the Vice-Chancellor of Adelaide University for these figures, and some of my colleagues will deal with them in greater detail in either this place or in another place. I think it is important to put on record the question of the increased retention rate in year 12, because the number of students of that year who will be working under the new system has increased markedly since 1970. The Minister reported recently that the year 12 retention rate has reached a level of 44 per cent, setting an unprecedented high, and the present year 11 retention rate is also reported as being the highest on record at 83.3 per cent.

The picture emerges clearly that students are tending to stay on at an increasing rate, to do year 12 and indeed they are staying on to do year 11, and this is occurring at a time when we are bringing in new legislation. I cannot emphasise strongly enough that point because, as I have said, the persons we are concerned about with this legislation are the secondary school students. Some important principles are at stake with this legislation, and I have already mentioned one of them: the most important one is the welfare of the secondary school student.

The other important principle at stake is equality of opportunity, and in most respects this Bill improves equality of opportunity, which is something to which I and this Party are committed, and I think all members of this place should be committed to equality of opportunity, not only with the academic plateau of students but with their ability to gain employment, and that is something to which we all subscribe.

The second important principle that I believe is contained in this measure is that most of the decisions now made on course content, subjects, and syllabuses will be made by a board on which there will be, I imagine, a majority of secondary school teachers and that has not always been the position. The secondary school teacher, apart from the student, is the most important section of the community covered by this legislation.

I agree with that and subscribe to that ideal. However, another important principle is not necessarily covered in this legislation: the principle that tertiary institutions themselves have a right to decide what subjects they require for admittance to those institutions and to decide the standards of admittance they require. That is equally a right that cannot be overlooked and a right that I hope we can impress on the Minister that it can be subscribed to without destroying the intent of the Bill.

Concerning the composition of the board, it is difficult to discuss this because I agree with the increase of four in its membership. I am happy to see the reference to a nomination from Roseworthy Agricultural College, and I thought it was a mistake that this provision was omitted from the previous Bill. I am also happy to see a second nomination from the Catholic Schools Commission and the Independent Schools Board. I have no opinion one way or the other on the inclusion of the nomination of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunities, but I will not carp or quibble about it.

I agree with the alterations the Minister has made, but I am disappointed that, by increasing the number of members on the board from 25 to 29, the total membership will be almost up to that of the Public Examinations Board, which at present has 32 members. This is a pity because in getting up to this number we are getting to a situation where the board starts to be unwieldy. However, I do not intend to move an amendment to this provision, because I believe that those people should be on the board and I agree with the former content of the board, as expressed in the Allison Bill, except for the lack of nomination from Roseworthy. The most important people on the board will be the secondary school teachers. I suggest that, when the appointments are made, the constituent bodies should be careful not to overload the board with administrators rather than secondary school teachers.

Coming to the controversial aspect, that the Bill does not include the original clause 17 of the Bill introduced by the Hon. Harold Allison, I am surprised at this because, although I understand the concerns that educationalists have about

the original clause 17, I think those concerns were misplaced. I do not want to see the new assessment board dominated by universities: nor will it be, because universities' nominations have been reduced, I understand, from about 14 to four, and in my consultations with education institutions (and many such institutions are opposed to the original clause 17) no-one has mentioned the reduced number of nominees from the universities on the new board.

It is a massive reduction in influence of the universities, and cognisance should have been taken of that reduction in influence. If the number of members from universities is to be reduced from 14 to 4, the influence of the universities must be reduced. What great ogre the universities have been or were going to be on the new assessment board! At this stage I refer to a letter that I and other members have received from the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, the Acting Vice-Chancellor of the Flinders University and the Director of the South Australian Institute of Technology, which states:

The Bill for an Act to establish the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia (S.S.A.B.S.A.)—

I interpose here to say that this business of initials is getting beyond a joke. I prefer PEASA, whereas SSABSA sounds like a carpet sweeper, and the Minister and his officers could have done a little better than concocting the combination of words that gives us—

was tabled in the House by the Minister of Education last Friday. It is designed to replace the Public Examinations Board (PEB) Act of 1968. The present PEB consists of 32 members, of whom 14 are drawn equally from the two South Australian universities and 2 members are from the South Australian Institute of Technology.

The need for broadening the choice of Year 12 subjects in South Australian secondary schools and the desirability of a single public authority to assess all those subjects is clearly recognised. Our institutions support these desirable innovations very strongly. The Public Examinations Authority of South Australia (PEASA) Bill, introduced on 7 October 1982, envisaged an authority with 25 members of which the two universities and the two largest colleges in South Australia have two nominees each. Our institutions concurred with this major shift in membership to give broader community representation, because the PEASA Bill had appropriate safeguards to maintain the standards and content of those subjects to be used for tertiary entrance and selection. The PEASA Bill therefore represented a consensus reached after extensive consultation to achieve a balance between the interests and needs of various educational and community groups.

The SSABSA Bill, now tabled, envisages a somewhat larger board membership of 29 members including, very reasonably, a member nominated by Roseworthy College. The increased membership is not at issue: what is at issue is that the safeguard clause (clause 17 of the previous PEASA Bill) has been removed. This safeguard clause enabled a tertiary institution, that is a university or a college, to nominate subjects 'in which it requires an assessment of students to enable it to select students for enrolment'. For any subject, the institution would have the right to recommend persons to be appointed as members of a subject syllabus committee and also its chairman: 'The authority may, where it thinks fit, make appointments in accordance with those recommendations'. Similarly, an institution could nominate persons to be appointed as assessors (that is examiners) for that subject.

At present, P.E.B. syllabus committees have significant membership drawn from practising teachers, as well as tertiary teachers who have special expertise in the subject. At present, chief examiners for matriculation subjects must be drawn from the staff of one of the universities. The PEASA Bill, whilst permitting greater flexibility, still acknowledged the role of tertiary institutions in the crucial role of assessment. Accordingly, the PEASA Bill envisaged that, for assessment purposes, examiners need not be exclusively university or college staff members.

The concern, therefore, of the universities and the institute [and the Minister should note 'and the Institute'] is with the standards and assessment of those subjects which are used for tertiary entrance. Suggestions that the involvement of tertiary institutions with syllabus and assessment matters should, or would, extend to all Year 12 subjects, are quite mistaken. The concern of our institutions is only with those subjects being used for tertiary selection. Already there exist many subjects which are not used for tertiary entrance and it can be expected that this number will increase. The latter subjects are not under discussion.

We would point out that the involvement of our staff makes constructive, and often indispensable, contributions to syllabus design and content. Often our institutions have the only staff working professionally in the area of the subject, who, by their research, are aware of contemporary international developments. It is important that these staff be involved and verbal reassurances are inadequate.

The new SSABSA Bill has provision for a retrospective review of the legislation after a four-year period. Our institutions cannot regard this as an acceptable compromise, nor does it seem to be practical. The expiration of the Act is projected for 31 December 1986. This date would not allow time to assess properly the impact of the new SSABSA arrangements, since the present P.E.B. matriculation subject arrangements are anticipated to continue at least to the end of 1984.

Accordingly, we seek inclusion of a clause in the SSABSA Bill which would provide for the involvement of tertiary institutions in syllabus committees and assessment of those subjects designated for tertiary selection.

That letter is signed by Professor Clark, the Acting Vice-Chancellor at Flinders University; Professor Mills, the Director of the South Australian Institute of Technology; and Professor Stranks, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide. That letter is important, not only for its content but also for the fact that it was signed by Professor Mills. There has been much discussion over the past few weeks that the Institute of Technology is opposed to the universities on this issue. It is obvious from the letter that that does not apply and that Professor Mills is supporting the case of the universities on this question.

I repeat that the content of the original clause 17 did not give universities the right to appoint examiners, and it did not give universities the right to say whether subjects would or would not be approved. It merely was that they should recommend to the board. I would be the last person to agree to the setting up of a senior school assessment board and then to try to take away the powers of that board. I believe that that would be eminently ridiculous.

It is obvious that, if we are going to set up such an important statutory authority primarily concerned with the welfare of our secondary school students, it is ridiculous to do anything that would detract from the authority of that board. However, a way exists by which the universities can still have the right to preserve their own entrance standards and decide on their entrance subjects without taking away the authority of that board. We will discuss that matter in more detail in Committee. There is no doubt that the universities have that right. They have the right to preserve their own standards in a society in which there has been much criticism of the fall in educational standards, not only in this State and in Australia but also overseas.

Only today I heard of severe criticism about the fall in standards in secondary schools in the United States. It is enough that criticism is coming from all these areas for the subject not to be overlooked, and I am sure that the Minister does not wish to overlook standards. That is important. For that reason the Opposition will support the second reading of this measure, and hope that the Minister will agree to some propositions that we will put before him: not exactly the same as was in the previous Bill but some propositions which, to this side of the House, make good common sense.

The last thing we want to do is to box the universities into a corner. The Minister is a Minister in a Labor Government, and knows what it is like to deal with trade unions. Indeed, he has a powerful union under his portfolio with which he constantly has to deal. He knows that the last thing one does in any negotiation is to box the opponent into a corner. Once that happens, dire consequences can flow from that action. In this case, if the universities are forced into a corner where they believe that they will lose control of their own standards, we will be faced with the possibility of the universities setting a separate examination for entrance to their institutions. That is something that I

would find hard to tolerate. It would be a gross imposition on secondary school students, and is not to be entertained under any circumstances. The Minister knows that it would destroy the Bill.

If we set up a board to bring in a universal year 12 assessment, and do not consider what I believe are sensible suggestions, we are faced with the possibility that universities will react. We already know that universities have the power under their own enabling Acts to make statutes to control their admittance standards, the courses, and subjects in which students have to obtain expertise, in order to gain admittance. I hope that the Minister will not take on that confrontation, as I believe it would destroy the Bill. As I mentioned before, the most important people in the whole of this debate are the secondary school students themselves.

The Minister has introduced a sunset clause into this legislation, as the Bill is to expire in December 1986. The Minister has already taken issue with me by interjection, because I said that the syllabuses were now being ordered for courses including 1985. The Minister is going to take me up on that and is going to say that that is not necessarily so. The person who told me was the Chairman of the Public Examinations Board, Professor Mills. He was the authority whom I consulted and he told me that if the new board was set up in the next few months it would be impossible to introduce new syllabuses (I assume that that is the plural of 'syllabus', although some members have said 'syllabi').

Mr Meier: It can be 'syllabuses' or 'syllabi'.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am indebted to my colleague from Goyder. The new syllabuses will be in train for 1986, and we can expect the present syllabuses to remain in force through 1985. I think that that is a pity, because if the Minister has this expiration clause in the Bill the then Minister of Education will have to come into this House with a Bill, presumably in the Budget session of 1986, if this measure is to continue. What will be the position then? The first year that the new board will really be able to operate will be 1986: if the new syllabuses are in train from February 1986, the Minister will be coming into this House in August/September of that year, when there will have been little more than five or six months of the new syllabuses and no examinations or assessments. Yet, the Bill will expire in December 1986.

To me, that is a mistake by the Minister. I think that he is wrong in having a sunset clause at all in the Bill. Whether or not it is a compromise for the universities, I think it is wrong because not only do we have the problem with the syllabuses in 1986 but the new secondary school assessment board will for a little over three years have the sword of Damocles hanging over its head, knowing, at the very worst, that by December 1986 it could be wiped out or that probably, at the very best, there could be serious alterations to its mode of operation.

I think that that is a mistake. As I have said, this is the most important education matter to come before this House in the time that I have been a member. It is, therefore, the most important education body—statutory body—to have been set up in that time, and to give it an expiration, or a threatened expiration, of its term of December 1986 is, I believe, a grave injustice not only on the new members of the new board but on the secondary school students of South Australia.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I am a little disappointed that there is a proposed speedy passage of this Bill. I simply have not had time to consider it properly, and I would like to have had an opportunity to consider its ramifications, because it involves an area in which I am vitally interested. It is an area that will fundamentally affect South Australia's educational performance over the next five years and probably until the end of this decade. It is an extremely important Bill, and as a new member (certainly other members had an opportunity during the term of the previous Government to obtain some inkling of the changes proposed) I would have appreciated an opportunity to consider the measure more fully.

I support the general changes encompassed in the Bill, but I have some grave reservations about it. We all know that we are in a state of evolutionary change in all forms of endeavour. The education system must reflect the needs of the community, and no system can remain static. Those or similar words appear in the two reports of the Jones and Keeves Committees.

It is obvious that we have a number of competing influences in the education field. For most of the post Second World War period, a relationship existed between school experience, employment and tertiary training. It is now far less well defined than it was previously. I think that it is useful to reflect on the demise of conditions experienced by school leavers, because they are the end point of the system. We are struggling with massive rates of unemployment, the highest since the 1930s. Tertiary institutions are also feeling the brunt and are struggling to maintain student numbers. Some of the subjects taught in schools are regarded by a significant number of school leavers as largely irrelevant to future employment or advanced education.

As the shadow Minister has pointed out, the board which will guide South Australian children through the formative years is, in essence, soundly based. The departure he mentioned is the lack of reference to the specific needs of tertiary training. I think that there are some tremendous difficulties in this area, and it comes back to the composition of the board and to a number of other matters that have to be seriously addressed by this Government if the new board is to be a success.

We are all aware that retention rates at secondary level have been increasing. Whilst I think that that is healthy, because people have a chance to improve their learning and get a wider understanding of a large number of areas, I also think that it partly involves a captive audience. Many of our children wish to leave secondary school with a certificate of some sort, and I am sorry to say that many of them are kept at secondary school well beyond their actual needs. Many children are required by convention to have in their hands a certificate such as the matriculation certificate, or their parents believe that they need to go to year 12 to complete their education. So, the retention rates result from not only a desire for improved education but also the nature of the system. I personally am sorry that the intermediate certificate is not still in vogue today. That does not necessarily reflect the views of my Party, but it is my belief that there should be some way of assessing children as they go through their secondary training years, apart from the present system involving school assessments.

The interesting part of the Bill involves the composition of the board, and the shadow Minister of Education has already mentioned the difficulties that could arise. The board will comprise a vast number of competing interests. People naturally will not come to agreement on a number of issues if those issues affect their own area of influence. The board has the potential to be able to cater for a wider range of needs which I believe need to be catered for, but it also has the potential for promoting protected interests in a number of areas.

Mr Mathwin: Vested interests.

Mr BAKER: There are certainly vested interests. I know that every educator believes that the way that he is doing things is right and that the way that the system is organised will be for the betterment of the children. In the process, however, there is a wide divergence of views on what is

required of the system as such. I think that it could well lead to the 29 people, with a very wide variety of interests, each trying to manipulate the system in the belief that his view is the correct one. I am not saying that these people will try to manipulate the system because of their own vested interests as such, but they have an affinity with their own area, and that is certainly the area that they will be considering when dealing with secondary assessment.

Mr Mathwin: They'll have a narrow vision.

Mr BAKER: I think that they probably will have a narrow vision, as the member for Glenelg points out. I do not think that all men can look beyond their barriers and provide the inspiration that is required. I think that therein lies one difficulty with the board. The second difficulty, which has already been pointed out, is the lack of representation by the tertiary training institutions. As has been pointed out earlier, that is not necessarily of concern to the institutions themselves because they understand that the new Secondary Assessment Board will be addressing wider issues besides the needs of the tertiary institutions. However, inherent in any system there must be an aiming point or a point at which the system says that it must achieve certain levels of excellence. It is my personal belief that the education system in South Australia, Australia and in fact overseas has failed to provide excellence. Some people call it elitism; I call it excellence. That means that people must be able to achieve to their maximum potential and that the system should provide for that.

If this board cannot come to grips with the fact that Australia needs excellence, it will surely fail. Recently there were statements by Barry Jones (Commonwealth Minister for Science and Technology), who said that Australia needs people of excellence. We need people with training and with a whole range of attitudes, experience and expertise which we do not have today. I believe (and I agree with Mr Jones) that the system is not providing to the level of Australia's needs. Therefore, any secondary system must encompass some recognition that we require higher standards in every form of accomplishment at a tertiary level.

Another matter which I wish to address is what happens at year 12. At year 12 we should then pre-empt what will happen in years 8, 9, 10 and 11 because, as we know the system today, students start at year 8 with an indication of the areas in which they will specialise and in which areas they are reasonably good. Therefore, whatever we do at year 12 will affect the whole system. I am sure that the Minister of Education is aware of that.

Whilst it is important that we cater for all the other competing needs (and I believe that there are a number of competing needs for children), more emphasis should be placed on manual skills in the schools. There is a whole range of other areas to which people are more suited than academic training. However, we need academic training and preparation for higher order training at tertiary institutions.

Mr Becker interjecting:

Mr BAKER: That is not true. I have had some discussions with people at Flinders University, and I know that they are particularly concerned about the situation that could arise unless due reference is made to the needs of those institutions. I have also received a number of telephone calls from private schools and other educators who are also concerned about the possibility that we could lose the standards that we have today. I believe that we should achieve higher standards, but they believe that we could lose the standards that we have today.

I have assured these people that the Minister will give due reference to their needs and that he will make the board work. However, unless he makes some provision within that Act which reflects his Government's commitment to the achievement of higher standards and the achievement of a reference system at year 12 which can be embraced by tertiary institutions and employers, surely we will fail to meet the needs that I have specified previously.

We cannot consider our education system as something that is totally malleable. We cannot consider that we have all the right answers, but we must ensure that the children have an aiming point and that they can perceive what will happen to them during their educational period.

As I said previously, with the composition of the board and the competing interests on that board, it may well be that to get consensus (that famous misused word) we will see a vast change in assessment methods over a period of time. We will go through a formative stage just like the primary schools have gone through their formative stage with their new maths and their various modules for teaching.

As a result of the changes that took place in the primary schools during the 1970s, a large number of children today do not have the basic skills, and the secondary system did not pick them up along the way: it just did not have the resources. Therefore, I can see the same principle applying to a board which does not have a commonality of interest. The only commonality of interest that it has is for the future betterment and the future educational standards of the children. However, it cannot come to grips with the fact that they will all have different ideas and a different way of meeting that problem.

I believe that the universities and other tertiary institutions have a right to demand a standard. I believe that they have a right to pre-specify what their requirements will be. It is encumbent on the Minister to ensure that the children who leave secondary schools and who wish to go on will, in fact, meet the requirements of the tertiary training institutions. There is no guarantee in this Bill; in fact, the shadow Minister has attempted to incorporate in principle a reference which will provide that the universities have a say. They do not necessarily need to have a say on the whole secondary system: they do not desire that. They realise that other interests are involved, but what they demand and what they should expect is that the Minister of Education should provide them with students who are capable of going on to tertiary training and fulfilling their requirements.

I think that the whole system of education, with the process of the new board reviewing the status of the various subjects, will go through a very healthy period of review, and that is long overdue. However, in the process I would hate to see South Australia, because of its difficulties and the composition of the board, being unable to come to grips with the basic needs of tertiary training. I support the shadow Minister of Education in his desire to have an amendment incorporated in the Bill, and I hope that the Minister of Education will also support that proposal.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): This Bill has certainly had a rather deferred entry into the House and, as a result of that, the problems being experienced by students wishing to enter tertiary institutions, by the teachers who prepare them for that career, and by the teachers who prepare students who wish to embark on other careers or occupations, together with their families have, of course, been exacerbated.

As the shadow Minister pointed out, the situation will not be quickly resolved upon the introduction and the passage of this Bill simply because it will be more than two years before the system can be set in place. By that time, considering the pace of change in the community, I think that many people will condemn the present Minister for his dilatory approach to the subject and for his failure to introduce the Bill immediately upon assuming Government. I should add that the Minister had very little choice because his Premier has chosen that Parliament should sit for so

few days. Such a lot of time has passed since the election and between the sittings that the Minister himself probably had very little responsibility for that failure.

On reading the Bill and considering the issues, I have reflected, as probably many members of this House have done, on my own situation when as a secondary student I was undertaking what were then considered by us all to be fairly stringent and somewhat awe inspiring examinations, namely, the Intermediate, Leaving and Leaving Honours.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: That dates us.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It does date us, but am I right in thinking that everyone in this House would have been in that position?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The honourable member did Leaving Honours, so I am confirmed in my belief. I am reflecting on the kind of education that I had and on the approach to that education that the existence of those examinations formed in my mind and that of my contemporaries. Because it is now a very long time ago the horrors of those examinations seem to have receded somewhat. However, what does stay in my mind are the influences of that education on me: if I were to identify those influences, I would do so in four ways. First, that education instilled in me a love of language and of English literature; it gave me an appreciation of history and the development of mankind; it gave me a sense of wonder at the natural world; and it also gave me a feeling of obligation to use my education in appropriate ways for the benefit of others.

I would like to say that that sense of obligation was instilled in me by the teachers at what was then known as Walford House School (which is now Walford Church of England Girls Grammar School). From my observation of the schools in my electorate and throughout the State, I have found that teachers today are still trying to inspire in their students those same attributes which I had the privilege of acquiring, together perhaps with wider attributes that are appropriate for today's community. I venture to say that those attributes are the mark of an educated person, the person who has had the privilege of an education, and they are as relevant in the twentieth century as they were in the nineteenth century, and will be just as relevant in the twenty-first century, and I refer to a love of language and literature, an appreciation of history and the development of mankind, a sense of wonder at the natural world, and a feeling of obligation to use education in appropriate ways for the benefit of others.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Very lucky.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, indeed I was very fortunate, and I believe that the girls who attend that school today (my old school) are still fortunate. The questions raised by the member for Torrens, the shadow Minister of Education, relating to standards are important questions that I want to develop. I do so as one who did not proceed from secondary school to a tertiary institution. Perhaps the perspective I have on the matter of tertiary standards is notable for the fact that I am not a graduate. In referring to standards, at the same time I am very conscious of the needs of the vast majority of students who will never proceed to tertiary education and whose lives in terms of their personal fulfilment and enrichment through education are no less important. Indeed, when considering their numbers we would have to say that the needs of these students are of critical and overwhelming importance.

Of course this Bill meets the needs of those students, but I am bound to share the concerns of the two universities and the South Australian Institute of Technology as expressed in the letter received by, I presume, all members of this House from the Acting Vice-Chancellor of Flinders University, Professor Clark, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, Professor Stranks and the Director of the South Australian Institute of Technology, Professor Mills. The member for Torrens read into the record the content of that letter, but I want to re-emphasise one particular paragraph, which states:

> The concern therefore of the universities and the institute is with the standards and assessment of those subjects which are used for tertiary entrance. Suggestions that the involvement of tertiary institutions with syllabus and assessment matters should, or would, extend to all year 12 subjects, are quite mistaken. The concern of our institutions is only with those subjects being used for tertiary selection. Already there exists many subjects which are not used for tertiary entrance and it can be expected that this number will increase. The latter subjects are not under discussion.

In referring to the subjects which are used for tertiary entrance, I think it is relevant to look back (as I stated earlier) to what I remember as being distinctive, important and lasting in my own education. I referred to language and English literature, and I feel certain that those subjects will continue to be used as tertiary selection subjects. I referred also to the appreciation of history and the development of mankind, but I am not aware whether history will be used as a tertiary selection subject. I referred to a sense of wonder at the natural world, and there is no question that scientific subjects and mathematical subjects are and will continue to be used for tertiary selection. In other words, the key subjects, the foundation subjects of the academic curriculum, if you like, the subjects which will continue to be regarded by scholars as the basic subjects in which anyone seeking tertiary education will need to achieve a certain standard, are important and their standards need to be safeguarded.

This Bill does not provide those safeguards, and the Opposition certainly believes that, in the interests of every student, whether he or she continues to tertiary education or goes into a trade or other occupation, minimum standards should be set in those subjects. I received a very timely letter this afternoon from a constituent, who is also a senior lecturer at the University of Adelaide. I would like to quote from that letter, because it summarises my concerns, which I believe should be the concerns of the Minister in the interests of the education system and also of the wider South Australian community, as the two are inextricably linked. In part, the letter states:

> I am writing to you both as one of your constituents . . . and as Chairman of a university department to express my concern at the Bill for an Act to establish the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia . . . tabled in the House last week.
>
> It is important to stress that there is no wish to stifle the development of a broader year 12. For my own part, I have tried, both as sometime chairman of a P.E.B. subject committee and a chief examiner, and since then simply as a lecturer, to maintain good contacts with teachers and to help contribute in a small way to making my school subject—

and he identifies the subject—

> broadly educational, not merely a narrow academic training. The issue is not the broadening of year 12, but simply the complete lack in the new Bill of any guaranteed control by the tertiary institutions over their entry standards. It is not good for students nor for the society which foots the bill and, I believe, truly needs strong university education more than ever in fast-changing times, if entrance standards are not safeguarded.

My constituent has put the situation as concisely and as accurately as it can be put, and I would like to place what he has said in the context of the role of the university in society because, when discussing this Bill, we are talking about the needs of society as a whole. The lad who goes on to become a motor mechanic, an apprentice cook or a gardener, or the girl who leaves school and may (although it is unlikely these days) spend the greater part of her life in domestic duty has as much need of an educated society with intellectual standards that are rigorously set as has the academic and the scholar. In the *History of the University of Adelaide (1874-1974)*, written by W.G. Duncan and Roger Ashley Leonard, reference is made in chapter 17 to the

wider community about which we are concerned in this Bill. The authors state that Sir Keith Murray, when presiding over the universities committee of inquiry, told the then Prime Minister (Hon. R.G. Menzies) that, in the true essence of what a university meant, he thought that the University of Adelaide was pre-eminent in Australia. At that stage of course, (in 1961), there was only one university in Adelaide, as Flinders University had not been established. The authors wrote:

> This clearly, thought most of his audience, was a reference to the eminence of its staff, as scholars and research workers, and to the brilliant subsequent careers of many of its graduates. They were wrong. Mr Menzies continued: 'Now that interested me enormously, because he [Sir Keith Murray] didn't mean that Adelaide had enormous buildings, surrounded by spacious grounds and gardens, vast sporting arenas and an area of land such as that which enriches the University of British Columbia. But I think I do know what he meant, and that was that this university, almost uncomfortably placed, as one might occasionally think, right in the heart of a city, without the elbow room that one would like to see, has succeeded in attracting the interest, the help, the enthusiasm of the most eminent people in this city and this State. There is not that kind of remoteness about the university which occasionally one sees in Australia . . . Year after year I have seen men of the greatest distinction in the life of this city serving actively—

and he might well have added that he had seen women of the greatest distinction serving actively, but this was written in the early 1960s—

> —in the university, maintaining what is needed for a university—an outlook by the university on the world, and an inlook by the world into the university. That was, for most of his audience, and probably still is for most Australian people, a novel way of measuring 'the true essence of what a university means.'

It may be a novel way, but it is a very appropriate way. This matter of an outlook by the university on the world and an inlook by the world into the university aptly describes what the two Vice-Chancellors and Professor Mills are trying to achieve. What is the use of a secondary school examination if its structure does not provide for minimum standards to be determined by the tertiary education authorities which have the job of educating our future doctors, lawyers, scientists, and teachers, the people who will shape and mould the intellectual life of the State and the nation and whose worth and talents will determine whether the nation is always striving to improve our lot or whether the nation is willing to sink into a sea of mediocrity?

In stressing these points, it is relevant to refer, as the member for Torrens referred, to the United States situation. My family has the privilege this year of hosting a student from the United States under the A.F.S. student exchange programme. That young boy has great intelligence. In his home State of Pennsylvania he has no difficulty in achieving high grades without really exerting any effort. It is interesting that his parents have written to us expressing their gratitude that he has the opportunity to be exposed to an education system which does have high standards. They have criticised the breadth and shallowness of the United States secondary education system.

I would hate the education system in this State to ever be subject to criticism of that kind. I fear that, if the points which the Vice-Chancellors and Professor Mills have made are not taken account of, this could occur. If it did occur it would be as much to the detriment of the boys and girls who will never go near a tertiary institution as it would to those who intend going on to tertiary studies.

There are four high schools in my electorate: Thorndon, Morialta, Campbelltown, and Norwood. Like the member for Mitcham, I deeply regret that the lack of time given to us to consider and debate this Bill has meant that the consultative process that I would normally undertake with those four high schools and with the staff of the Rostrevor and St Ignatius Colleges, which are also in my electorate, has not been able to occur. The Minister may say that there has been a week's break between the introduction of and debate on this Bill. During that week (and it was a short week) there was considerable activity in other areas, and I had all-day commitments, which had been arranged many weeks previously and which prevented me from undertaking the kind of consultation I would have wished.

As I speak I am thinking of the young people who attend those high schools and those two independent schools. I believe it is in their interests that the changes which the Opposition proposes to make to the Bill—the reasonable and reasoned changes—be accepted by the Minister. If that occurs it will be in the best interests of the education system and of the young people of today and of the future in South Australia.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): As a person who has been involved for some 13 years in the teaching of various subjects (or for something like 17 years, if one takes into account the training required to become an educator), I would like to make a few comments on the proposed legislation. One can go back in time and consider what our situation was in the not so distant past. Many or most of us here probably would remember the times when there was the Leaving Examination which had incorporated in it the Matriculation. For those who were able to or wished to go on to tertiary education, they were generally recommended to attempt Leaving Honours even if it was not—

Mr Mayes: You're showing your age now.

Mr MEIER: It shows my age, does it? A person did not have to pass all the subjects. That certainly gave some flexibility to students. They were allowed the chance of experiencing, to a limited extent, what university education would offer them.

In those days supplementary examinations were available for students who narrowly missed out in their examinations. Again, this equated somewhat with university expectation at that time, and those expectations have continued until today. There is no doubt that to a large extent the Leaving, and certainly the Leaving Honours Examinations were oriented to the so-called academically able students—those who wanted to go on to tertiary institutions and, in particular, to a university education.

With the passing of time we got to the ordinary Year 12 standard, which again was referred to as Matriculation. Prior to that, students were, for a time, almost drafted into various avenues. By that, I mean we had the '0-track', '1-track' and in many schools we had the '2-track' courses. The 0-track course was for the students who showed potential to go to university. The 1-track course was there for those who did not quite have it. The 2-track course seemed to be for (the words used were unfortunate) the 'no-hopers'—in academic terms anyway. It often surprised me that some of those so-called no-hopers finished up in private enterprise and I think many of them would be much wealthier than I am today. They certainly made a success of life if earning money is one aspect of living.

Unfortunately, that system which was operating in the 1970s brought great discrimination into schools. Students received comments from class mates. It was easy to identify a student's category and I saw many negative examples of what happened to students who had to go through this track system. It was probably a good thing that that disappeared during the 1970s.

Again, it was designed for the academic elite (if we want to use that term), and the less able students were not being catered for in the way that our academic elites were being catered for. I remember that when I first started teaching in the early 1970s I felt that the aim of schools was to encourage students to reach the entrance standard for uni-

versity; in other words, they should strive to get into university. When I look back I smile at how I tried to push some of the students in Year 8 or 9 level who obviously had no intention of going on in that direction and who probably were not capable of a university education, but it was encouraged and academic discipline was felt to be a positive thing.

Of course, the question as to who was academically able was assessed very much through an examination system that required a person to achieve a certain amount of work in a given period. Therefore, the so-called clever people were the ones that were able to think fast enough in perhaps an hour, or maybe three hours, with respect to certain questions. It undoubtedly disadvantaged the slower thinker and, as I would term the person, the deeper thinker—the person who was able to consider various factors, weigh them up and pass down a judgment but not necessarily within a split second or two. Perhaps we can think of one of the great leaders in our century, Winston Churchill, who was not suited to the education system in England at the time, was not able to adapt to the school system, and was not able to adapt to the examinations that were then current.

One could not say that Winston Churchill was not a clever man in his own right. Therefore, the system we have been used to until recently has obviously disadvantaged certain sections within the student body. Unfortunately, the Year 12 P.E.B. examination tended to become the standard in recent years and, undoubtedly, it was affected by the increased unemployment; employers were able to be more selective.

Therefore, we found that it was not only the tertiary institutions using the P.E.B. exam as their requirement for entrance but institutions such as banks, hospital authorities with respect to employing nurses, the Public Service and many business enterprises often looked to the P.E.B. exam as an indication of whether or not a person was capable of entering employment in their enterprise. Yet, that was never the way in which the P.E.B. exam was intended to be regarded. It was not meant for the everyday person: it was there for the person who wished to go on into the tertiary field. So, we found that students who were not able, in the real sense of the word, to achieve what was required of them in that 12-month period were entering into the P.E.B. exam or the P.E.B. year.

Some students decided to take two years to do the P.E.B. exam. They realised that they could not cram it all into one year. However, many students were insistent that they could achieve it in one year. What did this do to our school system? It put terrific strain on teachers, who were there to prepare students for university entrance. Those teachers should have been dealing with students who were capable of university work but they were dealing with students who were not capable, yet the teachers were expected to get them through.

Of course, the teachers had pressure coming from parents because the parents thought (or knew, I suppose) that, if their children wanted to get on, they had to have that P.E.B. certificate. Therefore, it was up to the teacher to see that the student was able to get through. There was pressure from the school councils, because schools' reputations were at stake and, in the competitive world we have today in the school situation, school principals were only too keen to see that their students' P.E.B. results were up with the top results.

Of course, in that sense it provided a strain on the school as well; other things were often put to one side to ensure that the students received maximum time so that they could be drummed sufficiently to pass a three-hour exam at the end. Admittedly, this was somewhat modified in the latter years as a result of 25 per cent of the school assessment being provided by the school during the year. Therefore, at least there was some chance for the students to show their ability in their particular academic areas during the year. Nevertheless, what was there originally for tertiary entrance had now become the recognised entrance exam to virtually any occupation a student wanted to go into.

Perhaps I had better clarify that. I appreciate that many of the trades are not looking at that so much, although I know of some exceptions there as well. Some of the trades certainly looked at the age factor perhaps more than any Matriculation factor. However, the general business community seems to still rely on the P.E.B.

As we heard earlier, some 16 of the 32 people on the current board come from the universities and the South Australian Institute of Teachers. If one looks at some of the syllabuses, it is not hard to see the orientation of those courses. One does not have to look only at the syllabuses but at the pass rates as well. I think that the subject of mathematics is usually held up as the one in which a pass rate of 20 or 30 per cent will probably see one through, unless it is an exceptional year and the pass rate is higher.

Of course, it has not been hard to see that a lot of that mathematics, therefore, has been oriented to the high standard. It has been there to see whether a person is capable of undertaking a certain minimum standard before he reaches the university. That has meant that, if a person wanted to go into a bank, nursing or many other occupations, it depended on whether he or she could achieve that minimum standard, which was not really there for the benefit of ordinary employers. The pressure of the old Centennial Hall exams was in a sense probably more unrealistic than latter examinations conducted within or close to schools. Maybe the Centennial Hall exams enabled students to opt out of the system more easily than if they were in their own school situations. Nevertheless, those exams were not real in the context of a student's future commitment or continuation.

We realise that there are examinations when one progresses through life, but these examinations usually encompass a known area rather than a vast range of areas leading a person to feel more like a number than a name. There are advantages and disadvantages in the system. Discipline is probably involved. Many argue that massive forms of examination were a good form of discipline. I do not know that I want to argue against that. Obviously, most things involve some discipline in a person, and testing of one sort or another is a discipline to some extent, too. A person could just as well argue today that a person attempting to do a crossword puzzle might be disciplining his mind to a greater or lesser extent. Anyway, the exams as they existed caused many headaches and heartaches for so many students, parents, principals, schools and school councils. Of course, many of the results became good headlines for newspapers, particularly country or local newspapers, showing which school was best in the area for that year.

This Bill appears to do away with many of the earlier anomalies. When we see how the board to be established varies from the earlier board, we note the wide range of community representation on it, so that it is no longer purely a university or tertiary-oriented authority: together with education personnel, there are representatives from the Chamber of Commerce, the Federation of Parents and Friends Associations, the Parents and Friends Association of the Independent Schools, the School Parents Club, the Independent Schools Board, the Association of State School Organisations, the Commission for Catholic Schools, and the Institute of Teachers.

Surely education is something that should prepare us for service or for our life in our community. Therefore, when we see representatives from a wide selection of the community, it would appear that we have a distribution that

can be only to the advantage of our education system. As I said, the board is a positive factor. Likewise, it would seem that the assessment of students allows considerable flexibility within certain reason. I refer to clause 15 *(b)*, referring to the functions of the board, as follows:

> to assess students submitting themselves for assessment in a subject studied, in accordance with a syllabus prepared or approved by the board by such means as the board thinks fit;

Therefore, there is no doubt that various subjects will be accommodated for in different ways. People who have been involved in art—particularly people involved in the subject of art, rather than the teaching of English—will not be as disadvantaged in the teaching of art as they have been in the past, where the practical side is so important. For a person to be adequately assessed, high emphasis on the practical side would be important.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Its about one-third now.

Mr MEIER: Certainly, as the member for Torrens says, that has been progressing during the years and now exceeds 25 per cent.

I question whether the appropriate standards will be maintained, but only the future can tell. We need standards to be retained for entrance to tertiary institutions, otherwise it could make not necessarily a mockery but it could lower the standards of our South Australian tertiary institutions.

It is important to keep our tertiary institution standards at the same level as those of other tertiary institutions throughout Australia. If a person with a degree seeks a job interstate, it can be most annoying if an employer says, 'You have your degree from such-and-such an institution, but it has a fairly low standard.' I hope that our standards will not be lowered in this respect. It is for that reason that I agree with the member for Torrens, who referred earlier to clause 17, which has been left out of the earlier Public Examinations Authority of South Australia October draft last year; it seems that there is no right any more for a tertiary institution to have an assessment of students for a particular subject or subjects.

It does concern me that we must maintain the appropriate standards if this is not a proviso. Certainly, the Minister has written in a sunset clause concerning 1986 and perhaps he sees that as a way of overcoming this problem if it has not worked in the meantime. However, it would be much safer to put in this clause or perhaps a slight variation of the old clause 17 to ensure that tertiary institutions have that right, particularly during the transition stage, so that there is not going to be any possible lowering of standards through this new Bill.

That brings me to the so-called sunset clause. Why should we have to review it at the end of 1986? Why should it automatically become obsolete at the end of 1986 when, as the member for Torrens has pointed out, the Bill will come to grips with this aspect in its entirety only at the beginning of 1986?

That should be looked at further in this Bill. I think I have covered most of the matters. In essence, the Bill seems to be a step forward. Hopefully, it will overcome many of the anomalies that I have seen arise over the past years. Hopefully, there will not be the discrimination against students that has occurred from time to time. I omitted to say earlier that certainly internal exams, such as for the alternative year 12 course (which has been designated under various headings), have shown considerable progress over the years. In fact, we are well aware that some people from the alternative year 12 course, although few in number, have been accepted into tertiary institutions. Once again, that indicates that some flexibility has applied, but that has not been the case on the part of universities, to the best of my knowledge. By having one board for year 12, we should be able to overcome these problems. I hope that the Minister will see some reason in relation to old clause 17 and in relation to terminating the Bill at the end of 1986.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I believe that much of the substance of what needs to be said in a direct and applicable sense in relation to this measure, certainly from the position from which I view it, has already been said most ably and eloquently by the four speakers who preceded me. I particularly refer honourable members who may have missed it, as well as anyone who happens to read *Hansard*, to the contribution in relation to this question by the member for Coles. It was a contribution of excellence. In fairness, I think that is what this measure should be about.

This Bill does not give sufficient time for adequate consultation between members of Parliament and the institutions in society that will be affected by this Bill. The member for Coles pointed out that fact in one of the directly applicable and relevant parts of her remarks in relation to the mechanisms of consultation that we hear the Labor Party talking about so much publicly but doing so little about in Government. The institutions affected are more wide ranging than the formal institutions that provide education in a formal sense to people seeking to qualify for higher education. That brings me into the area about which I wish to make my next comment.

Nothing in the state of nature is static. We live in a world that is dynamic; I use the word 'dynamic' in that context to mean a constant state of change. I know in these times that colloquially words come to mean something different to many people; some people see 'dynamic' as meaning fast moving and having a capacity for accommodating rapidly changing ideas. Some people see it as being an adjective to the descriptive noun of 'charisma'. I do not see it or use it in that context in this instance. Nature is dynamic, and society of itself is a part of the state of nature and, therefore, it is dynamic. In this constant state of change we need to know that there are certain things upon which we can rely to provide us with handrails on a stairway to the future. In terms of our ability to think and our ability to discern fact from opinion, in terms of our ability to discern the difference between logic and hearsay in thought, we need to be able to identify intellectual excellence and grade it—and we rely on that enormously.

It is a pity that the public did not perceive more politicians having a greater capacity for intellectual excellence. In making that remark, I do not excuse or exempt myself from the perception that the public has of us. Excellence is the goal—seldom achieved, always acknowledged. That has always been part of the nature of man. I guess that our species would not have survived to be the dominant species on earth today if that were not so. Most certainly, if we ignore it, that will be the consequence to us as a species in the future and, in the short run, the consequence to us as a society.

We, therefore, need to foster excellence, to seek it out and reward it in every way we can, because it is by that means that our very stability can be sustained and our prosperity sustained and improved, wherever that is possible. Nothing in the state of nature can be taken for granted; in fact, it is clear to philosophers at large that nature of itself will tend towards greatest entropy, greatest disorder, greatest disarrangement and disorganisation. It is in the nature of life, not only human life, to reorder things according to the needs of that life and the survival of it and the species to which it belongs, and we are no exception to that.

Recognising those points and their relevance to this debate is vital. We are making changes in keeping with the dynamic nature of society and education as a part of that society. Education is an essential part of that society to ensure its continuing survival. There is little point in kidding ourselves that it is possible to provide a place in a tertiary institution for everyone who aspires to go there. Tertiary institutions, by their very nature, are expensive organisms in society,

and they compete with other services provided by the formal structure of our society for scarce resources. We need to make choices between the options available to us as to where we allocate those resources. Therefore, any attempt to try to con the public into thinking that a new order of things in the Public Examinations Board will enable a greater number of South Australia's sons and daughters to become eligible for, and indeed join and participate in, tertiary education is dishonest in the extreme.

Any attempt to argue that there are benefits from this Bill that will do that in a rhetorical sense and in the public forum does no service whatever to the intellect of the person who takes up such an advocacy in argument. I have noticed over the past couple of decades, and more particularly in recent times, that there is, nonetheless, a tendency to try to con the public (politicians and educators alike of the mealy mouthed kind from the socialist left who are inclined to that kind of rhetoric pursue the line) to provide a tertiary education opportunity for your sons and your daughters, meaning, in the general context, that there ought to be more places and more opportunities. Maybe that is so in some respects, but for us to take it on board as an overall administrative approach to the kind of services with which those institutions provide society is ridiculous in the extreme and a waste of scarce resources within this society that could be better put to improving the common welfare not only of Australian citizens but the whole of humanity.

It is ridiculous to argue, assume or imply that these amendments will make it easier for more people to become tertiary students. That will never be desirable as a goal in itself; nor will it be possible, at least in the short term. Our productive capacity as a nation and as a species does not permit that. Therefore, we need to choose the people most capable of benefiting personally from the additional experience and training that they will obtain at the tertiary level and the people who will contribute most from the benefit of that training to the rest of us in society, and apply our scarce resources in that way.

As is well known, or should be well known to anyone who seriously regards the nature of civilisation, education is the process by which we approve awareness of fact and extend the capacity for thought, that is, rational and logical thought. By doing that, we remove from our society, culture and behaviour our reliance on ritual for our survival and our reliance on hearsay and dogma. If this Bill was passed in its present form and was maladministered (given that form), it may result in the watering down of those noble goals and ennobling goals which the education system in our civilisation has had, and that would be to the detriment of everyone, not only those who participate in such a system but also those who presumably will derive services from those who have participated in that system.

Specifically, I am disappointed that clause 17 has been removed. I am also cognisant (being closely associated with both Roseworthy College and the Adelaide University, as a member of its council) of the necessity for those institutions to be able to contribute with certainty to the range of subjects which are to be examined at Matriculation level, in terms of identifying which subjects are to be studied and then examined, and also to the appointment of examiners so that we can be sure of their competence to identify relevance in terms of subject matter. I note that members opposite are smiling, which indicates that they do not understand the context in which I used that word.

I am referring not only to the relevance of subject matter but also to the excellence in the capacity of the individual so examined to comprehend it and apply it. The Opposition's education spokesman, the member for Torrens, has already read into the *Hansard* record the letter dated 29 April received from the Flinders and Adelaide Universities and the Institute of Technology under the hand of the Acting Vice-Chancellor of the Flinders University, the Director of the South Australian Institute of Technology, and the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, Professor Stranks.

In that letter they recognise that this Bill involves an improvement (we recognise that) in that it includes institutions like Roseworthy which were not specifically included previously. It also recognises the deficiency in the Bill, namely, the removal of clause 17. I regret that the Government has done that. I do not understand its reasons for so doing. I do not believe that the explanation given to date is in any way adequate or cogent.

Furthermore, the letter on behalf of the institutions served by the signatories to it points out very properly that the institution should have the right to recommend persons to be appointed not only as members of a subject syllabus but also its Chairman. Emanating from those or any other tertiary institutions which have expressed opposition to the format of the Bill and to having clause 17 deleted from it, I do not perceive amongst their reasons any mischief aforethought, or any inclination to engage in subjective empire building.

I do not see these institutions as attempting to exercise disproportionate unnecessary power and control over the destinies of the individuals who may participate as students in their institutions and their lives. Their single most important concern has always been, and is now, to ensure that they continue to be relevant institutions, identifying and encouraging excellence and, therefore, an improvement in the common welfare of the whole of humanity with the most efficient utilisation of the scarce resources at their disposal for that purpose. It is therefore necessary, in my judgment, to reinsert that clause and provide, as has been suggested by our spokesman, a definition of 'tertiary institution' in the law. We need to have that. Without it we cannot be sure of exactly what will happen in the future in terms of the composition. Verbal assurances are not adequate: I have learnt that to my sorrow on more than one occasion.

Mr Mathwin: You cannot rely on them.

Mr LEWIS: Never. It is better to put it in writing.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It has to be enacted.

Mr LEWIS: I agree with the member for Torrens and welcome the ideas coming, although out of order, nonetheless from intelligent capable people, such as the members for Glenelg and Mount Gambier. Tertiary institutions must be able to nominate the subjects in which they wish to have assessment. I put it to the House that the board should be able to establish a committee to prepare the syllabus and that it ought not to be dictated to from outside; nor should the facilities or circumstances exist whereby it can be. In conclusion, I believe quite clearly (for the very good reasons outlined by the member for Torrens) that we should delete the sunset clause or at least extend the time.

Quite clearly, there is not sufficient time to test the relevance of the measure within the limits described by the present sunset clause in the Bill. If we as a Parliament cannot make these improvements to the Bill, we will be seen by the institutions in the first instance and ultimately by society at large to have failed in our responsibility to that society to ensure that we make the state of nature in which education is provided to those seeking it and capable of deriving benefits from it a less than adequate service. The contempt visited upon us as a Parliament for failing in our duty in that respect will be deserved.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I support this Bill through the second reading stage, although I will certainly support the amendments to be moved by the shadow Minister of Education (Hon. Michael Wilson), and I will com-

mend those amendments to members in due course when they come before the Committee.

I am pleased that this Bill is essentially that which was introduced into the House by the former Government late last year. I would remind the House of the history of this legislation and I express some regret that the present Bill has been delayed to the extent that its final implementation and, therefore, its presentation to the students of South Australia will be delayed by yet another year as a result of the almost frenzy of consultation that has taken place in the past few months to achieve very little.

What have we achieved? The Bill should have been brought in almost instantaneously with the accession to power of the present Government in November. I say that not because I had any substantial part in the presentation of the legislation. Indeed, I would much prefer to pass credit to the vast number of people who were involved over the preceding seven years, from the time when the Jones Committee of Inquiry was appointed. That committee ultimately brought down its report in 1978, and it was one of the first documents that was placed on my Ministerial desk in 1979. At that time the urgent need for some reform in the public examinations system at matriculation level was emphasised.

However, rather than be rushed into legislation which I was not convinced at that stage was absolutely necessary in the form proposed in the Jones Report, I asked a great number of people, including parent organisations, the Institute of Teachers, various tertiary institutions, the members of the Jones Committee, the chairman and members of the Public Examinations Board and a host of others to consult with me directly, and also with the later formed Ministry of Education. The Director (Mr Barry Grear) did some sterling work in meeting on a personal level and at length with those bodies to ensure that their wishes were not necessarily acceded to in all cases but were certainly listened to and were really essential in the final formulation of the legislation which appeared before the House.

The Bill that appeared in November was not the first draft. It was one of several drafts that were refined ultimately to the stage where the Bill was presented to the House. Therefore, I think it is unfortunate that, after all those people had come to a very close consensus, the Minister should have felt it necessary to indulge in further lengthy consultation to amend the Bill, probably in two counts and, thirdly, to change the name of the Bill, although that is a relatively insignificant change.

The main aims of the PEASA Bill (Public Examination Authority of South Australia Bill) were to establish a single authority to assess and accredit the year 12 examinations, whether they were conducted by the new board or by other authorities and recognised as appropriate to year 12 standard by the newly established board. The intention was also—and this is particularly important—to broaden the range of subjects currently available for public examination assessment and for accreditation. That was one of the main thrusts of the Jones Report, which pointed out that so many students would have gone on to years 11 and 12 had there been the choice of subjects available at public examination level. There was also the realisation that the internal examinations conducted by individual schools in South Australia and accredited by the Education Department were struggling to achieve a universal acceptance from both parents and employers, who tended to look at the former Intermediate, Leaving and Matriculation examinations as common yardsticks of assessment, rightly or wrongly. I will not enter into that matter, because that was what was done: that was the practice. We decided that it was appropriate to broaden the range of subjects on offer and to embrace within a common public examinations system those internal subjects currently offered by secondary schools at year 12.

Another very important aspect of the legislation was that it was intended to maintain standards of examinations in those subjects required by the tertiary authorities for admission to their tertiary courses. I make no apology at all for having included the presently contentious clause 17 in the legislation, because that was a recognition not only by the Minister but also I believe by the general public of South Australia that levelling should not be done at the expense of standards. Surely it is the right of tertiary institutions whose primary aim is excellence to establish those courses and the standards which they require for admission. I do not believe that it is appropriate in any way for us to introduce a year 12 examination which is a leveller and which tends to level more towards knee height than to make students aspire towards standards of excellence—and that is a danger.

The Australian Council for Education Standards over the past decade has constantly pointed out that problem, and people on both sides of politics have acknowledged that there are two major areas of neglect within contemporary education. One is the sociologically under-privileged person—the slow learner, the slow developer, the child who has a low tested I.Q., but who may be a slow developer and whose I.Q. will come up to or above the norm given reasonable encouragement in school. The other area of neglect, of course, is the gifted or precocious child who tends to be allowed to move along at his own pace, frequently becomes frustrated with the system, and does not achieve as well as he might.

Both ends of the spectrum are to be catered for in this public examinations system, and I would hate to think that by the Minister's making what I regard as some form of attack upon the tertiary institutions that latter group would be neglected, because that group is essential to the future well-being of Australia. It is a very important section of the community, which simply has to be fostered if the nation is to make the progress that it must make to compete in the modern world, particularly in the world of Western technology. We have to foster standards of excellence.

The tertiary education authorities, as I said, must have the right to nominate those subjects which they require as prerequisites for their courses. Contained within the amendments of the member for Torrens are conditions which do not give the tertiary institutions individual rights; there is a collective right to nominate but not to appoint examiners. They simply place the responsibility for that ultimate decision where it really belongs, and that is with the SSAB—the board itself. By removing clause 17, the Minister has tended to efface that extremely important sector of South Australia's educational community—the tertiary institutions. Should he succeed, there is every chance that the standards—

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Should the Minister succeed in having clause 17 expunged from the previous Public Examination Authority of South Australia Bill, there is every chance that the standards of examinations in those tertiary entrance subjects would be diluted; that is, the prerequisite subjects for tertiary admission would be diluted. There is also the distinct possibility that, if that were to happen, the tertiary education authorities themselves would reappraise the situation and sooner or later they would be forced to institute an examination of their own.

By doing that, they would defeat the purpose of the present legislation; that is, to unify the examination system under one banner. That is quite a distinct possibility, that the tertiary institutions would be forced into a corner and would have to institute some examination of their own, were the standards to be diluted. I do not think that anyone would want that—certainly, none of the people with whom

we have been conferring over the past three or four years. The tertiary institutions themselves would not want to be put to the considerable expense of setting up another examination, another examining authority, and having to conduct examinations and assess and accredit the students.

It would be a massive operation to mount. As the member for Torrens has intimated, he will be moving an amendment to the Bill. It will be a modified version of the previous clause 17 that was in the PEASA Bill, and I am sure that that modification will be one that is acceptable to the general public; to all those people with whom the present and previous Ministers have conferred in preparing the legislation; and it will certainly be acceptable to the tertiary education authorities themselves, which are quite willing to give way on a few critical points in order to retain some presence, some influence in this very important public examination.

Mr Mathwin: Will the Government accept it? That is the critical point.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member asks me whether the Government will accept it. That is the Minister's prerogative to decide. I hope that he will accept—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is Parliament's prerogative to decide.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I thank you for your correction, Mr Speaker, but I do not believe that any of us are sufficiently naive to believe that, if the Minister makes some sort of decision from his vantage point on the Government benches, the rest of his Party will not accede to his gentlemanly request and, since he has the numbers, there is every reason to suspect that what he feels is necessary will be the prevailing view of the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is guilty of overkill.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Be that as it may, if the Minister is willing to compromise, the amendment to be moved by the member for Torrens will be of inestimable value to the student population and to the population of South Australia generally for a long time to come. Such an amendment would certainly assist the Minister in another decision with which he will be faced; that is, a decision to remove the sunset clause that is contained in the present legislation. That sunset clause is absolute nonsense: it should be removed. Just imagine, we were to have had the PEASA Bill passed by the House in the last session of Parliament. At least the board would have been established by this time.

We would have been looking at implementation of the examining system by 1985. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, there has already been substantial delay which will set back that examination by one more year. The sunset clause contained in the present legislation dictates that the legislation will be under review at the most critical period of the board's relatively short existence—the very year in which it first implements the new public examination scheme. I ask whether it is fair for an examining body to be reviewed by a special committee with a view to terminating its existence when it has only had one season in which to convince people that its continuing existence is warranted. That is a most unfair clause to leave in this legislation.

Once again, the member for Torrens will move that that clause be removed from the legislation. That very wise motion will be moved in the Committee stages. It places the S.S.A. Board in the invidious position of being faced with extinction in its first year of operation—most unfair. I have never been convinced that the Matriculation Examination possessed all of the faults that have been laid at its doorstep over the past few years. It has been quite sorely criticised. As I have said, I have not been convinced, because I believe that the steady trend towards retention in secondary schools at years 11 and 12 has placed a greater emphasis on the Matriculation examination than it used to have when it was not an all-purpose examination. It was more a specific examination to accredit students for entrance to the various tertiary institutions in South Australia. The steady retention rate and the reluctance of employers to take on young people are two factors in a variety that have militated against youngsters getting work early. They have tended to stay on at school as a matter of natural course. Of course, the important, but I believe retrograde, decisions that were made quite some time ago during the last decade to abolish the Intermediate and Leaving examinations have certainly placed vast importance on the Matriculation examination.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Just listen.

Mr Ferguson: I don't want to see them again.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member interjects and says that he does not want to see them again. I do not mind the honourable member interjecting and putting his point of view.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do. Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: They spice up the evening, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: They may, but they are out of order.

Mr Mathwin: The member for Henley Beach was speaking to himself.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I point out to the House that two or three years ago I was discussing this very issue with Professor Jordan, who was one of the senior members of the Public Examinations Board.

In the presence of a number of senior educators in South Australia (whose names I will not mention) I put the question to him over luncheon in this House, in the Strangers Dining-room, about the educational reasons that had been in the minds of members of the Public Examination Board when those two examinations were abolished. The simple, straightforward and perfectly honest answer came out that educational reasons were not behind the abolition of those two examinations. He gave two reasons: first, the question of economy—the Intermediate and Leaving examinations plus the Matriculation examination were costing a large sum to mount and to mark each year. One can understand the economics, but the second reason was probably the more interesting: simply, that the Public Examination Board was finding it increasingly difficult, year by year, to convince teachers that for what they considered to be a relative pittance they should be spending Christmas holidays marking a large number of Intermediate and Leaving examination papers.

The reasons for the abolition of those two examinations were the wrong reasons. They were based not on sound educational concepts or precepts but on economical factors and the fact that not enough teachers were volunteering to mark the examination papers. Therefore, at the board's suggestion, those two examinations were scrapped. That placed a tremendous amount of pressure on the Matriculation examination because that examination, plus the internal secondary school certificate examination, became the yardsticks by which parents, students and employers judged the education system.

It is interesting to realise that educational grounds were not those before the Public Examinations Board when those examinations were scrapped. No sound educational reason was ever given for the abolition of those examinations. I do not think that the introduction of this examination, together with the quite massive reduction of influence of the tertiary sector, is for the good of the public examination. There is every chance that, as the Minister claims, it will

be levelling the examination and making more subjects available to more students. However, I do not think that levelling is necessary when levelling is about knee height. We should still leave room for aspiration, there is absolutely no reason at all why the tertiary authorities, which are of paramount importance to the future well-being of any nation in the world, should not be soundly recognised in this legislation and be allowed to present their point of view.

As I said earlier, and as the member for Torrens has pointed out, his amendment does not give the tertiary institutions authoritarian rights: it gives them the right collectively of nomination, but still places the ultimate decision in the hands of the S.S.A. Board. I sincerely hope that the Minister has listened to the sound reasons propounded by the member for Torrens, the shadow Minister of Education, and that he will see the light of sweet and gentle reason, accept the amendments and, therefore make the legislation a much more desirable and effective measure that certainly will not need any sunset clause to hold over it as a point of censure in 1986—a most unnecessary clause, which is almost an acceptance that something is radically wrong with the legislation. I submit that what is radically wrong is clause 17 from the PEASA Bill and its omission from the present legislation. I support the Bill throught the second reading stage and will watch the developments in Committee with great interest.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): Most of what needs to be said in this debate has already been said. I understand that the Opposition basically accepts this legislation, which is obviously a step forward. As stated in the Minister's second reading explanation, the influence of the tertiary education system in setting Matriculation examinations has for many years created a false standard.

I went to a boys technical school where one learnt basic skills. Many of those boys became managers, tradesmen and the people in industry and commerce today. They did not pass the Matriculation examination. These people have run this State, the economy, trades, and professions in many cases, for the past 20 years without having a Matriculation standard of education.

Since the inception of the Public Examinations Board standard of Matriculation it has been very substantially used by employers in whatever class of employment was involved. If one wanted to be an office boy one had to have Matriculation. A person had no hope of becoming a tradesman unless he had Matriculation. When I went to trade school I remember one lad in particular (although there were others) who had not even completed grade 7. However, he turned out to be a top tradesman; he applied himself to that trade course, and I think he topped a couple of the subjects that he had never previously come across. That is the case of a lad who, through application and desire, achieved what he wanted.

This also brings to mind the old system (which I think is still in existence today) relating to the School of Mines, now the Institute of Technology. Under that system people could continue from a basic education and, as their careers unrolled and their lives and careers developed, they then had a list of subjects from which to choose. Many people even now study adult Matriculation in order take further courses.

It seems to me that this false standard set in our community in regard to Matriculation standard is ready for change. That opinion has been supported by several reports, as referred to in the Minister's second reading explanation. It is surprising to hear the opposition from members opposite when generally people involved in education in the primary through to the high school area accept that this change is worth while and valid.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr PETERSON: Thank you, Sir, for your protection. Opposition members are saying that the legislation falls down badly.

Mr Baker: In one area.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, that is exactly what I am about to refer to.

Mr Mathwin: You're in the wrong area.

Mr PETERSON: It is surprising that people in the education area do not see this as a bad thing, but that members opposite do.

Mr Ashenden: Only because that excludes—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Todd will come to order.

Mr PETERSON: The educationalists to whom I have spoken do not see the position involving that tertiary institution influence as being unsatisfactory. If members read the legislation they will realise that it has not cut out the universities.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PETERSON: It has not cut out the universities, because there is still vast scope for including on the subcommittees those people with expertise.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I will ignore the interjections, as I must.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are completely out of order.

Mr PETERSON: I would say that it is a very high influence factor to have that number of tertiary institution representatives. I realise that tertiary institutions must protect the standard, that they must set a standard, and I do not deny them that right at all. That is their right, and I think it is a good thing that they do. However, the system as it exists at the moment disadvantages many students who do not intend to go to university. It puts a terrific strain on many children to achieve Matriculation just to get an ordinary job. I have heard other speakers talk of lowering standards, and there are several reasons for that. I will come back to that matter later. In regard to the overseas experience, one reads of situations such as that which exist in Japan where students are under so much pressure to achieve that it drives them to suicide. I am sure that that has occurred here.

Referring back to the standard that is required, I point out that children now must strain and strive and put themselves through this trauma. Many children are now very young when they study for the Matriculation. They are put under an enormous amount of strain for something that they do not need, because they will never go to university. They do not need it. I do not deny the universities their right to set a standard, but I do not think that they should set a standard for the entire community. They should not set the standard for Myer to take oin a storeman.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Todd is out of order.

Mr PETERSON: If the input to the board sets a false standard, it creates that standard in the community's mind. Also, the situation has occurred where we have a much more complex economy in society. The old rigid system of a set syllabus and set subjects in many cases is no longer valid. It is a complex work force out there, more complex than ever before. The needs, demands and requirements for young people going into the work force are much more complex. They should be educated to that rather than the rigid reading, writing and arithmetic type of education. That is what the board will do. The bringing in of the influence of other people should help to adjust that standard. I do

not see that the decrease in the number is particularly bad. I wonder whether this is one of those standard political exercises in the House where one side puts up a viewpoint and the other says 'No', or finds something wrong with it.

The standards set today for the vast majority of people are not valid. Perhaps one point made by the Opposition is valid—the definition of 'tertiary institution'. I can see that that needs definition rather than being left wide open. We will see what happens to that when it comes forward.

Generally, I believe the legislation is good. It will be to the benefit of our students and employers of this State. Rather than being ground through the system, gaining something they do not need, young people can now pick a path, studying the subjects they wish, and setting themselves up for a more broadly-based employment scene when they leave the education system. I will be supporting the legislation.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): In view of some of the comments made by the member for Semaphore, I think that, on behalf of the Opposition, I had better make our position quite clear, although I believe that the speeches of my colleagues should have done that. In case that is not the position, I make it quite clear to the member for Semaphore that Opposition members strongly support the aims of the Bill before the House. In fact, for the benefit of the member for Semaphore, I point out that this Bill is based almost entirely upon a Bill prepared by the previous Minister of Education, the member for Mount Gambier. Obviously, the Bill has strong support on this side of the House, apart from two areas which we as an Opposition believe can be improved in the present Bill, and which have been modified slightly from that prepared by the previous Minister of Education. It is also pleasing to note that, at last, somebody from the other side of the House (apart from the Minister) has spoken on the Bill. I can only assume from the fact that nobody else has spoken (and we have had speaker after speaker on this side of the House), that members of the Government are not interested in such an important aspect which is vital to the community, namely, education.

Mr Mathwin: I think the Minister has forbidden them to speak.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg will maintain the Standing Orders.

Mr ASHENDEN: That may be the case; the member for Glenelg could be quite right. It is either that or a complete lack of interest by the back-bench on the Government side in relation to this extremely important Bill. I would hope that some of those members will stand up and support the measure, for the sake of the many children who must reside in their various electorates.

There are very good reasons for having this Bill brought before the House. Again, members who have spoken on this side have raised many issues. There is no doubt that the present system is not only open to abuse but has been abused; it is not being used in the manner for which it was originally designed.

I take the points made, by interjection only, by some members opposite that the old system of Matriculation is not being used correctly by many employers. However, the point is that the employers, parents, children, teachers, and universities are looking for a scheme which will solve many, many problems that are in existence. There is no doubt that the Bill before us will achieve many of those aims.

However, there is a necessity for one area in particular to be amended, because there is no doubt that, at the moment, the tertiary institutions are not happy with the Bill before the House. The Minister has made much of consensus, as has his Party. If the Government really wants to achieve consensus, I believe that the amendment to be brought forward by the member for Torrens will provide a means of achieving virtually all the aims that the Minister wants to achieve, but at the same time not painting the tertiary institutions into a corner where they will be forced to take action of their own. Make no mistake about it: if the Bill goes through in its present form and does not allow for more consultation and input from the tertiary institutions, a very real risk is being run that a completely separate system of examination will be set up. That will be set up by the tertiary bodies themselves as a method of determining entry into their universities or colleges.

Mr Peterson: Is that bad?

Mr ASHENDEN: Yes, it is bad, and there are a number of reasons why it is bad. I am glad that the honourable member interjected as he did.

The SPEAKER: I am not glad that he did, and interjections will cease.

Mr ASHENDEN: Mr Speaker, in deference to your ruling, I have a point to raise, and I think that this is an opportune moment at which to bring it before the House. I believe that a further system of examination must be bad, for two reasons. First, it will cost a tremendous amount of money. If we are to have the universities preparing examinations, areas in which those examinations can be held, the marking of those examinations (in other words, a completely separate system running virtually in parallel with another examination system), it must cost money.

Mr Mayes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley will come to order.

Mr ASHENDEN: For the benefit of honourable members opposite, it may be only for 10 per cent. However, examinations still have to be set and areas in which those examinations can be conducted still have to be prepared. Examiners have to be present during the period of examinations, and there must be the marking of those papers. The examinations will have to cover a very broad spectrum, because some students will be wanting to come in for medicine, others for law, others for arts, and others for science. In other words, a whole series of examination papers must be prepared, and I have heard that it is estimated that in South Australia alone such a separate system of examination could cost about $1 000 000. That is an awful lot of money which can be much better spent in the actual education of persons rather than in testing their suitability for further education.

I do not know whether the honourable member who interjected has been in the United States, where he would have seen this type of system in operation. Virtually every university there conducts its own entrance examinations and, therefore, one has students from all over the country competing for places in various universities. That is resulting in some shocking situations in regard to persons who want to further their tertiary education. I do not want to see a system like that set up in Australia. What I want to see are the basic aims of this Bill. I agree with virtually everything in the Bill. All that we on this side ask the Government to agree to is some input from the universities to ensure that, when the board is making its decision, it has input through the various subject committees that would enable it to make considerations that would—

Mr Mayes: Have you spoken to the universities about it?

Mr ASHENDEN: The Opposition has, certainly.

Mr Mayes: But have you?

Mr ASHENDEN: The sheer ignorance of the member for Unley is being displayed perfectly here.

Mr Mayes: I have been part of it.

Mr ASHENDEN: All right. I have not spoken to the universities officially, although I have spoken with a very senior officer of the University of Adelaide. The shadow

Minister of Education has spoken in detail with the tertiary institutions. He is the shadow Minister; it is his job. I do not wish to usurp the job of the shadow Minister of Education, who has reported in detail both to shadow Cabinet, of which I am a member, and to the Party room, of which I am a member. We are fully aware of what the tertiary institutions want, and I have confirmed many of those points in private discussions with a very senior person at the University of Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: Therefore, I am speaking here with a considerable degree of knowledge of what they want. I cannot understand the nit-picking of Government members opposite. For goodness sake, one would think that I had stood up and said that we want to throw the whole Bill out. All we want to do is amend two sections of the Bill, one of which is not to put any additional university representation on the board, but is purely and simply an attempt to enable greater consultation and input from the tertiary institutions to the board. We are not asking to change the board or to put any more people on the board. All we are saying is: let all the tertiary institutions as a group have additional input to the board so that, hopefully, when the board makes its decisions as to what future curricula will be they can bear in mind what the universities and other tertiary institutions require and, in doing so, avoid any necessity for the tertiary institutions to set up a new examining authority of their own. That is all we are asking.

If the Government believes in consensus, surely it will look at an amendment which, it has been indicated, would be acceptable to the tertiary institutions. They would no longer feel that they were not having the input that they required and that it would then not be necessary for them to set up their own examinations authority. Surely to goodness, such an amendment is worthy of the Government's consideration.

Again, many times I will grant that when I have got up here I have spoken in strong opposition to what the Government is trying to do, but tonight I am stating, as other Opposition members have stated, that we are in agreement with the Bill that is before the House. But, we would like the Government to consider two small amendments, the first being the one on which I have now spoken for longer than I had intended that, if accepted, will remove the last vestige of confrontation that could exist in this Bill. In other words, it is an effort by the Opposition to have a Bill that will be acceptable to all areas of the interested education community.

At the moment, if Government members are honest, they will admit that one area is not completely happy with this Bill—only one! I agree that the parents' organisations like it, that the teacher organisations like it, and that one can go through the high school principals association, the primary schools principals association, etc.; it is a Bill that has the support of the community and the Opposition, except in one area, and surely, if members opposite really mean what they say in wanting to achieve consensus in this community, they will look closely at an Opposition amendment that will bring about consensus.

It does not in any way alter the major intent of the Bill that has been brought before the House by the Minister of Education. It does not alter the board. I think, perhaps, that members opposite may have misunderstood the amendment that has been brought forward by the shadow Minister of Education. Again, I have spoken with many concerned parents in my electorate, with teachers and students from high schools, and there is no doubt at all that there is virtual unanimity that a change must be made to the present Matriculation examination and the way in which it is being used. Having been involved very deeply before I became a member of Parliament in the employment area in a major employer company in South Australia, I am only too well aware of how managers look wrongly at the academic achievements of graduates from the high schools and their Matriculation results. There is no denying that. This Bill will go a long way towards solving that problem.

However, another reason why I believe that the input from the tertiary institutions would be a good thing is that the only area of discontent that I have been able to determine in my district comes predominantly from around one high school (certainly, I do not intend to name that high school), where the parents are most concerned, probably because of the socio-economic group involved, where the children come predominantly from professional-background families. These parents who have spoken to me are concerned because they want their children to go to university. The only concern that has been put to me by these parents is their worry that this could possibly be another area in which there could be a lessening of the criteria required for their children, who may not have to achieve so much and it might, therefore, affect their future education.

I hope that, as the Bill is accepted and as the aims of the Bill come into operation, those worries will be put aside and that those parents will see that, in fact, the Bill will achieve what they want to achieve for their children. However, I cannot ignore the fact that there is a section in my district that has expressed concern to me and asked whether this change will result in a lowering of academic standards and, therefore, putting their children at risk in relation to the tertiary education that they want for their children. If we can have the input from the tertiary institutions along the lines of the amendment of the member for Torrens, that will go a long way towards allaying the fears expressed to me by those parents.

Another aspect which should be considered is the point raised in relation to the fact that, as the Bill stands, it will lapse in December 1986. As I said, although the Bill was prepared by the previous Minister, the present Minister has had it in his hands for some time, and has consulted with various bodies and organisations, but the Bill has now come before the House later than the former Government expected.

I believe that it will mean that the new board will not be able to have its curricula recommendations ready for courses before 1986. In other words, with the present sunset clause, we will find the Bill lapsing in the same year in which it is first having an effect. I do not believe that this in any way, shape or form gives the Bill a fair chance to achieve the goals that it sets out to achieve. Therefore, I urge the Minister seriously to consider again agreeing to the amendment that will come from the Opposition to delete that sunset clause and, if the other amendment of the member for Torrens is accepted, I see no good reason why this Bill, without minor amendment, should not go on for many years to come.

I urge the Minister to consider seriously the Opposition's amendments. I hope that he will accept them in a spirit of compromise, because that is, after all, what we are trying to achieve. I believe that there is a very real risk that, if there is no compromise, tertiary institutions will believe that they have no choice but to institute an entrance examination of their own, something which I am sure the Minister would not want to see and which I do not want to see. Therefore, there is no doubt that, if the amendment can be accepted by the Government, it will do much to improve the Bill; it will remove an area of contention; it will achieve consensus; and it is a compromise well worthy of consideration.

The other point relates to the sunset legislation, to which I hope the Minister will give close consideration. Finally, I wish to ensure that the member for Semaphore and Gov-

ernment members are clear in their understanding, because I and other members of the Opposition wholeheartedly support virtually the entire Bill now before the House, with only those two improvements that we believe would make the Bill even better.

Mr MATHWIN: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Minister of Education): I listened with great interest to the points raised by members during debate this afternoon and this evening. Members opposite have repeated many of the points made. When I refer to the comments of individual members in relation to a number of areas I will reflect in a positive way on the comments of other members. I will go through some of the points that have been raised by honourable members in the debate before going on to some other general areas of discussion that have been canvassed in recent days. I will go through a listing of the various points made at this stage.

The member for Torrens, the shadow Minister of Education, raised a number of issues for consideration. First, he stated that the subjects that would be approved by the new authority would not be in place until 1986. There is slight confusion in the honourable member's mind in relation to this matter; I will set him right on this occasion and perhaps the rest will fall into place. The new authority, if approved by the Legislature (and I will not make the same presumption that was made earlier by the member for Mount Gambier), will allow for Public Examinations Board subjects, S.S.C. subjects in the Education Department, and a couple of others which we have identified but which were not identified in the previous Bill to carry on at least until the end of 1985. That does not presume that there will be no new course possibilities from the authority in its own right in that same period. It will still have an opportunity to introduce new subjects before the end of 1985.

Another matter that was raised by a number of members was one that I found quite staggering. I refer to comments about the excessive delay in bringing this matter before the House; on the other hand, there were comments about the lack of consultation and rather sarcastic and snide comments about the art of seeking a consensus. The two matters did not really go together very well. I will follow the matter of the delay through quite closely. I particularly draw the attention of the member for Mount Gambier to this question of delays. The honourable member succinctly took us through the history of the Jones Committee and the Keeves Committee and reminded us that it was one of the first reports that landed on his desk when he was Minister of Education in 1979 that raised this issue as one for public discussion and as a matter for concern.

Members may well remember that, as shadow Minister, on a number of occasions in 1981 and 1982, I asked when we would see some changes to legislation to put into effect the recommendations of a committee that was getting older year by year. Nothing much happened. Finally, in 1982, something did happen. A process of consultation was entered into by the previous Government, and I will comment further about that later. The sum total of the situation was that, just before the last election, a Bill was introduced into this House which was not the exact equivalent of a Bill that had been shown around for consideration by the education community.

It had at least one significant difference, and I think that we all know the number of that difference—clause 17. The election came in between. I hope that no honourable member opposite is suggesting that the election was the fault of the Party now in Government, or that the delays caused by the election process can be attributed to this Government, because that is a quite ludicrous suggestion. When I came to office as the new Minister of Education I was very concerned, understandably, that this issue needed to proceed as a matter of urgency. I asked officers of my department what stage we were at and whether we could proceed with the Bill, wanting to know from further examination about the comments that had been made on the Bill presented by the former Government.

It was revealed to me that a large number of serious concerns in the education community deserved further examination. Two possible courses of action remained open to the Government; one was to open up the whole issue for major rediscussion; the other was to take a much more modified approach and deal with particular areas of concern in the Bill. I chose the latter option, because I accepted the point that has been made on a number of occasions this evening, that it would be irresponsible to delay this matter much longer and to put off year by year opportunities for change for senior secondary students in the years ahead. Instead, I limited my attention to certain areas of the Bill as introduced and started on a process of consultation with the tertiary and secondary education sectors. I suggest that anything less than the period of time I have taken to do that could easily be regarded as inadequate.

Within the time constraints we gave the optimum amount of time available to us for consultation. The Bill was then introduced into this House. The sittings of the House and the time constraints involved have been well known for some time, so I reject any suggestion that there has been unnecessary delay on my part or on the part of the Government. It is not correct, as the shadow Minister has said, that it will now be impossible to introduce courses before 1986—that is not the case at all. It will be possible for the new authority, if approved by the legislature, to introduce courses before 1986.

The other point that should be made is that the former Minister, when he introduced his legislation, anticipated that the authority would be able to start work in March of this year. If this Parliament sees its way clear to pass this Bill, it will be through both Chambers this month, it can be proclaimed within a short time, and the authority can be operational in June this year, a three-month delay on what the former Government anticipated might be the case. However, we are being told tonight by members opposite that that three-month delay will result in a full 12-month lag effect in the outcome of the operations of the authority. That does not add up. A number of comments have been made about increasing the retention rate and I will come back to those in a moment when dealing with the comments made by the member for Mallee.

The shadow Minister of Education made some comments about there now being a majority of secondary teachers on the authority. That, of course, makes some presumptions about who the various bodies will appoint to the authority. I would prefer to think of the authority as consisting of educators, that those educators will come from a variety of areas, and that some of those educators will, in all probability (certainly, hopefully), have significant administrative expertise so that we can try to marry the educationalists and those with administrative abilities. I believe that it would not be the intention of anyone to overload such an authority with people who have no skills in administration, or those who have skills in administration only. The shadow Minister made an interesting point in commenting about the increase in membership of the authority. He commended us wholeheartedly on three out of the four members, but was a bit equivocal about the Equal Opportunities Commission—I suppose it was a consistent position to be equivocal about equal opportunities.

The honourable member certainly did support the first three. He then indicated that he was disappointed that we had gone from 25 to 29. If the honourable member accepted three of the four others whom we put on, whom does he propose we should cut off? The Government went through those members and made the assessment that one could not reasonably cut off those who had already been put on by the former Government by way of the previous legislation.

One issue has been put across innocently, perhaps, out of context in a number of forums recently when figures have been quoted about the university situation in regard to the present P.E.B. and the authority to cover it. The figure is very easily quoted that there is a reduction from 14 to four. Those figures are in fact correct. However, I would draw the attention of members to the fact that we are talking about tertiary education and its contribution and, in fact, the very clause (that is, clause 17) in the former Bill and the present amendment that we will be considering in Committee stages, deal not with the universities but with the tertiary education sector.

Let us look at the situation in regard to the tertiary education sector. One finds that in fact there are 11 tertiary education representatives on the new proposed authority, the implication being in the stated reduction from 14 to four is that tertiary education at large has lost a voice—that certainly is not the case.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I didn't say that.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The reason why I am raising that point now is that on the one hand people are arguing about the representation of universities, but they then say that to protect that representation we need this kind of clause. However, when one looks at the clause one finds that clearly it does not relate just to universities, but it relates to the tertiary education sector. Therefore, the figures that should be quoted in this House concern the reduction in regard to tertiary education representation at large: that is not 14 to four—there are still 11 members of the tertiary education sector on the proposed authority.

The shadow Minister indicated that he prefers the name PEASA to SSABSA. I suppose that this is a matter for personal opinion. PEASA is very close to TEASA, of course. SSABSA does of course pick up the fact that assessment is more than just examination. It includes examination as an important element, but it incorporates other areas. That was not necessarily so in regard to the name PEASA. However, with PEASA and TEASA around the place it might then have looked like the terrible twins. I think that SSABSA is quite a reasonable name. In fact, it is quite interesting that, in the process of consultation between the tertiary and secondary education sectors, SSABSA was unanimously approved by both sectors. They appreciated the implications of the name.

The shadow Minister made some comments that clause 17 of the former Bill (and now in his proposed amendment) was really not the horrible clause that the Government is suggesting it to be, that it really is a very nice little thing, and in fact allows only for recommendations to be made. That makes it sound all very sweet, but in fact I would draw members' attention (and I will be doing so during Committee stages at further length) to a further provision that is being proposed that puts an onus upon the proposed authority that it can only reject those recommendations if it has 'a substantial reason' for not accepting the recommendations. That suddenly takes out the rather sweet and light element of the recommendation and makes it what it actually is, namely, a direction to the authority to accept those nominations.

The shadow Minister also made the point about the fact that it is not only the universities that have taken objection to the Bill but that the Institute of Technology has also done so. I must acknowledge that we have all received a letter jointly signed by the two universities and by the Institute of Technology. I would say that this is not necessarily the same position as was the situation at the start of the consultation process. In a few moments I will raise with this House the other areas of opinion that have been advanced in regard to the legislation.

The member for Mitcham made a few points. He did not agree with his shadow Minister, who regretted the delays. The member for Mitcham was disappointed at the speedy entrance of the Bill. I have a great deal of difficulty trying to achieve consensus over the member for Todd when I cannot have members of the Opposition agreeing on what approach they want. He went on to make more serious points. One point concerned me greatly. He made the reference that some students are kept beyond their educational needs in the education system. That is a very grand statement for the member for Mitcham to make about other people in this society. I would suggest he would do well to consider the rights of other people in society in regard to educational opportunities. To suggest, in this forum, that somebody else has not the right to achieve what education that individual thinks is appropriate for them, is arrogance. I believe that the right to go on to educational opportunity should rest with the individual, and it is not for somebody else to say that one group does not have the right to achieve the education that they may think they need.

Mr Baker: I said that they were a captive of the system.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member's words were that some were kept beyond their educational needs. The other point made by the honourable member for Mitcham was on the size of the board. He also made comments about the danger that the board may promote protected or vested interests. That is always a difficult problem in regard to any authority. I accept that it is one that must test sorely Chairmen and executive officers of authorities. I was interested to note that the Flinders University (and I believe the member for Mitcham is aware of this) has had brought to its attention the findings of a hearing in the New South Wales Supreme Court which related to the duties of members of an authority, their rights and obligations in representing their nominating body and in performing as members of that authority. I wish to read some of the comments made by the presiding judge as follows:

> Each of the persons on such a board owes his membership to a particular interested group, but a member will be derelict in his duty if he uses his membership as a means to promote the particular interests of the group which chose him. The object of providing for interested groups to nominate the members of such a board as this might be said to be threefold.

Three reasons are outlined as follows:

> First, one can be confident that an interested group will select a man whose personal qualities and competence equip him for membership; second, it promotes the confidence of that particular group in the board, and provides a means of liaison between that group and the board; and third, it ensures that the board as a single entity, has available in its deliberations the views of all the interested groups.

It further states:

> A member must never lose sight of this governing consideration. His position as a board member is not to be used as a mere opportunity to serve the group which elected him. In accepting election by a group to membership of the board he accepts the burdens and obligations of serving the community through the board. This demands constant vigilance on his part to ensure that he does not in the smallest degree compromise or surrender the integrity and independence that he must bring to bear in board affairs.

That is an interesting situation which has been brought to the attention of the Flinders University Council. I would suggest that it is something which all members of all authorities and boards representing people should bear in mind.

I was a little amazed that the member for Mitcham (who is a member of the Flinders University Council) had not commented on that situation himself. Many imputations have been made about the operations of this new authority that may, if the Parliament wills it, come into place. These imputations are, in many cases, quite unreasonable. The member for Mitcham said that, if the board cannot come to grips with the fact that Australia needs excellence, it will surely fail. Where has there been anywhere the suggestion that it is not the intention of the authority, or anyone concerned with the senior secondary area, to be concerned with excellence? Much has been floating around tonight—trying to throw mud around hoping it will stick. There have been insinuations that a group of people are determined to undermine the quality of our education system. We have to act as a Parliament in good faith.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The member for Mitcham made the imputation about the board. The member for Coles was another one who had to start off with what was now getting to be a bit of an knee-jerk reaction. This time she condemned me for my dilatory behaviour and then decided that perhaps I was not really to blame, and that some *eminence grise* in the background was controlling everything, over which I had little power. However, that was just becoming standard at that stage. Then she went on to make an interesting comment on what she saw as the purpose of education. This raised the level of the debate somewhat as we canvassed some other areas about what we are really trying to achieve. I believe that the honourable member is quite correct in that teachers are no less today concerned with those four attributes to which she referred.

The member for Coles regretted the lack of time in having the Bill available to consult with her local high schools. I certainly commend local members who have made that effort to contact their local high schools to ascertain their views on this Bill. However, I point out that her colleague, the member for Mount Gambier, the then Minister of Education, after he had introduced the previous Bill in Parliament before the last State election, suddenly introduced into that Bill a clause, which had not been in the Bill at any stage, that high schools in the community were allowed to make their comment about the legislation. The draft Bill circulated amongst the education community did not contain clause 17. Therefore, I would have thought the very same comment might be made; in fact the situation this year has been that it has been well known in the education community that the Government has been considering the pros and cons of whether or not a clause like clause 17 or a modified version should or should not go in the legislation.

The member for Goyder correctly identified what is one of the basic problems with the present P.E.B.—that the P.E.B. has been asked to serve functions which it was never designed to serve and that organisations and institutions in society have been inappropriately using it as a measuring stick for assessment for things other than tertiary education when it was never intended for that in the first place.

The member for Goyder asked why we should have a review at the end of 1986 when we will only start coming to grips with the new authority in 1986. One of the purposes of the sunset clause (if one might call it that) for 1986 is to try to minimise, if there is any negative effect from the legislation, that negative effect. I do not believe that there will be that effect, but it is to minimise any that might take place. However, it is to allow the opportunity for the processes to be closely examined because, whatever may happen (some courses will be introduced in 1985, and certainly, it is true that the bulk of them will be in 1986), the whole education community and this Parliament will want to examine over 1984, 1985 and 1986, the process that the authority goes through in establishing the foundation for new courses, for planning those new courses, the make-up of its curriculum committees, the consultation process that it has those committees enter into with the various education groups and, in other words, how it gets to the final product, namely, a subject which will be one of the subjects assessed by the authority. That is the critical thing that we will need to look at.

By 1986, we will well and truly have an indication of how successful the authority is in that regard. It is upon that that I believe the universities' concerns rest. They doubt the capacity of the proposed authority to successfully handle that process without the intervening capacity of a clause like the one that is being moved as an amendment. So, it is not actually to wait and see what the first year results or the pass rates are from the exams or assessment applying to those subjects: rather, it is to find out how the planning process provided subjects that will be sat for in 1986.

The member for Mallee said some amazing things. He first made what I found again to be a very disappointing statement; he said that any attempt to con the public (and that was his word) that they might be eligible for tertiary education in greater numbers than they are now was dishonest. I draw to his attention the comments yesterday of Justice Kirby, who quite clearly outlined that Australia, in terms of international comparison, is on a bit of a downhill run in the educational race because participation in, amongst other things, tertiary education is way down in this country compared with many other countries in the world.

He linked it with an economic relationship, namely, the standard of living. The standard of living in Australia has dropped from about fourth, Mr Justice Kirby said, some 20 years ago to barely in the top 20 now. In his paper he presented reasons why the participation rate in tertiary education can be seen to have a link to that. So, on the one hand, there are sound economic reasons why we should be looking for further participation in the tertiary education sector—not less participation—but the member for Mallee went on further than that and started taking us into grounds almost verging on what right have some people to ask for a tertiary education, and he started talking about this as being the stuff that has been peddled 'from the socialist left'. At that stage, the level of the debate hit rather a sound low.

He then started talking about the fact that when more places were provided according to this demand it was a waste of scarce resources. That kind of educational attitude in the last century said that most people did not even have a right to secondary education because it was a waste of scarce resources. We, as a Parliament, have to balance, on the one hand, those rights people have to education—and it is not for us to determine when those rights do not exist—with, on the other hand, the resources that we have available, to maximise our offering to achieve those rights within the resources we have available. It is not for us to talk about a waste of scarce resources because somebody is choosing to further his educational opportunities.

The member for Mallee capped it off by making the statement that we need to choose people who will benefit most and apply our scarce resources in that way. That is a kind of attitude that I certainly hope will not reflect itself in the new authority, or in the way in which resources are allocated to secondary or tertiary education in this country.

The member for Mount Gambier also had some comments to make. He regretted the delay; he said that it should have been brought in instantaneously. He then, of course, started to talk his way around the fact that he had had the Jones Committee since 1979 and had not done much with it; in fact, he had been most uninstantaneous with it, but indicated

that that was an entirely different situation; that things are different when they are not the same. He then said quite an amazing thing that I will come back to later. He said that there was no need for further consultation in this whole process because he had done a lot of consultation and 'had come to a very close consensus'. I will just leave those words there and come back to them in a minute and show what a close consensus the member for Mount Gambier had reached.

He said that he made no apology for having included clause 17 and that failure to have a clause 17 would be a levelling thing that would be done at the expense of standards. What the member for Mount Gambier did not really address was why, when he first brought up the draft legislation, it had no clause 17 at all; it got it only very much later. What happened that the member for Mount Gambier suddenly found that he was wrong all along and that it should have been in there right from the start?

Another comment made by the member was that there have been a lot of attacks on tertiary institutions. It would be regrettable if there have been attacks on the credibility, the stand or role of tertiary institutions. Of course, they are vital for education in the community.

The point is well known by another member of the Opposition, who referred to it at another stage in the debate, that the role of the tertiary education institutions in the community is not just to the students who benefit directly but to the students who will never go near the place. I would just make the comment that, when we consider in a few moments the position of the secondary education community, members ought to realise that the comments that they have been making have resulted in nothing other than a very grave attack on the thinking processes of those involved in the secondary education sector.

The member for Mount Gambier also made the point that he did not accept criticism made about the Matriculation P.E.B. I can really only draw the member's attention to his own second reading explanation when he introduced the Bill last year and indicated that there were reservations about that very level. He finished off once again by saying that the omission of clause 17 was radically wrong; that is, he admitted that from his own standpoint his first proposition on PEASA was radically wrong. The member for Semaphore drew our attention to the area referred to by the member for Goyder as well; that is, that the P.E.B. has been falsely used, not just by the education community but also by the whole community, and that is what has been so urgent about the need for change. He commented on the attitude of the secondary sector. That is important.

The member for Todd started to interject at that stage, but really missed the boat. The situation is that it is acknowledged that the Opposition and the tertiary sector support the concept of the Bill, but we really are coming down in debate to whether or not we accept a clause, such as clause 17 in the former Bill. It is that clause to which the secondary education sector, and to which the member for Semaphore was referring, is so opposed. That was the comment there: that is where the division is taking place predominantly between the two education sectors. Of course, we had some more talk about consensus, and that all that we needed for consensus was for me to accept the Opposition's amendment.

I will come back to a bit more of that in a moment. If that is the kind of consensus envisaged. I would be happy to say that I was going to reject automatically all the viewpoints against clause 17 that have been put to me, and I will come to those in a few moments. The member for Todd also made the point of the cost for a separate examination system if it were run by the universities. I have said publicly that I would be very disappointed if the universities ran their own separate examination system. It would be most regrettable, because it would be a great disservice to the students who would then have to sit two lots of assessment procedures over a Christmas period.

The other point that I have made is that the universities, which at this stage are quite rightly identifying the factor that they are so short of financial resources that they cannot upgrade their equipment or put on staff in the areas of urgency (and these are issues that I have taken up on behalf of the universities with the Commonwealth Government), should then suggest that they would have available $1 000 000, as quoted by the member for Todd, to run a separate examination system against the comments of nearly everyone else in the education debate that their fears are groundless. The member for Todd said that he is fully aware of what the tertiary sector wants: he has done much consultation with the tertiary sector. I commend him for that, but how many members of the Opposition have consulted with people in the secondary sector?

Mr Ashenden: I did.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member made little mention of it. How many people contacted the Principals Association, the High Schools Staff Association or the parents organisations of the secondary area? I did not hear those organisations mentioned tonight. They were not mentioned because it was not suitable to do so. So that members in this Chamber, particularly members on this side who are interested in this matter, will not miss out on those thoughts, I will do service to the House by introducing those view points in a few moments. Then we had perhaps the most profitable contribution of any member on that side for some time when the member for Glenelg called for a quorum.

However, we must come back to the issue of clause 17. I think we have accepted the concept of the legislation, and we all seem to be agreed on that. We are all saying nice things about the concept of the legislation and how important it is. It is certainly very important indeed. However, let us concentrate on clause 17 and the sunset provision. A few moments ago I mentioned that I would come back to the fact that the member for Mount Gambier claimed that he had been very close to a consensus. I will refer to a few view points about the legislation introduced by the former Government.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable Minister that during his remarks in reply he has been referring to a certain clause. In actual fact, that clause is not in the Bill as such at this point in time, and I ask the Minister not to refer to it—he should wait until the Bill goes into Committee.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I accept your comment, Mr Deputy Speaker. I point out that this is a SSABSA Bill, which is different from the former Government's PEASA Bill. The Bill now before the House consciously omits one clause of the former Government's legislation. This House has the right to know why that provision has been omitted and argue its merits. Indeed, that has been done all afternoon. I believe I have the right to defend my decision to recommend to the Government that that clause not be carried on into my Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair recognises that the Minister can discuss the proposition, but he cannot deal with it.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. It will not happen all that often, but on this occasion I support the Minister. Clause 17 has become, in the education debate on this matter and within the education community, a synonym or a name for a specific action that was to have been taken by the former

Government. In fact, we are not discussing the Committee stage at the moment, although we are getting close to it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair does not uphold the point of order. The honourable Minister can refer to the principles, but he cannot debate the actual clause.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I will not refer to clause 17, which the shadow Minister will introduce in Committee. I will refer to the propositions put to me, as the newly incumbent Minister, about the previous legislation which assisted me in preparing the legislation now before the House. On 3 February, the South Australian High School Principals' Association commented about the former PEASA Bill in a letter, as follows:

> A close study has been made of the Bill presented to the South Australian Parliament by the then Minister of Education, Hon. H. Allison, and there is much disquiet by principals at some of the provisions.

I remind the House that we were advised that they had come very close to a consensus—that is how close it was. The letter continues:

> At our recent conference, two workshop sessions were conducted on the Bill, when 21 principals spent time studying in detail the proposed Bill.

They went away and did that, and then brought the Bill back to their conference for discussion by the delegates. A number of comments were made about the legislation. As to whether the tertiary education community should have the right to make recommendations and appointments, it said:

> There was very strong objection to this section, because it was so out of step with the rest of the Bill's spirit. The whole section should be deleted. It did not appear in the first draft distributed for comment. There were many queries about possible reasons for its inclusion.

That is one area that we have to count out of the close consensus. If one reads the Teachers Institute journal of 17 November last year one sees that it, too, makes comment about the appropriateness of having the tertiary education institution nominate or recommend people to be on committees. It states:

> The sting in this is not that the tertiary sector should have this right but that a similar right has not been extended to the secondary sector, or to any other sector. This leaves the control of curriculum for senior secondary education quite firmly where it has always been, in the hands of the tertiary sector.

That letter was signed by the Secondary Deputy Principals Association. There are other comments that I think should be made. Members would realise that the High School Principals Association again drew community attention to its concern about any attempt to reintroduce tertiary control, when it said it did not support that, and went on to say the fears expressed by the universities were, in fact, they believed groundless.

I will in Committee refer to an interesting matter regarding the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia, which serves a number of functions, one of which is to advise the Minister about areas in the tertiary education sphere. Consequently, I made good use of its services to advise me during this whole consultation process as we toyed around with what possibilities we could get to. The interesting thing is that they not only raised objections to the exclusion of some legislative right to the tertiary sector over and above the right of any other education sector, but also went on to say that it was entirely reasonable, suggesting two reasons why it was so reasonable. Those reasons were as follows:

> 1. Procedures for nominating subjects for entry to higher education institutions and examiners for those subjects are likely to be complex and could change, if only in minor ways, at regular intervals and are therefore best left to the authority to determine.
> 2. The instruction that tertiary institutions should take into account assessments in nominated subjects is, in practical terms, almost meaningless since the power to determine the basis of selection and the order of merit for selection rests with the individual institutions under their respective Acts.

Likewise, I will canvass this more in the Committee stages as we debate the amendment to be put, as I will also raise matters discussed by various educationists within the education community.

However, I return to the point that the entire education community, with the exception of three institutions, believes that the authority will be able without any such legislative inclusion to protect standards, and advance the educational needs of students and the community of this State. They also believe that to do otherwise leaves the very real danger that we will have nothing other than a replica of the present board with, despite all its genuine efforts and good work, the inherent weaknesses of that board. They are saying right across the breadth of the education community that those fears of the universities will not come to fruition. The universities, of course, are saying that they will. It therefore behoves me as Minister carefully to consider that dichotomy of views, and I have done so. It puts the burden on me to try to resolve those differences. I am now being attacked for that, but I tried to reach a solution that would address those two sides of the issue.

Finally, I came down to a solution, which has also been attacked, which I will come to in a moment. That solution rests upon this presumption, and says to the universities that most of the education sector does not share their concern, but that, should their fears prove correct against the weight of all the other evidence from all other sources when they are unlikely to do so, then we will give them an opportunity to pick those up.

It will not be just an opportunity, but we will make it mandatory on the Parliament of the day to examine whether or not those fears have come to light, whether or not those fears have been correct or not, providing that the Bill not only has the opportunity of being reopened at the end of a certain period, but also indeed, if it is passed in its present form, it must be reopened, because if it is not, it lapses. We can then examine whether those fears have eventuated. It is a way of indicating to the parties involved that the majority of the education community does not agree with them, but that they should be given a go, even if they are making a presumption that the parties do not share, and with whom most are out of step. We are saying, 'Give this Bill a go, let's give the authority a go on the basis that most people believe that it will work, and then if, against the odds, it does not work, we will guarantee that it will be re-examined.'

I believe that that will make particularly irresponsible any decision to establish an alternative examination system during the interim period. If a tertiary institution was not prepared to try to let the system work until the end of 1986, they would be wasting their own resources, which ultimately become the community's resources, as these institutions are funded by the community at one level or the other.

Finally, the member for Mitcham raised the question of employer representation, or the employer and parent viewpoint. Of course, any suggestion that the tertiary sector should have an input to curriculum committees does not contain within it in the legislative sense that so should the employer, employee or parent groups. Those rights do not seem to exist there; it is given only to the tertiary sector. The other point is that parent organisations are very well represented on the proposed authority. Of course, the employer and employee groups are also well represented on the authority. In addition, employer groups and parent groups have been represented on the advisory curriculum board that has existed in the past, and that representation will

continue in the future. Their viewpoints are well in step with those that I have been sharing with members tonight.

In fact, the final point on which I want to close is that the tertiary institutions will find that they will have *de facto* significant involvement in those subjects that are of direct relevance to their own entrance requirements. They will always nominate the subjects that they want. There is no suggestion that they should not have that right. I am absolutely certain, as would be every member who looks through the proposed membership of the authority, that that body will act responsibly and soundly and that it will incorporate the appropriate community viewpoints where those viewpoints ought to be taken note of.

In the case of subjects for university entrance, naturally, tertiary institutions will be involved. To suggest that the authority will not do that is automatically to make reflections upon all those organisations that are proposed to be on the membership of the authority. I know that the Opposition will be supporting the Bill to the second reading stage. We will debate its amendments again, and I will bring up more points about those matters, well and truly accepting your ruling, Sir, not wishing to transgress.

I ask Opposition members seriously to consider what they are trying to do. Are members opposite trying to present to the community a replica of the legislation that we now have in place with the same inherent problems of status subjects, and non-status subjects with the same inherent problems of some young people of the relevant age group feeling that education has nothing for them and, that therefore, in a reflection of our lower retention rates compared to those of other countries, they leave school. It is all very well and good to talk about the fact that our retention rate is up this year; 43 per cent or 44 per cent is fine, but it is still a long way behind other countries, and, at the rate at which we are increasing that rate, it will take us until 1995 to get to the stage where other countries like Japan are now (if we are able to maintain and increase in retention rates). I ask Opposition members seriously to consider that matter, because this Bill, as the shadow Minister said, is a vitally important piece of legislation: it is one of the most important pieces of education legislation to come before this Parliament in many years.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Mr Chairman, will you allow us to debate the substantive matter (which is the matter in the next amendment) in regard to the amendment to this clause? This amendment is consequential upon the successful insertion of the new clause on page 6. In other words, I am suggesting that we debate the substantive matter now and take this clause as a test clause. If this amendment is defeated, I will then not put the next provision.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Torrens has two or three amendments on file. I point out to him that his first amendment to clause 4 is in regard to interpretation only.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The next amendment deals with the introduction into the Bill of new clause 17a, in which tertiary institutions are referred to. Clause 4 gives the definition of 'tertiary institution' which is referred to in the next amendment. If you, Mr Chairman, do not allow me to debate the substantive matter now, namely, the introduction of new clause 17a, we are going to talk about definitions. If the Government intends to defeat the next amendment, it will defeat this provision, and there will be no point in continuing on with the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognises the point made by the member for Torrens. I take it that he will move the first amendment. The Chair will allow the honourable member to deal also with the new clause.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I appreciate your ruling, Mr Chairman, and I thank the Committee. I move:

Page 1—After line 32 insert the following lines:

'tertiary institution' means—

(a) the University of Adelaide;

(b) the Flinders University of South Australia;

(c) the South Australian College of Advanced Education;

(d) the South Australian Institute of Technology;

(e) the Roseworthy Agriculture College;

(f) the Department of Technical and Further Education; and

(g) an institution declared by proclamation to be a tertiary institution for the purposes of this Act.

(2) The Governor may, by proclamation published in the *Gazette*

(a) declare an institution to be a tertiary institution for the purposes of this Act; and

(b) vary or revoke a declaration made under this subsection.

This clause deals with definitions and gives the definition of tertiary institutions which are in place in South Australia today. That is all I intend to say on that matter, because it is consequential on the most important matter with which we will be dealing tonight, namely, the introduction of new clause 17a into the Bill. That new clause gives tertiary institutions collectively the right to nominate to the new Senior Secondary Assessment Board either subjects or persons who will become examiners and, in so doing, it will allow the board to make the final decision.

The Minister has already spoken at some length on this matter, which was canvassed in the second reading stage. The Minister says that, because of the wording of new clause 17a that 'the board shall appoint those persons accordingly unless there is, in the opinion of the board, a substantial reason for not doing so', the board will be forced to accede to the requests of the tertiary institutions.

I am saying to the Minister that that is not so. Certainly, it means that it will have good reason, and the Minister knows that it would have to have good reason, to refuse a request of the tertiary institutions. Let me canvass the matter in more detail. However, I wanted to make that point first.

I want to make quite plain that I believe that the board will act responsibly whether or not this clause is inserted in the Bill. However, there is no guarantee that it will do that. As is always the case in this Parliament, we all know the intent in regard to certain pieces of legislation and certain clauses. If we know the people who will be appointed to these various bodies, we know in ourselves that they will act responsibly and we have respect for the organisations, especially for these organisations which have the right to nominate to the Secondary Assessment Board. We know that they will be responsible people. However, as always in this Parliament (and I have never yet seen this Parliament accept it on face value, because we are here as legislators) we are trying by the introduction of this clause to say to the Secondary Assessment Board, 'We respect you. You have an enormously difficult job. We are not saying that any single tertiary body will be able to nominate an examiner or a subject that it requires for entrance: we are saying that the tertiary institutions collectively, in other words, with the approval of all the tertiary institutions, will nominate. You must certainly have good reason to refuse. You will have the final decision.'

That is not unreasonable. It is far more reasonable, if one takes the Minister's attitude, than the original clause 17 contained in the November Bill. It is a compromise that the tertiary institutions are prepared to accept, even though some of them thought that it reduced their influence. Nevertheless, for the sake of compromise, they are prepared to accept that. The other thing I want to say to the Minister is that it is not a matter of status subjects. We will not be

returning to the present system of status subjects and non-status subjects by the introduction of this clause. The decisions on curricula, syllabuses, and examiners will be made by the new board where the influence of the universities (just so that the Minister does not misunderstand me again) has been reduced from 14 to four. The Minister knows that it is the universities and not the other tertiary institutions that are the focus or kernel of this debate. He knows that it is not the South Australian College of Advanced Education, the Institute of Technology, Roseworthy Agricultural College, the Department of Technical and Further Education but the universities, and even more so the University of Adelaide, that are the kernel of this debate. The representation of the universities has been reduced from 14 to four. So, let us hear no more from the Minister in his trying to obscure the fact by saying that there will be a representation of 11 from tertiary institutions.

However, those tertiary institutions that I mentioned may not always agree with the two universities, as the Minister knows. He has spoken to them, as have I, and I hope that he was not including me in his condemnation of members when he said that members had not consulted with education institutions on this matter.

He knows that those tertiary institutions that I mentioned do not always agree with the two universities, and I am telling the Minister that I have consulted all of those tertiary institutions except the Department of Technical and Further Education (because I thought that, as that came directly under the control of the Minister, it would be improper for me to do so, but that is another matter). They all agree that this is the best compromise achievable, and I think that Professor Mills would not mind me saying to this House what he said to me today when I spoke to him again on the matter. He said, 'It is far better than having no clause 17 and much better than having the original clause 17.' They are the words of Professor Eric Mills, who is none other than the present Chairman of the Public Examinations Board.

So, I am saying to the Minister that this is a compromise that will certainly cause some disappointment in the secondary sector—no-one is pretending that it will not—but it will not cause the divisiveness in the education sector that the omission of the original clause 17 will because, by omitting the original clause 17, one is asking for a confrontation between the tertiary and secondary sectors in education. I deplore divisiveness; I always have. I am not saying that the divisiveness will continue indefinitely because, if the board behaves as we expect it to, maybe the universities will be satisfied—but it is only 'maybe'; it is not in the legislation.

Certainly, the secondary sector is opposed in general to a clause 17. I am not sure that all the secondary sector is as strong in opposition as the Minister may like to put it, and I am not sure that all the secondary sector is aware of the modified form of the original clause 17 that we have before us tonight. Certainly, I have not had a chance to consult with them this afternoon on that matter, but I can assure the Minister that I have consulted with many areas in the secondary sector, nevertheless, on the Bill.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Can you name them for us?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I will be very happy to name them. I have written to the Primary Principals Association, the Secondary Principals Association, the Catholic Education Office, the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the South Australian Organisation of State School Organisations and the Independent Schools Board.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Have you got their responses? I would like to hear them.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am just going to tell the Minister that the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the Secondary Principals Association have not yet replied, which surprises me. I have the responses of the others: some are lukewarm in opposition to clause 17 and some are strong in opposition to clause 17.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I am sure we would like to hear the comments.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Nevertheless, I assure the Minister that what I am saying is true. I am not sure that I have them all here, but I would be very pleased to show them to him later. The situation is that I have never said that the secondary sector of education was not opposed to the introduction of a clause 17; it is generally, but some are more lukewarm than others.

All I can do is reiterate the importance of this amendment. The amendment will achieve a consensus, and I do not necessarily use that term as the Minister tried to use it a short time ago. It will not force some tertiary institutions into a corner. I emphasise that, under section 22 of the University of Adelaide Act, to give a case in point, the university has power to set its own examinations. The universities can make regulations, by-laws or Statutes to do so.

It would be only in the most extreme circumstances that they would do so, but I am not willing to take the risk. Perhaps the Minister is, but I am not willing to take the risk of that enormously divisive action by a university. The Minister said that such action is or would be deplorable: I say that it would be disastrous if that happened, if we had a year 12 assessment where what we want is all students being assessed under the same criteria and then we found that one section of the tertiary education field intended to run separate examinations. I am horrified at the effect that that would have on the great and important purposes of this legislation. Therefore, I ask the Minister to re-examine his attitude and accept the Opposition's amendment for what it is: a genuine attempt to try and prevent divisions in the education community, to prevent one sector being set against another.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I appreciate the call of the shadow Minister not to have divisiveness. I would have thought that the most appropriate way that the shadow Minister or the Opposition could try to reduce any potential divisiveness is to communicate to those who are expressing grave fears about the absence of a clause 17 that, in fact, those fears are not justified.

The shadow Minister related to the Committee his confidence in the proposed authority as it will be established; he reflected his confidence in the basic sound common sense that will apply; he has expressed his awareness of the feelings of the secondary education sector, and the best that he can tell us is that the opposition to clause 17 is still opposition, but that it runs from lukewarm to strong.

In fact, I have to concur: it does run from lukewarm to strong, but it is still opposition. I have addressed groups in the secondary sector, both Government and non-government-schools right across the spectrum of schools in the Government and non-government sector; indeed, the shadow Minister was present at one function where I addressed a meeting of parents federations of the non-government sector. He knows that, lukewarm as it may have been, comment was still made against the essence of clause 17.

I appreciate the comments are not here now, but I am sure that what I am saying is not contrary to the evidence of the documentation that the shadow Minister would have received.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I know that. Indeed, I arranged to have circulated to all those groups the Bill that I have introduced. My point is that we have the entire group across the Government and non-government sectors in the secondary arena who are saying that they have an

opposition to putting in a clause 17. We have this big group and another group who are expressing fears and, when analysed, those fears do not hold up.

We have a shadow Minister who is not prepared to try and talk universities through their fears to assure them that their fears are unreasonable and that we should give the system a go. If we want an approach that attempts to make the system work, we should encourage an attitude that tries to make the system work. I am concerned about one point in particular. The shadow Minister referred to universities as the kernel of the debate. If they are the kernel of the debate, why has he couched his new clause in terms of tertiary institutions? His attitude almost becomes euphemistic.

The university sector comprises more than just tertiary institutions. I would like the shadow Minister to tell us why the firm viewpoint of the secondary education sector, including the not-so-firm viewpoints of some (but who still oppose the move), do not stand up. I thought he might have given us this information in his introductory comments. I would like the shadow Minister to tell us why the views of some of the other areas do not stand up.

I remind the House again of the comments I made earlier, which were provided to me by the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia, as follows:

> The deletion of clause 17 of the revised Bill appears reasonable on several grounds.

I have already listed those grounds. The shadow Minister is saying that, as regards the authority, which is there to advise the Minister of Education on, among other things, tertiary education and which has deemed it reasonable that clause 17 should be deleted, its evidence does not count, but we have not been given a reason why it does not count. The South Australian High School Principals Association stated in a letter that it had a strong objection to clause 17 because it is so out of step with the rest of the Bill and that it should be deleted. That is a very strong objection, and surely that is potentially divisive, but the shadow Minister has not said why that viewpoint apparently does not count.

I also draw the attention of the House to a report of a curriculum directorate working party which examined the former PEASA legislation. I remind members that the various curriculum committees within the education system contain wide representation of people from various sectors. This working party closely analysed all the clauses of the PEASA Bill introduced by the former Minister. I am prepared to read out its full summary if the shadow Minister wishes, but I think the crux of the matter is summed up in recommendation No. 1, as follows:

> It is recommended that clause 17 be removed from the PEASA Bill.

I am prepared to go through the reasons why the working party argued for that, if the shadow Minister wishes. Why should not the report by a group such as that working party be counted as significant in this Chamber? The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity examined the various proposals in this legislation, and I refer to her comments on clause 17 of the previous Bill, as follows:

> This relates to the nomination of subjects by tertiary institutions for selections of students for enrolment. This clause must not be reintroduced in the Bill if the needs of all senior secondary students are to be accommodated. The maintenance of clause 17 focuses on a smaller group of students who wish to continue with tertiary education by giving special powers to the tertiary institutions and requiring the authority to act accordingly. A large group of students will be disadvantaged by this clause which has the potential to create 'first-class subjects' (those initiated by the tertiary institutions) and 'second-class subjects' . . .

Why should not the House accept that information? The shadow Minister also said that I am being quite unreasonable to lay any emphasis upon the words 'a substantial reason' for not doing so. If they are inconsequential words, why are they there?

The Hon. Michael Wilson: You keep twisting my words. I did not say that they were inconsequential.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I put the proposition that that does not leave it as a simple situation of recommending to the authority. It gives that recommendation considerable clout. The shadow Minister is attempting to suggest that I have over-read those words, that I have assumed that they contain much more weight than my statement implies. Clause 17 was contentious: it was not contained in the original Bill provided by the former Minister and considered by the education community; it came in very late without much warning to the education sector, and it has now come out again.

I will summarise some of the reasons why the old clause 17, now clause 17a, is not supported. First, it preserves within the structure of the new authority undesirable features of the old P.E.B. without any reflection upon the goodwill of that board, I think that we all acknowledge that it did not adequately handle the situation, because of expectations in the community and not the capacity of the board itself. Nevertheless, that was the reality. It diminishes the control the authority has over its own affairs. It constrains the operation of the board and could render it unworkable. It is unnecessary, because the tertiary sector already has the means to influence subject choice in schools and methods of assessment. That is clearly already included in the legislation in the operations of the authority.

It will legitimate a hierarchy of subjects. It will give to one group privileges which other groups will soon demand. We recognise that a small percentage of students go on from senior secondary to tertiary education. Many do not; they go on to employment. We could have the very real prospect that those groups will say that they have rights to have similar controls. Likewise, those who go on to other forms of training may say that they should have rights to similar controlling capacity.

The provisions of the Bill without clause 17 are sufficient to ensure that academic standards are maintained. I am reassured to hear the shadow Minister acknowledge that in his comments just now—that, indeed, the standards will be maintained, given the composition of the authority; it is not a wild, woolly, anarchic group but one that will be a sound responsible educational body. The new board should have the trust and confidence of those who will use its assessment. It will not be suspected of being unable to carry out its functions before it has even begun. That is an important point. If we are making the assessment in this Parliament that we doubt so soon the capacity of the authority to act wisely that we have to put in a policeman clause, so much else of its effectiveness will be undermined.

Mr BAKER: Having listened to the Minister, I am assured of two things: first, that whatever I say will be taken out of context as he has done four times tonight already; and, secondly, that he has a closed mind to this amendment. The Minister's response to the initiatives as we have explained them has been less than positive. I draw his attention to the Jones Report, on which this Bill is based and on much of which this amendment hangs. Subclause 6, on page 22 of the report, states:

> A subject committee shall be chaired by a person elected by the committee. For any subject included in the Matriculation statutes of the universities, the board shall appoint a Chief Examiner who shall be a member of the academic staff of one of the universities or a person approved by them.

Under 'Duties of the Board' (1.34), the first duty is seen as being to conduct the year 12 examination annually, and its third duty is to provide the results to the South Australian Tertiary Administration Centre. They are seen as prime

functions of the board. At page 24 of the report, clause 1.36 (1) states:

> The early appointment of a Chairman is considered essential, or acting Chairman if protocol demands it. If so appointed, this Chairman, together with the existing Chairman of the Public Examinations Board, would advise the Minister of Education when the new board should commence operation and the existing Public Examinations Board cease to exist.

That relates to the timing of the matter under consideration. At page 57 of the report clause 4.3 refers to data concerning trends in numbers of students remaining in secondary schools after year 12, which is provided later. The report states:

> It may be noted that about 12 per cent of the age group, 17 to 22 years have usually enrolled in C.A.Es. and universities in the 1970s. However, during that same period about 40 per cent of students enrolled in year 12 have proceed to C.A.Es. and universities.

That is the import of the report, namely, that 40 per cent of year 12 students have proceeded to C.A.Es. and to universities: that is a far cry from 12 per cent. At page 64 of the report, again some figures are given at 5.4 which relate to the breakdown of the composition of those people going to year 12 assessments. At the time that the report was compiled 41.9 per cent of students went immediately to full-time tertiary study. I am sure that the Minister is aware of these figures. On page 69 at 5.11 the report states:

> However, the committee firmly believes that the university scholars in the various academic disciplines should continue to play a significant part in the public examinations and curriculum development, not only in their role of guardians of intellectual standards and integrity in the community, but also in the helpful role, of using their role to assist secondary teachers in their work.

That matter was pointed out in the report. At page 71 at item 5.16 the report states:

> The committee was left in no doubt that the Matriculation examination has an effect on the students' choice of subjects at levels below year 12.

So, we are talking about a complete change of the system or the potential for change in the system. We are referring to the importance of the system. At page 76, at item 5.29, there was an expression of disappointment with the employers. I am also dissappointed with the employers, but it is a fact of life. It is stated at 5.29 that:

> The committee was disappointed to find evidence that because of the expressed belief of employers that external examinations gave a more independent and objective measure of students' competence than internal examination, the primary criteria for job selection was often the Matriculation examination, irrespective of the skills actually needed to do the job satisfactorily.

We are all aware of some of the deficiencies in regard to what has happened in the past. We are also aware of community values and the number of assessments that has taken place in the past. I am sure that the Minister sees this Bill as overcoming those problems, but what the Minister does not want to accept is that these perceptions do exist. Any perceived breakdown in standards could cause problems not only in the acceptance by universities and tertiary institutions of the standards, but also of the employer groups.

The Minister failed to say what response had come from the employer groups. He failed to outline what response he had received from universities. It was left to Opposition members, in fact, to express the opinions of those parties. The Minister talked about Justice Kirby, and I referred to the Federal Minister for Science and Technology (Barry Jones). Both of those people are expressing the same opinion. The Minister's argument has included quotations of a number of sections given to us by the primary principals, etc. He has talked about the undesirable features of the P.E.B. That has been accepted by the Opposition. We have no complaint about the Bill's endeavouring to achieve change in the secondary assessment system. Properly constituted, and with the right will, it will achieve those things. The Opposition is talking about a recognition of a certain sector which becomes very important.

I was interested to hear the comment that there was a potential for creating first-class subjects and second-class subjects. Surely any intelligent person realises that, if the universities require a standard (and I am assured by the Minister that universities will have standards), they will be, and always have been, first-class or second-class subjects in the minds of some people. That will not alter. The Minister puts this rubbish in front of us and says, 'Look, we are creating divisiveness—first class and second class subjects'. If we know that certain standards are required then many of the groups in the community plus the institutions themselves will want those standards. If the Minister is saying that we are not going to have any standards, then we are lost before we start.

He talked about the diminished control of the body over its own future. That was another excerpt. It does not diminish control. There are a number of core areas which the universities and tertiary institutions find important for their own wellbeing. I have had a look through all the curricula used in Intermediate, Leaving and Matriculation areas and there are a vast number of subjects of no relevance at all to the tertiary education institutions. I am sure that that list will expand, and so it should.

No-one on this side of the House wants the Senior Secondary Assessment Board dominated by the academic needs of the institutions. We have already recognised that, and supported the principle of the Bill. One of the interesting things about the Minister's discussions was that there are unreasonable fears on behalf of the universities. On the other hand, he has just quoted some unreasonable fears from some of the organisations which responded. The Minister says that they are not unreasonable on behalf of the primary principals and other people—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The primary principals have never contacted me.

Mr BAKER: The secondary principals, I understand. He has talked about the unreasonable fears of the universities. By the same token, he must also talk about the unreasonable fears of the other organisations which are opposed to clause 17. He cannot have it both ways. We are talking about a legitimate hierarchy. In any school situation a hierarchy of development exists in every sphere. There is a gradation. That argument is not relevant.

The most compelling argument for me is that, if one is a consumer of a product (we can use the example that the universities and employer groups are consumers of products), and if we have a production line which breaks down and which does not produce the goods which the people want, is one then required to consume those goods? If the Minister went into operation producing clothing size 60 for people who required clothing size 40, he would not sell the product. He would not meet the demands of those people. If he pays no adherence to what those people demand, he will go out of business. In this situation, there is no quality control. We are saying that there are certain minimal needs and that they should be recognised in the Bill. We have made an honest attempt at saying that they should be recognised in the Bill. I believe the Minister should embrace them, because they do not take away from the ability of the Senior Secondary Assessment Board. They add to its ability.

If the Minister can grasp that one simple principle, we will reach agreement tonight. However, I believe that the Minister's mind is closed to the debate and that we are wasting our time here. It is a matter of such importance that the Minister should embrace it. I also believed that he would see some reason. I leave him with those thoughts, because the Opposition is not debating the Bill for the sake of it. We believe that there needs to be a fundamental

consideration placed within the Bill which recognises certain matters. If the Minister starts quoting the letters of people who are opposed to clause 17, then he reaffirms my fears.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

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

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

Motion carried.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a Bill to amend the Real Property Act in various respects. I seek leave to have the second reading explanation including the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The major areas covered by the Bill are as follows:

The Assurance Fund: Two of the principal advantages claimed for the Torrens system of land registration are the security of a registered proprietor's title and the protection given to a bona fide purchaser for value. These two advantages are to some extent in opposition to one another, for the protection given to a bona fide purchaser for value is sometimes given at the expense of an owner's 'secure' title. To prevent an innocent party incurring a loss because of these competing interests, an assurance fund was established by the original Real Property Act and contributions were made by way of a small levy imposed upon transmission of an estate of freehold upon the death of the registered proprietor and upon first bringing land under the provisions of the Act.

A person is entitled to compensation from the fund when deprived of any estate or interest in land by fraud, by the operation of the system or when he suffers loss through any omission, mistake or misfeasance of the Registrar-General or his officers.

In 1945 the Government of the day, anxious to have all land in South Australia brought within the ambit of the Real Property Act, decided not to charge assurance fund levy on bringing land under the Act. In 1956, the levy on transmissions ceased to be collected.

The amount of money standing to the credit of the assurance fund in 1956 cannot be ascertained as neither the Auditor-General nor the Registrar-General kept a running account of moneys paid into the fund and the money which constituted the fund was kept as part of the general revenue of the State.

Even though the levy is no longer collected, for the purposes of the Real Property Act, the fund continues to exist and claims can still be instituted against it. In 1981 a successful claim was made against the fund resulting in a payout of nearly $90 000. In that case a migrant, Mr Zafiropoulos, who had little understanding of written English, was fraudulently induced to sign a document transferring his house property together with a substantial amount of land to a company called Photo Investments Pty Ltd. Mr Zafiropoulos had no knowledge of the effect of the document.

Photo Investments became the registered proprietor of the property and took out two substantial mortgages; the mortgagees had no knowledge of the fraud. Photo Investments defaulted and the mortgagees threatened to foreclose.

An action was instituted in the Supreme Court (the report of which can be found in (1978) 18 S.A.S.R. 5). The court found that Mr Zafiropoulos was entitled to have his property back, subject however to the lawfully executed mortgages. Following negotiations between the parties and on the receipt of the advice of the Crown Solicitor, it was decided that a claim against the assurance fund was made out on the facts. A Governor's warrant was obtained for payment of the amount owing under the mortgages and for other costs. The required payment was met by the Treasurer from general revenue. At present, the Registrar-General is considering two cases involving forgery which may result in claims against the fund.

There has been an increase in claims in several jurisdictions, namely, New South Wales and Western Australia. In one New South Wales case which reached the High Court, the decision made it quite clear that, where a person is deprived of his land in consequence of fraud and is unable to recover from the perpetrator of the fraud, the assurance fund will be liable.

Assurance funds are not and should not be seen as State funds, they are built up as insurance funds by the contribution of landowners. It is considered appropriate for contributions to the fund in South Australia to be reintroduced. It is proposed that a levy will be collected as documents are lodged for registration. This is in keeping with the manner in which fees are collected elsewhere in Australia. It has been specifically provided that the Registrar-General shall keep an account of the moneys he receives for the fund. Provision has been made for the Treasurer to assign moneys to the fund if necessary. This would be essential if a large claim was made in excess of the amount paid into the fund. We are in the midst of a wage freeze and consequently it is not intended that this part of the legislation will be proclaimed until the wage freeze is over.

Coupled with the reintroduction of assurance fund fees, it is considered a simpler method of obtaining money from the fund is called for. At present, a plaintiff must go through the complicated procedure of obtaining a Governor's warrant. It is considered that when small claims against the fund are involved, formal methods of recovery should be avoided. When the sum claimed from the fund is less than $20 000 a certificate from the Crown Solicitor should be sufficient to enable the Treasurer to pay out of the fund. For sums in excess of $20 000 the Governor's warrant procedure is to be maintained.

Provision has also been made for claims against the assurance fund to be mitigated or barred altogether where the person suffering loss has been negligent or failed to take all reasonable care. The Bill also provides for an increase in the penalty for incorrect certification of real property documents.

A solicitor or licensed land broker is required to certify any documents for registration as 'correct for the purposes of the Real Property Act'. This certification relates not merely to clerical correctness but to the legality of the document. The expectation is that the certifying party vouches for the bona fides of the transaction as far as can reasonably be ascertained.

It is hoped the imposition of a fee will have the effect of stimulating conveyancers to proceed more carefully with their work, rather than to succumb to the temptation of relying on the Lands Titles Office to detect errors in instruments lodged for registration. It is anticipated that the fee will not be levied where the correction is based on a contentious point of law or in other limited circumstances.

In order to set the Real Property Act in line with the Registrar-General's practice, a minor amendment to section

273 of the Real Property Act is also included. This section provides that the Registrar-General shall not receive any instrument purporting to deal with or affect land unless it is certified to be correct for the purposes of the Act. There are a limited number of dealings with land which the Registrar-General does not require to be certified. The amendment brings the Act into line with the actual practice of the Lands Titles Office. A further minor amendment clarifies the position of the Commonwealth Crown by virtue of the enactment of the Real Property Act Amendment Act, 1982.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act, which sets out definitions of expressions used in the Act. The clause provides a revamped definition of the assurance fund.

Clause 4 inserts a new section in Part XVIII of the Act, 'The Assurance Fund'. The proposed new section provides that the assurance fund, kept at the Treasury, shall consist both of moneys which the Treasurer assigns to the fund for the purposes of this Act and those moneys collected by way of the prescribed assurance levy. The provision will allow the Treasurer to transfer to the fund such extra money as may be necessary. The Registrar-General is to keep an account of all moneys received by him under this section.

Clause 5 amends section 205, which deals with proceedings against the Registrar-General where it is appropriate that he act as nominal defendant. The amendment widens the application of the section to encompass any situation where compensation cannot be fully recovered from the person who would normally be liable. It also makes it clear that the Registrar-General's liability under this section is limited to that amount of compensation or costs that the claimant cannot recover from the defaulting party.

Clause 6 provides for the repeal of section 206 of the principal Act. This section becomes superfluous with the introduction of other provisions contained in this measure. Clause 7 amends section 208 of the principal Act by striking out that part of the section which requires a claimant under this Part to give written notice to the Attorney-General and the Registrar-General of his intention to issue proceedings. Section 210 also provides that a claimant may apply to the Registrar-General for compensation before commencing proceedings and given current practice it is unnecessary to have the duplication which section 208 presently creates.

Clause 8 provides for the amendment of section 210 of the principal Act. This section presently provides that, where it is appropriate to do so, the Governor may issue a warrant for payment of compensation from the assurance fund. It is proposed that, where the amount of compensation does not exceed $20 000, the Crown Solicitor will be able to authorise payment. A warrant signed by the Governor and countersigned by the Chief Secretary will still be required for amounts exceeding $20 000. Clause 9 provides for the repeal of section 216 and the substitution of a new section. The present section 216 directs a court before which proceedings under this Part are brought to take into account any fault or neglect on the part of the plaintiff. This section is recast to provide that in any action under this Part for compensation, regard shall be had to any degree of contributory negligence on the part of the plaintiff and the award to the plaintiff is to be adjusted accordingly.

Clause 10 amends section 220 of the principal Act and in particular that paragraph which deals with the Registrar-General's power to require a person lodging an instrument to comply with any requisitions which, in the opinion of the Registrar-General, are necessary or desirable. Mention is now made of the prescribed correction fee and that the Registrar-General may refuse to proceed with registration until it is paid. Clause 11 amends section 233 *la* of the principal Act, which is the interpretation provision for that Part of the Act that deals with the division and amalgamation of allotments. The amendment provides a definition of the Crown in right of the Commonwealth and for this to be distinguished from the Crown in right of the State. This is consequential to the succeeding provision.

Clause 12 effects an amendment to section 233 *ld* of the principal Act. This section is now to distinguish clearly between the Crown in right of the State and the Commonwealth Crown. The amendment returns the legislation to the situation which existed under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981, where the Crown in right of the Commonwealth did not necessarily require approval for a plan of subdivision.

Clause 13 alters the penalty for falsely or negligently certifying documents under the Act. The penalty is now to be up to $5 000. Clause 14 amends section 273 of the principal Act which provides that all instruments presented for registration must contain a certificate that the document is correct for the purposes of the Act. As a matter of conveyancing practice, some documents do not require such certification. The amendment therefore validates this practice by permitting the Registrar-General to exempt instruments of specified classes from the requirement of certification.

Clause 15 provides a second subsection to section 274 of the Act. It is considered desirable that where the Registrar-General requires the correction of a document which has been lodged under the Act by a solicitor or land broker, that solicitor or land broker should not be able to recover from his client the cost of his errors or omissions. This amendment enacts this policy.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

The Legislative Council intimated that it had appointed the Hon. Barbara Wiese to be one of its representatives on the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in place of the Hon. Frank Blevins (resigned).

WHEAT MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for certain amendments to the marketing and pricing arrangements applying to the wheat industry under the Wheat Marketing Act, 1980. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The amendments are in conformity with uniform legislation which is to be applied in each State and provide an arrangement which is to apply for two seasons, being the 1982-83 and 1983-84 seasons. The Bill provides for the implementation of proposals put forward by the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation and the Australian Wheat Board and is aimed principally at improving the operational flexibility and efficiency of the Australian Wheat Board.

An important feature of the Bill is that the Australian Wheat Board will be able to operate on futures markets for

hedging purposes, thus providing it with an accepted commercial facility in international grain trading. The board will also be able to do such things as offer growers optional arrangements for the payment to them of the guaranteed minimum price; transfer residual stocks from one season's pool to another; redeliver wheat to contributing growers; and to provide for subsequent adjustment of provisional allowances and charges to individual growers to reflect actual costs and sales realisations for wheat delivered.

As I have said previously, the Bill is uniform legislation; most other States have already implemented corresponding legislation. The measure has considerable merit and should prove to be of great assistance to all persons involved in the production and marketing of wheat. It is noted that the previous Liberal Government, prior to the November 1982 election, had accepted this Bill in principle. Its introduction now is worthy of the full support of this Parliament.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on the same day as comparable Commonwealth legislation. Clause 3 defines 'futures contract' and 'futures market'. Clause 4 empowers the Australian Wheat Board to enter into futures contracts for hedging purposes, subject to Ministerial guidelines established by the Commonwealth Minister under the Commonwealth Act. Futures contracts may only be entered into to minimise either risks arising from variable prices for wheat, or risks of variations in the cost to the board of borrowing or raising money.

Clause 5 amends section 16 of the principal Act by providing that advance payments made by the board by way of guaranteed minimum price may be made either as a lump sum, or by instalment. Each agreement to pay by instalment must be fair and equitable when compared to all other such agreements.

Clause 6 amends section 17 of the principal Act, which deals with the final payment for the season which is made to the grower. The section prescribes the various matters which are to be taken into account when calculating the payment, and adjustments are also now required because of the establishment of a reserve account under the Commonwealth Act and the introduction of dealings in futures contracts. A new subsection (2a) caters for the situation where the grower has bought wheat back from the board. The final payment under this section is reduced by the amount that is debited to the grower on the redelivery scheme. This provision avoids double counting.

Clause 7 inserts a new section 17a into the principal Act. The proposed new section provides for far greater accuracy when the board is determining at the end of a season what is owed to, or owed by, each individual grower. When an advance payment is made to a grower, several matters relevant to the real value of the wheat, and the state of the grower's account with the board, remain unknown. These matters may vary considerably from grower to grower. The board will now be able to take these variables into account in each case and either credit a further payment to the grower, or debit any amount paid in excess. Clause 8 provides amendment to section 18 of the principal Act which deals with payments relating to the last two seasons. The amendments are consequential to proposed amendments to section 16.

Clause 9 relates to section 21, dealing with home consumption of wheat. Growers will be able to take redelivery of wheat for use as stock feed on their farms, at prices determined by the board. Adjustments may be made to reflect the quality difference between wheat delivered by the grower and wheat delivered to him. A grower cannot take delivery of more wheat than the amount of wheat which he sent to the board. The final day for purchasing wheat is to be the final day on which wheat may be delivered to the board, or such other day that the Minister determines. The scheme shall not apply after the 1983-84 season, when principal sections of the Act are due to expire.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a small amendment to the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946-1980, for the purpose of empowering the Metropolitan Milk Board to operate milk testing facilities. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

Some time ago, the herd testing service of the Department of Agriculture was handed over to a co-operative formed by the herd testers. This co-operative, the Herd Improvement Services Co-operative of South Australia (HISCOL) has continued to operate successfully with some Government support and now wishes that its milk testing facilities should be administered by the Metropolitan Milk Board. This is a desirable proposal which will centralise and rationalise existing milk testing facilities in South Australia. The purpose of this amendment is to provide the board with the necessary authority to give effect to the proposal.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals section 15 of the principal Act and substitutes a new section relating to the property of the board which is consequential on clause 3 of the measure. Clause 3 inserts a new section 23a in the principal Act. The new section empowers the board to establish laboratory facilities for the analysis of milk, cream and dairy products, to conduct research relating to methods of grading milk and cream, to conduct research into matters relating to the dairy industry and to provide analytical and research services that will, in the opinion of the board, be of benefit to the industry. Subclause (2) of the measure empowers the board to make such charges as it thinks fit for services supplied by it under subclause (1).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Barley Marketing Act, 1948-1980, is an Act to establish the Australian Barley Board (a joint South Australian-Victorian marketing authority) which in South Australia is charged with the responsibility of marketing the State's barley crop and to a lesser extent the oat crop. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The amendments which are proposed follow a series of representations by the Barley Marketing Board industry and the Victorian Minister of Agriculture.

The Barley Marketing Act is expressly limited in its period of operation and currently is set to expire at the end of the 1982-83 cereal season. However, it has been agreed the Act should be extended for a further five seasons, i.e., until and including the 1987-88 season.

It is proposed that provision be made for the appointment by the Governor of a Deputy Chairman to the board. The Deputy Chairman will act on behalf of the Chairman in his absence and shall be a South Australian grower member of the board.

To assist with continuity of board membership and avoid a complete turnover particularly of elected members after any one election, it is proposed to stagger board appointments and elections. This proposal is to take effect immediately after 31 August 1984, when the current term for all members (elected and appointed) expires. The opportunity has arisen to repeal subsection (3) of section 8. This provision was required on the commencement of the principal Act but is now redundant.

In order to assist the board with its financial management strategies, the board will be given the authority to enter into and deal with futures contracts for hedging purposes. The guidelines for such trading are to be specified jointly by the Ministers of Agriculture for Victoria and South Australia. The proposal is similar to a provision contained in the Commonwealth Wheat Marketing Act, 1979.

It has been agreed between all parties that the Barley Board should be given sufficient authority to facilitate more thorough investigations into incidents of alleged illegal trading, particularly in barley. Currently a person shall not sell or deliver barley to any person other than the Barley Board, although there are five exceptions to this provision. For example a farmer may transport his own barley for use on his own farm and genuine trade between States cannot be impeded. However it is claimed that an amount of illegal interstate trading occurs under the guise of genuine trade between States.

In order to detect and stem illegal sales generally, it is proposed to include a new section in the Act obliging a person duly served with an appropriate notice to provide the Barley Board in writing with specific information relating to barley or oats. This provision is contained in the Victorian Barley Marketing Act and has proved to be of great assistance with illegal trading inquiries. Penalties for convictions under the Act are also proposed to be increased from the present maximum of $600 to a maximum of $2 000 in the case of a body corporate or $1 000 in the case of a natural person.

Section 18a (2) of the Act is to be repealed to remove from the Barley Board the obligation of considering the oat requirements of specified oat users who under the Act may purchase oats on the open market directly in competition with the board. The board holds that it is irreconcilable for it to be required, on the one hand, to market to the best advantage all oats delivered to it, while on the other hand being required to consider the interests of its oat purchasing competitors. The repeal of the subsection will overcome the conflict and enable the Barley Board to sell its oats to the best advantage of the grower.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals section 2 of the principal Act. This section related to the commencement of the Act and made the commencement conditional on the taking of a poll of barley growers. The section is no longer required. Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act, dealing with interpretation. Definitions of futures contract, futures market and inspector are inserted. 'Futures contract' is a grains futures contract (whether or not the grain is grown overseas), a currency futures contract or a financial futures contract. 'Futures market' is a market or exchange at which futures contracts are frequently made or traded. 'Inspector' is an inspector appointed under new section 10.

Clause 4 amends section 4 of the principal Act, first, by inserting a new subsection (2a) which provides for the appointment by the Governor from members of the board appointed under subsection (2) *(b)* of a Deputy Chairman of the board. In the Chairman's absence, the deputy has his powers, functions and duties and acts in his place. Secondly, a new subsection is inserted in place of subsection (4). New subsection (4) provides for staggered terms of office for board members.

A member of the board shall hold office for three years calculated from the first day of September in the year of his appointment or election, subject to the Act, the law of Victoria and the arrangement between the Governor and the Governor of Victoria. This general principle is qualified as follows:

(a) a member elected or appointed to a casual vacancy holds office only for the balance of the term of his predecessor;

(b) a member whose term expires prior to the election or appointment of a successor remains in office, subject to the Act, until a successor is appointed or elected;

(c) the term of office of the Chairman first appointed after the commencement of this measure shall, subject to paragraph *(b)*,expire on 1 September 1985;

(d) of the representatives of South Australian barley growers first elected after the commencement of this measure, the term of office of one shall, subject to paragraph *(b)*, expire on 1 September 1985, and the term of office of another shall, subject to paragraph *(b)*, expire on 1 September 1986;

(e) the term of office of one of the representatives of Victorian barley growers first elected after the commencement of this measure shall, subject to paragraph *(b)*, expire on 1 September 1986; and

(f) the term of office of the member first appointed under subsection (2) *(e)* after the commencement of this measure shall, subject to paragraph *(b)*, expire on 1 September 1986.

Thirdly, a new subsection (4a) is inserted pursuant to which the order of retirement as between representatives of South Australian barley growers first elected after the commencement of this measure shall be determined by lot. The order of retirement as between representatives of Victorian barley growers first elected after the commencement of this measure shall be determined in accordance with the law of Victoria.

Clause 5 repeals section 8 (3) of the principal Act. This subsection is transitional and related to the commencement of the principal Act and is therefore no longer relevant. Clause 6 makes an amendment to section 9 of the principal Act by inserting new paragraph *(ab)*, which empowers the board to enter into and deal with futures contracts for hedging purposes at a futures market in accordance with written guidelines jointly determined by the Minister and the Minister of Agriculture of Victoria.

Clause 7 inserts a new section 10a. New section 10a provides in subsection (1) that the board may, by notice in writing, require a person to furnish in writing to the board specified information relating to barley or oats. Subsection (2) prohibits a person without reasonable excuse from refusing or failing to comply with a requirement to furnish information or to furnish information that is false or misleading in a material particular. Clause 8 repeals section 18a (2) of the principal Act.

Clause 9 repeals section 20 of the principal Act and substitutes a new section relating to offences and penalties. Under subsection (1), any contravention of or failure to comply with a provision of the Act constitutes an offence. Subsection (2) provides that proceedings be disposed of summarily. Subsection (3) provides that a natural person convicted of an offence against the Act is liable to a penalty not exceeding $1 000, except where some other penalty is provided. Subsection (4) provides that a body corporate convicted of an offence against the Act is liable to a penalty not exceeding $2 000, except where such other penalty is provided. Subsection (5) requires that proceedings for offences be commenced within 12 months of the date of the alleged commission of the offence.

Clause 10 amends section 22 of the principal Act. In subsection (1) the figures '1987-1988' are substituted for the figures '1982-1983'. This has the effect of extending the application of the Act to barley grown up to and including the 1987-88 season. Subsection (2) is struck out and a provision inserted extending the application of the Act to oats grown up to and including the 1987-88 season. Clause 11 repeals the schedule to the principal Act. This repeal is consequential upon the repeal of section 2 of the principal Act.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill makes amendments to certain provisions of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1981, that allow a jury to bring in a verdict for a lesser offence where a more serious offence has been charged but not proved. The amendments are designed to adjust penalties that may be imposed on a verdict for the lesser offence to make them consistent with penalties for the same offence provided elsewhere in the principal Act or in the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1982. Anachronistic and restrictive provisions as to fines are also removed from sections 14 and 38 of the principal Act. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes the provision of a fine under section 14 of the principal Act. The fine is limited to $500 and is an alternative to imprisonment for a maximum period of seven years. The provision has been in the Act for many years and the amount of the fine now bears no realistic relationship to the term of imprisonment. Rather than increase the fine, it has been decided to remove it. This will enable the court, by virtue of section 313 of the principal Act, when imposing sentence, to impose a fine of an unlimited amount either in substitution for, or as an alternative to, a term of imprisonment.

Clause 3 repeals and replaces section 14a of the principal Act. Existing section 14a allows a jury to bring in a verdict for an offence identical to the offences under sections 45 and 46 of the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1982, where the prosecution fails to prove a charge under section 14 of the principal Act. Because the offences are identical it is important to provide identical penalties, and the simplest and most effective way of doing this is to provide in new section 14a that, as an alternative to the more serious charge, the jury may bring in a verdict that the accused is guilty of the offence under the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1982. The penalties and other consequences then flow as if the accused had been originally charged with and found guilty of the offence under the Road Traffic Act.

Clause 4 amends section 24 of the principal Act. This section enables a jury to convict an accused of wounding where he has been acquitted on a charge for a felony. The amendment increases the penalties to bring them into line with the penalties that may be imposed under section 23 for a similar offence. Clause 5 makes an amendment to section 38 of the principal Act that corresponds to the amendment made by clause 2 to section 14 of the primary Act.

Clause 6 amends section 38a of the principal Act, which corresponds to section 14a of the Act. The amendment is in the same form and is made for the same reasons as the amendment made by clause 3 to section 14a. Clause 7 amends section 75 of the principal Act which provides that where a jury is not satisfied that an accused has committed an offence under sections 48 or 49 of the principal Act (sexual offences) it may bring in a verdict of indecent or common assault. The purpose of the amendment is to expand the operation of section 75 to apply where the accused is initially charged with an attempt to commit rape or one of the other sexual offences under sections 48 or 49.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

AIRCRAFT OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J.G. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Aircraft Offences Act, 1970-1971, is complementary to the Commonwealth Crimes (Aircraft) Act 1963. The joint State and Commonwealth legislative scheme is designed to ensure that aircraft, their crew and passengers, are protected from criminal acts on international, interstate and intrastate flights. The aim of the Act is therefore to deter and punish punish hijack attempts, extortion attempts, threats to aircraft or passengers, etc.

This Bill amends certain provisions of the Act to extend protection to aircraft which are engaged in flights commencing from one geographical area and intended to finish at the same area and which are not covered by the Commonwealth Crimes (Aircraft) Act 1963 or the State Aircraft Offences Act. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAW COURTS (MAINTENANCE OF ORDER) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

SENIOR SECONDARY ASSESSMENT BOARD OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 1083.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I support the amendment moved by the member for Torrens. I am concerned to hear the Minister's response to the arguments that have been put. It seems to me that a Minister who has, as this Minister has, a breadth of knowledge of the education system and experience of it as a student and a graduate should certainly acknowledge the merit of the arguments that have been put forward by the Opposition in respect of the guarantees for the universities' rights to exercise their influence over standards in regard to secondary school assessment and examinations.

Other speakers on this clause have put the arguments in perhaps what might be termed the academic sense. I want to put the arguments to this clause, as I did in the second reading, from the point of view of the lay person who is the recipient of services provided by professionals. I want to say to the Minister that as a resident of this State, I want to know in future years that the professionals who are graduates of our universities—the doctors, lawyers, architects, engineers, teachers and pharmacists—have entered those universities under the rigorous scrutiny of and under standards imposed by the universities. In saying that, I do not in any way diminish the concerns that I have as a parent and as an elected representative that students who undertake year 12 assessment and who do not wish to proceed to tertiary education shall not have undue pressure placed upon them. They shall have the advantage of the opportunity to obtain a certificate which is acceptable to employers and which will stand them in good stead in whatever occupation they intend to pursue as adults.

Subjects such as English, physics, chemistry, mathematics, biology, history, geography, French, Latin, German and other modern languages, possibly classical Greek, economics, and geology are the foundation subjects for university courses. It is wrong, illogical, and anti-scholarly to refuse the universities the opportunity to guarantee standards of assessment in those subjects.

I do not want to labour the point, but I simply say that in allegedly considering the interests of the representative educational bodies that have been mentioned (and, as the member for Torrens said, they are bodies which the Opposition greatly respects), the Minister appears not to be looking beyond the immediate considerations and into the future, into the needs of South Australian society, and into the needs of the very students whom he claims he is considering.

We want to know that the high standards that our universities have always maintained will be maintained, and that the university authorities are guaranteed the right to ensure the maintenance of those standards. The University of Adelaide and Flinders University have not only national but also international reputations which have been hard earned and hard won. It will be—because it appears that it will be—a very sad day for South Australia when a Minister of the Crown by his obduracy and by the obduracy of his colleagues refuses those bodies the right to determine the standards which they have won over many decades in the case of the University of Adelaide, and in a shorter period in the case of Flinders University, and which they have a right and indeed a responsibility to retain.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There are a number of points that I wish to make. The member for Mitcham is not in the Chamber. He commented about the large number of year 12 students who go on to tertiary education: he said that the figure was not 12 per cent, as someone must have indicated earlier, but 40 per cent. In fact, what one must look at is the age group of those eligible to go on to year 12 education, and that is 43 per cent; last year it was only 40 per cent. Therefore, if only 40 per cent of that 40 per cent go on to university, the sum total of the age group able to go on to university is 16 per cent.

The question that has been so important in the minds of many educationalists is why the retention rate at year 12 is only 40 per cent or 43 per cent whereas in other countries it is in the high 60s or even the high 80s. That question has to be answered. We cannot presume that for some reason our students are less capable of handling year 12 education in great numbers. I do not think that any of us would agree with that contention.

Therefore, that is the goal at which we should be aiming. In aiming in that direction, one of the things that we need is changes to the senior secondary assessment procedure, and that is what we are on about now. In fact, the comments about the statistics were not entirely correct. I have never denied that the universities are concerned about the omission of former clause 17 from the Bill that I introduced in the House, as the member for Mitcham would try to tempt me to do. We would not have been here as long as we have been if I was not denying that I have acknowledged that.

I am also well aware that the Opposition has been putting very forcefully the arguments of the universities. Therefore, it is quite reasonable for me to put the other viewpoints that have also been made to me very strongly. I suggest that it is doing a great discourtesy to those who have put their viewpoints to me as strongly as they have (which I have related to this House) for the member for Mitcham to criticise them, by referring to . . . 'putting this rubbish in front of us'. They are the words of the member for Mitcham. It is a gross discourtesy to those people who have considered seriously the implication of this legislation. I am not suggesting that what they have put before us is rubbish at all; it is commentary worthy of consideration.

I suggest that the member for Mitcham betrayed his own attention to this whole matter by the fact that he thought that I kept on referring to the Primary Principals Association; in fact, at no stage did I even mention that body. If the member for Mitcham had listened more closely to what I said, to pick up that point, he might have picked up a lot more in the process. The member for Mitcham also said that if I were a shirt manufacturer—we canvassed some interesting ground tonight—and I made size 40 shirts for people who wanted size 60 shirts I would go out of business very soon. That example is apparently somehow relevant to the attempt to place a legislative control over the authority. Surely it is exactly the opposite. If the authority ends up producing courses that are not relevant to the community at large, surely it will quickly become a redundant body because of the community demand. Further, retention rates will start to fall and expectations in the wider community will also start to fall.

A shirt manufacturer who manufactures shirts of the wrong size does not need a legislative quality control to make him produce shirts of the right size; he will soon do so because he will not be able to sell the shirts that he produces. The member for Coles wanted to know that professionals had complied with rigorous standards in their entrance to university. We have not yet been provided with reasons why this will not happen under the new authority. That point has not been adequately canvassed. It should be borne in mind also that universities will continue to nominate the subjects that they require for entrance, and there is no suggestion anywhere in this legislation that that right should be taken away. Universities will also have the right to determine how their courses are structured once they admit students. There is no suggestion in this Bill or any attempt

by the Government elsewhere to undermine or control that right of those tertiary institutions.

Spectres are being raised all the time, and I do not believe that they are reasonable. I draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that in Victoria some years ago changes were made to the senior secondary assessment provisions and a new institute was established, the Victorian Institute of Secondary Education. When it was established some seven or eight years ago the university sector in Victoria showed considerable concern. It expressed a lot of fears about whether standards would fall and whether universities would receive the range of subject offerings required. The reality is that some seven years later they have received the sort of educational preparation required and they have the input required.

The Victorian experience of the past seven years shows that sudden change will not occur but that considerable gains and improving options and opportunities for students can be made over a period of time without endangering tertiary interests. It is timely to remind the Committee that that legislation was passed under a conservative Government. Fears were expressed, but they were worked through. Finally, seven years later, we do not find an abysmal educational mess over the border; we find something that is still working to the satisfaction of those in the education community. I refer to one other point. We have had reference to the Institute of Technology joining with the universities in support for a new clause 17. The shadow Minister placed much stress upon the fact, when I commented on the unanimity of the secondary sector, that some of it was only lukewarm.

I think that the shadow Minister would do well to acknowledge that the Institute of Technology's viewpoint is pretty lukewarm. In a letter I received from Professor Mills he indicates that there is no reason why clause 17 should not go in, and I acknowledge that, and states:

> We believe that, in practice, the new board will find it essential to ensure strong tertiary representation on the appropriate subject committees to maintain the credibility of the subjects for tertiary entrance and to make use of the special subject expertise available in the staff of the tertiary institutions.

That is exactly what I have been saying all afternoon and evening, that that is a reality that all of us acknowledge will take place.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am disappointed with the Minister's attitude. I am more disappointed with the way in which he has taken words out of context and has used debating tricks. I will take up one of the several debating tricks he used when dealing with what I said. It is a warning never to concede anything when dealing with this Minister—never to be fair—because he takes one's words and twists them.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The Minister said that I said that the universities were the kernel of this debate. He then asked why on earth, if that was the case, was I introducing a measure that dealt with tertiary institutions. I ask you, Mr Chairman, after all that has been said this afternoon, what one must think when the Minister makes a statement like that. In his last remarks the Minister proved what he was doing when he quoted a letter from Professor Mills in which the professor said that clause 17 should be retained. However, he then went on to say other things about subjects and syllabuses. That is the very reason that tertiary institutions are included collectively in this clause, because it is people like Professor Mills who will be acting as a brake on the university, and this particular clause, where we include tertiary institutions, is included because of the objections of the secondary sector and because it brings out a reasonable compromise that will prevent, I believe, divisions in the education community and enhance the welfare of secondary students in this State.

Mr PETERSON: The member for Mitcham spoke of unreasonable fears of people in the education sphere related to this legislation and at one stage he quoted the secondary school principals. I do not believe that there is unreasonable fear held by them about this matter. The point they put forward strongly in a letter to the local newspaper was that they wish to have a better system to give the whole spectrum of their students a far better chance in the education system so that it does not place all their students under unreasonable pressure.

The Minister spoke earlier about the composition of the board, about personal competence, liaison between members of the board and their respective organisations, and the views of interested groups. The board as set up by this legislation will do that, in my opinion. It has been implied during this debate that this new structure will not be sensitive to the needs of the tertiary institutions.

We all agree that the Matriculation system, as such, is in need of change and that it is not working at the moment. However, one point occurs to me: if this change is needed, why was the system not changed when the tertiary institutions were represented by 16 of the 32 members of the current board? If they had recognised the need for change, that there were problems with the system, why did they not change it then? Was it that the other 16 members were totally unaware and insensitive to the need for change? Why was the system not changed? They had 16 votes out of 32—half the voting power on that board. They have acknowledged that there is a problem, but as far as I can ascertain they did nothing about it at all.

The Bill does not remove from the three organisations referred to in the letter (that is, the Adelaide University, the Flinders University and the Institute of Technology) the opportunity for setting their own standards. As the Minister said, those organisations have the same right now to set the standards, and they can put whatever conditions they require in regard to education within the structure. The Bill removes their power to dictate to that vast majority of students who will not go on to study at tertiary institutions. It should be remembered that even in the amendment only three of the six bodies named there have gone into print to voice their objections to this Bill. The provisions of the Bill do not allow those bodies to dictate the workings of the entire system.

The vast majority of students who do Year 12 do not go on to tertiary institutions. We have had a couple of figures given: the member for Mitcham stated that 60 per cent of students do not go on to tertiary institutions, whereas the Minister stated that 84 per cent do not go on, yet all the students are subjected to the same pressure. However, the students who will not be going to tertiary institutions will now not be subject to the pressures. I think that the saviour in this Bill is the sunset clause. This provision occurs in several types of legislation.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: On a point of order, Mr Chairman. I am always prepared to accommodate my friend, the member for Semaphore, but I point out that he will have the chance to talk about that matter in a little while.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order. The matter before the Chair is an amendment moved by the member for Torrens to clause 4.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am so sorry that the shadow Minister smarts so much at what I have been saying tonight about the Bill. However, I would simply point out that a number of sound and significant objections have been raised tonight which are not rubbish put in front of us from the education community, and which I do not believe have

been satisfactorily answered. I have acknowledged that the universities have a concern, a strong vehement concern which is supported in a luke-warm way by another tertiary institution. I am sorry if that seems to the Opposition to be an unreasonable presentation of the case as I see it, but I have not been convinced that the arguments that have been put to me by the secondary education sector are unsound (and I have read out all of those reasons). Accordingly, it is not the Government's intention to support the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson (teller), and Wotton.

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

Pair—Aye—Mr Goldsworthy. No—Mr Bannon.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Membership of the Board.'

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I seek information from the Minister on this question. In particular, talking about the terms of office and the Chairman, is it the Minister's intention that there be a full-time Chairman or a part-time Chairman? Obviously, under a later clause the board will be able to elect its own executive officer which, no doubt, it will. Is it the Minister's intention that there will be a part-time or full-time Chairman, because, of course, this is where there is again one difference from the previous Bill, where the Chairman was appointed by the Minister or by the Government.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It would be our anticipation that there would be for an interim period of time a full-time Chairman available to the authority. Then, naturally, as the shadow Minister has outlined, the authority would be appointing an executive officer to assist the authority in its work. We considered a number of propositions on this matter.

One alternative proposition was to instil into the legislation a position of executive director quite different from a Chairman, who would be a voluntary person in that kind of instance. Finally, after various considerations, and without strong viewpoints on any side of this issue, we decided that this option was in fact a reasonable way as any to go.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I would like to point out to the Minister that in my experience, both in business and as a Minister, I have found the joint position of full-time Chairman and full-time executive director to be a disastrous one. Certainly, before one appoints an executive director, if one has a full-time Chairman, he or she acts as both. However, it has been my experience that a full-time Chairman and a full-time executive director is not a good combination. In fact, I found that in relation to the State Transport Authority—which is certainly a little different from the way this board will work and in some respects I am relieved to hear that—it did not usually work well. However, I do not do anything more than make that point to the Minister so that he can keep his eye on it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 14 passed.

Clause 15—'Functions of the Board.'

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Once again, I seek information from the Minister on the powers and functions of the board. I refer particularly to clause 15 (1) *(e)* which states:

(e) to undertake or commission research into methods of assessing students in relation to subjects studied by them at the year 12 level of secondary education.

Once again, I seem to detect a significant difference in wording from the previous Bill, although I cannot seem to put my hands on the previous Bill. However, I ask the Minister to explain that difference in wording because, it seems to me that this might represent a reduction in research capability, and I would want him to reassure me that that is not so.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is certainly not meant to be a reduction; it is meant to be giving greater ambit to the authority. Clause 14 (1) *(e)* (Two) of the former legislation states:

undertake or commission research—

(1) to determine the best methods of assessing students for further study or employment;

(2) into other matters relating to the assessment of students at the year 12 level of secondary education.

This clearly goes wider than that and gives the authority the right to canvass other areas; indeed, one could say about the previous legislation that that applied only to one of two options, that is, tertiary institutions or the work force. Sadly, in the modern day and age we have a third section which is all too great, and that is neither.

That really was not possible there. It is a small change of wording meant to free up the capacity of the authority to conduct research. We find it a quite exciting innovation in the authority that it has the capacity to conduct research, and commend the former Government for including that in that way. We believe that, having worked as it will to develop curricula and assessment methods and to conduct the assessment, it is probably one of the better placed organisations, then, to conduct the research related to those important areas. I can give the undertaking that it is not meant to restrict the research to a lesser degree than was intended in the previous legislation.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I refer the Minister to clause 15 (6), which states:

A syllabus prepared or approved by the former board or by the Director-General of Education before the commencement of this Act for a subject to be studied in 1983, 1984 or 1985 shall, in relation to those academic years, be deemed to be a syllabus prepared or approved by the board.

Will the Minister be prepared to concede that the majority of the syllabus, as now approved by the Public Examinations Board, will apply in 1985 and that we really cannot expect a full new syllabus from the new board until 1986?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I must be very careful, because all the words that I say tonight are causing such discomfort to the shadow Minister that I would at every turn be taken as quoting him out of context. I did earlier today make that concession (if that is what we choose to call it), indicating that the first full year would be 1986 but that there would be some subjects. I do not see it as a concession, since I announced it before, but if, to avoid any further indignation on the part of the shadow Minister, he requires me to say the word 'concede', so be it, but it just repeats what I said earlier today.

This legislation has two significant differences from the former legislation. The first is the addition of 1985 (the previous one had only 1984). It was the opinion of many who looked at the former legislation that there may well have been difficulties, that, even if everything had gone according to the anticipation of the former Minister, it would well have been in the clear by 1985 for the full implementation of the new authority's courses. There was serious doubt that that could have taken place and that there may have had to be some amending legislation later on if that legislation had been in place. So, we picked that up. Of course, that is now, I would almost suggest, a misuse

of words, put to indicate that this is an indicator of how the delay to the Bill has affected the whole thing. We put it in there to give it that extra bit of cushioning.

The other point that is significantly different is the inclusion of a syllabus prepared or approved by the Director-General of Education. Of course, we have the very large range of S.S.C. subjects that come under the approval of the Director-General of Education. They, of course, cover a large number of students. Planning is already well under way for many of those for next year and beyond. Quite frankly, that was an oversight in the former legislation. I furthermore indicated in my second reading explanation that not only the S.S.C. subjects but certain of the agriculture studies subjects do not fit into either the P.E.B. or S.S.C. categories of subjects.

Clause passed.

Clauses 16 and 17 passed.

New clause 17a—'Nominations of subjects by tertiary institutions for selection of students for enrolment.'

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Just for formality, I move:

Page 6, after line 30: Insert new clause as follows:

17a. (1) A tertiary institution may, if it has the approval of every other tertiary institution, by notice in writing served on the board, nominate a subject in which it requires an assessment of students to enable it to select students for enrolment.

(2) Subject to this Act, the board shall, on receiving a notice under subsection (1), establish a committee to prepare a syllabus for the subject concerned.

(3) The tertiary institution may, if it has the approval of every other tertiary institution, nominate persons to be appointed as members and the person to be appointed as chairman of the committee and the board shall appoint those persons accordingly unless there is, in the opinion of the board, a substantial reason for not doing so.

(4) A tertiary institution may, if it has the approval of every other tertiary institution, nominate persons to be appointed to undertake the assessment of students in relation to a subject that it has nominated pursuant to subsection (1) and the board shall appoint those persons unless there is, in the opinion of the board, a substantial reason for not doing so.

(5) After a tertiary institution has nominated a subject pursuant to subsection (1) it shall take into account assessments of students in that subject when considering applications for enrolment in the institution and it shall continue to do so until the expiration of two years after it has, by notice in writing served on the board, withdrawn the nomination of that subject.

New clause negatived.

Clauses 18 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—'Expiry of Act.'

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I move:

That this clause be struck out.

The Opposition opposes this clause. It is now in the ironic position of opposing the measure which the Minister has introduced in some way to appease the tertiary institutions when, of course, it is the Opposition which has so far been trying to find a compromise between the views of the tertiary institutions and the secondary institutions. We have this ironic situation where the Opposition opposes this measure, even though the Minister introduced it as a form of compromise to please the tertiary institutions.

The Opposition opposes it because we believe that it is a clause that will cause enormous trouble, and not only because of the syllabuses, as I explained in the second reading debate, where we have the first full year of syllabuses from the new board in 1986, yet this legislation and possibly the whole board will lapse in December 1986, as I said, with the then Minister bringing the legislation into the House to enable the board's continuance before the first full set of examinations is conducted under the new system.

Even if the Minister argues against that, as he undoubtedly will, we have the worrying prospect of this new board, this most important educational statutory authority knowing that it has only a short life of just over three years, if it is set up by the Minister before July this year. Because of that, the board will be hamstrung in its decision making, especially in its last year. All members of the Committee have heard how Governments are hamstrung in their last year of office in taking the tough decisions that need to be taken.

I am sure that I do not have to spell this out to members in this place, yet the Minister is putting this new board, the board that is carrying the hopes of the education community for an enlightened new year 12 assessment, in this difficult position. I am pleased to be moving this amendment, although it is designed to appease some tertiary institutions and help them. The Opposition and I take the view that this clause is so dangerous for the efficient working of the new board that it should be removed.

I hope that the Minister does not ask me to enumerate the various organisations, but many secondary and tertiary organisations are opposed to this clause; some who even oppose the reintroduction of clause 17, are also opposed to this clause. I apologise to the Minister because it is remiss of me not to be able to give him chapter and verse, but he had better take my word for it.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I acknowledge that the shadow Minister has realised the spirit in which this sunset clause was introduced in the Bill; that is, to try to take account of those fears expressed by the universities and to say to them, 'You will have a chance to have another look at this.' In all the debate about this legislation, the sunset clause relates to the existence or absence of a clause 17 or 17a.

In essence, it does not refer to other aspects of the authority, because something will have to take place. It is saying to the community that it will be opened up for examination. I would be most fearful of removing that provision now that the Opposition's amendment has not been carried, because we would be telling the universities that, if, again against the odds, their fears prove to be true, there is no recourse. I think that that would not be an appropriate proposition to the tertiary sector.

I refer to the timing, as mentioned by the shadow Minister and why it should be 1986, when there will be only one year of subjects and no real assessment of the results. The issue at hand is the process by which the authority will operate, how it will establish committees, whether or not it will have taken account of tertiary education viewpoints, whether or not it will have taken account of tertiary education submissions to its various curriculum committees and incorporated them as members on those committees. That information will be well and truly available long before the end of 1986.

The desire is to minimise the effect of any fears that may prove to have foundation and for them to have as minimal an effect on the student community of this State as is reasonably possible. The end of 1986 is deemed to be the end of that period. I again call on members to acknowledge that common sense will prevail. The Parliament of the day, whatever political fortune does with its makeup, will undoubtedly continue an authority. In large measure, it will be the exact equivalent of the proposal before us but with the opportunity to debate whether or not there should be a clause 17. That is what this clause is all about and that is what has been spelt out in my deliberations to this House; that has been clearly understood by various people in the education community.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Very briefly, I inform the Minister that this time the Opposition is on the side of the angels. I suggest to the Minister that it does not matter into which educational forum he might like to walk in the next few days: he will not find much support for this clause, whether or not clause 17 is in the Bill.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I cannot miss this opportunity after hearing the shadow Minister say that this time he is on the side of the angels. This whole saga tonight reminds me of the biblical story which we could reparaphrase as SSABSA and Delilah, with the shadow Minister trying to cut the strength out of the authority. I have noted the shadow Minister's points, and they will be taken into account.

The CHAIRMAN: I put the question that clause 24 stand as printed. For the question say 'Aye', against 'No'.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Aye.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the 'Ayes' have it.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: On a point of order, Mr Chairman, you have not called for the Ayes.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order. I asked for the Ayes while I was looking at the Minister. The Chair has ruled that the Ayes have it.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: On a further point of order, Mr Chairman, the amendment is that this clause will be opposed. I was waiting for the chance to call—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member wishes to call for a division, the Chair will accept that call. The Chair has ruled that the 'Ayes' have it. Does the honourable member wish to call for a division?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I would like the chance to call 'No', too, Mr Chairman. I was not given that opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair must receive advice from the honourable member that he requires a division.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I certainly do, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: A division is required, ring the bells.

The Committee divided on the clause:

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

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

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (IRRIGATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 April. Page 854.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The principle of this Bill, fundamentally, is to adopt what has commonly been used under the Local Government Act as a means of inducing the payment of rates, a principle which I believe is fair and reasonable, whereby at the due date (or, in the case of the Irrigation Act provisions, three months after the due date—when water rates fall due at the end of March, 30 June would apply) an interest rate will accrue at the rate of 5 per cent at that time and at 1 per cent per month thereafter. This principle has been adopted and used under the Local Government Act for some time, and I believe that it is a reasonable approach in this day and age. The Auditor-General has brought to the attention of Parliament on a number of occasions the high level of outstanding water rates. I believe that the provisions contained in this legislation, considering the economic circumstances that exist at this time, are fair and reasonable.

However, I want to make a number of points in relation to the adoption of this provision. I trust that this legislation when passed will not be used to bring to a conclusion one or two outstanding matters in relation to rates on properties where a property may have changed hands a year or two ago and where the Engineering and Water Supply Department failed to collect the outstanding rates from the former owner. In two or three instances of which I am aware the department is endeavouring to recover such rates from the present owner where no provision was made in the bill of sale for that property which meant that the present owner was liable.

This legislation clearly places the liability on the land, but I do not want to see some back-door method used following the proclamation of this Bill in regard to those outstanding instances whereby the Engineering and Water Supply Department failed to collect its dues prior to the property changing hands, but where it now endeavours to utilise this piece of legislation to force the present owner of a property to pay rates that should have been collected by the department from the previous owner.

Therefore, I will be looking for an assurance from the Minister that that will not be the case. I will be quite happy if in the future any outstanding charges in the form of rates be regarded as a charge against the land and it is appropriate that that should be the case. Because of the amendments which were made to the Irrigation Act and which mean that the Minister of Lands is no longer required to grant approval for the transfer of property from one person to another, a situation has been created whereby the Engineering and Water Supply Department, unless it is on the ball, could find that a property had changed hands without the rates owing on that property being paid to the department.

Also, the advent of freeholding, brought in by the previous Government on irrigation land under the department, now means that that land does not go through the process of having to obtain Ministerial approval to transfer. That has resulted, in one or two instances, in the E. & W.S. Department's missing out on rates which are due and payable to it. However, that is not the fault of the present owner of that piece of land, whether he be the freehold owner or still the perpetual lessee of the land under the Irrigation Act. If I can have an assurance from the Minister later on that matter, it will satisfy my concern.

The other point of grave concern to me is the ability of the owner or lessee to meet the rate payments. I was appalled this afternoon to hear the Premier announce to the House that the Government's rehabilitation programme for the Cobdogla irrigation area (which is the main remaining area of the Government's irrigation land to be rehabilitated) is to be abandoned. I hope that, in taking that decision, the Government realises what it has done. It is a disaster not only for the growers and irrigators in the area concerned but for the whole State, in that it is the first step by the Government in abandoning the overall Murray River salinity control programme in this State. The real purpose of the rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas is, above all else, to reduce the quantity of water being used from the Murray River for irrigation. The other main concern is to reduce significantly the salinity input into the Murray River in this State. They are two very real reasons why the rehabilitation of Government irrigation areas should proceed.

The former Minister of Works (Des Corcoran) many years ago recognised the reality of the situation and realised that the rehabilitation was extremely important in reducing salinity and saving water in South Australia. The other benefit was to the grower who reduced his requirement for water and recognised that, by putting less water onto the property, the leaching traction was reduced and therefore the amount of fertiliser applied to the soil currently being leached away was significantly reduced. Without the

improved irrigation practices that can come with the rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas, the inefficient irrigation procedures will, to a large degree, continue. With the improved irrigation practices, the Government gains the benefits of less salt going back to the river, and of less water being used for irrigation. The grower gains the benefit of higher productivity, reduced power bills, and a reduction in the waste of fertilisers applied to that land through inefficient irrigation application.

That is of extreme importance to South Australia because, if this is the first step (and it is an important step as far as Murray River salinity control is concerned) in abandoning the total salinity control programme in South Australia, then it is a very sad day for this State. In fact, what it has done is create two classes of irrigators within the Government irrigation system. One will have irrigators who are in the rehabilitated area receiving the benefits of being able to implement improved irrigation practices. The ones in the Government irrigation areas currently being rehabilitated were able to take advantage of the Government rehabilitation grant or the connection grant which, I take it, will no longer be available (with the decision that has been taken today by the Government), which will leave those growers in areas that have not been rehabilitated at a distinct disadvantage compared to those who have been involved in the rehabilitation process.

There is no way that the drip irrigation system which, no doubt, is an extremely efficient form of irrigation on the right soil types, can be put into effect in the irrigation areas that have not been rehabilitated. Therefore, we now have in South Australia within the Government irrigation areas distinctly two classes of irrigators. Yet, we are asking those irrigators to meet their payments of rates on time. The ability of one section of the growers to meet their rates on time will be quite distinctly less than that of those irrigators who have the advantages of the higher productivity in the areas where the rehabilitation has taken place. From the growers' point of view it is a disaster. It is also a disaster from South Australia's point of view as a whole because it was a significant part of the salinity control programme in this State.

There is one other matter that concerns me and I will deal with it more in the Committee stage. In relation to the part of the Bill that deals with provision for recovery of charges and drainage rates, we find that there is a subclause at the end of that clause which states:

> That the Minister may, where, in his opinion the payment of interest would cause hardship, remit the whole or part of the interest payable under this section.

I cannot understand why (and I fully support the inclusion of that subclause) that subclause has not also been included in an earlier clause, clause 5 of the Bill, which deals with the provision for recovery of rates. We are dealing with exactly the same matter, and I firmly believe that clause 5 of this Bill should be amended to contain the same provision as that in clause 8 (7). It just does not add up to have that provision in that part of the Bill and not to have it in clause 5, which amends section 75 of the principal Act.

It is a Ministerial discretion. It is one that can only be exercised by the Minister, and I believe that it is one that should be there so that, in the event of that hardship situation coming up, the Minister has by law the authority and the flexibility to examine the matter and to come down with a responsible Ministerial decision.

I support the second reading of this Bill. I will look forward to the comments that the Minister may wish to make. If the Minister cannot provide me with a satisfactory explanation as to why that has not been included in clause 5 of this Bill (as it is in clause 8) I will seek to amend the Bill by including an amendment similar to the one contained in clause 8 of this legislation.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): I thank the honourable member for his support of this Bill. I wish to comment on some of the matters that he has raised. First, I will deal with the matter that he has just instanced in regard to clause 5 of the Bill, provision for the recovery of rates. The provision in regard to the Minister is as follows:

> The Minister may, where, in his opinion the payment of interest would cause hardship, remit the whole or a part of the interest payable under this section.

It is already in the principal Act in regard to the recovery of rates. It is included in clause 8 (7) in regard to liability to rates on this occasion to bring it into line with the principal Act. That is the explanation: it is already in the principal Act.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: But that provision in the principal Act does not relate to the drainage.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No, it does not, but it will if this Bill is passed in relation to the recovery of charges for drainage rates. I will also take note of the other matter that was raised by the member for Chaffey in regard to outstanding accounts and the change of ownership. I understand that there have been one or two problems. If I remember correctly, the honourable member wrote me in regard to one in particular. Let me assure him that endeavours have been made, of course, to contact the previous owner, as it was his responsibility. It is certainly my intention not to be unduly difficult in regard to the change of ownership. There is a history associated with this matter where, at one time, the Crown leases, of course, were not transferable. When they became transferable, some problems arose. I understand that only a few are involved. Certainly, I am prepared to give—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: The Minister of Lands had to give his approval.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That is exactly right.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: He would contact all other departments.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That is right. He would contact other departments, of course, to ensure that all of the outstandings were paid. This has not occurred, of course, in the last—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Since the amendment.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Since the amendment some four or five years ago. As a consequence, this problem arose. Let me assure the honourable member that I will still have the opportunity, as will be included in this Bill and in the principal Act, where there is hardship, to remit the whole or part of the interest payable under this clause.

In conclusion, I just want to say again that it is a problem which has been accentuated specifically in the last two or three years. I am appreciative of the growers' problems in the Riverland. I do not believe that this should be regarded as a measure only in regard to a recovery initiative. We ought to consider that the Auditor-General, as the member for Chaffey has already indicated, has expressed concern at the lack of recovery initiatives in the past and, unfortunately, they have been somewhat limited. At an interest rate of 5 per cent, it would pay a person not to pay and, if the money was readily available, by placing it elsewhere he could obtain a much better return.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: I can't imagine that occurring.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It could occur in the present situation. One could do better than 5 per cent in any investment these days. We are looking to ensure that anything outstanding is not accentuated further, while at the same time being fair and reasonable in recovering rates outstanding

and ensuring the payment of rates in future. I thank the member for Chaffey for his comments and hope that I have answered the two questions he raised specifically. If not, we can discuss those matters in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Provision for recovery of rates.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I take it from the Minister's second reading reply that this amendment will not be used in any way to resolve outstanding problems in the two or three instances that still exist in regard to the recovery of rates on properties that have changed hands.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I can assure the honourable member that that is the case.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Short titles.'

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: In his second reading explanation the Minister indicated that all the people concerned with the Irrigation on Private Property Act, as well as the Lower River Broughton Irrigation Trust and the Pyap Irrigation Trust, are in full agreement with this Bill. I can remember writing to the various bodies concerned, and I believe that those who responded in favour of the Bill have been included in it. Is that correct?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: That is correct. The Renmark Irrigation Trust was not really happy about our intruding into this situation, but the honourable member is quite correct: the Lower River Broughton Irrigation Trust, the Pyap Irrigation Trust and people concerned with the Irrigation on Private Property Act advised, I think, that the then Minister, the member for Chaffey, that they were willing participants in this scheme, and we amended the legislation accordingly.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 14) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 April. Page 854.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I support the Bill, which is substantially the same as the Bill I introduced, as Minister of Health, in 1982. The second reading explanation dealing with that Bill can be found on page 1299 of *Hansard* of 7 October 1982. That Bill, and this one, have been the subject of long, intensive deliberations in the Ministry office with the Medical Board and the profession. When this Bill passes tonight, as I hope it does (late though the hour is), I know that there will be rejoicing in the profession, because this legislation has been long awaited. The Act that this Bill replaces is antiquated and has needed overhauling to ensure that it relates to the practice of medicine in the late twentieth century.

The Minister's second reading explanation, which was somewhat more expansive than the second reading explanation of the Bill that I introduced, makes some sound statements about the nature and purpose of registration. It states that registration obliges practitioners to ensure, and entitles the public to believe, that certain standards of competence and ethics will be maintained. I will address myself briefly to the question of ethics, because it is fundamental to the function of the Medical Board that it not only attends to registration and education but that it maintains those personal, professional and moral standards with which the profession is associated and has always been associated in the public mind and which are the basic strength and foundation of the profession.

It was a coincidence, perhaps, that on the day this Bill was introduced into the House I received in the post the annual report for 1982 of the Department of Medicine, Flinders Medical Centre. I opened it and turned to the editorial written by Professor John Chalmers, Chairman of the Department of Medicine. What he had to say is relevant to this Bill and worth reading into the record. He states:

> It is sad to reflect that where some 20 or 30 years ago the medical profession held a very proud place in our society, at the end of 1982 this position is somewhat tarnished, to say the least. Indeed, our profession is now clearly under siege and is seen as avaricious, expensive, and less than honest, and yet still a bastion of privilege! While I am hopeful that the man in the street doesn't necessarily see all doctors in this light, the odium which grew rapidly at the time of 'Medibank' in the Whitlam years, inevitably affects us all. On the one hand, we are seen increasingly as a business rather than as a profession, and on the other hand we are seen as a tight and tough trade union, working to exclude other health professions.
>
> It is idle to try and turn the clock back, but it is interesting that most of the deterioration in public perception has occurred in parallel with a change in the source of the doctors' income. Whereas this was once derived from private practice and directly from the patient's pocket, it is now mainly funded by the taxpayer either through the sessional or full-time salaries of hospital specialists or through Government subsidy of the fee for service system. It is fascinating that the public expects so much more when it pays through Government than when it pays directly and privately. For while our profession has earned much of the abuse which it attracts, the standards and quality of health care have risen very markedly in this same period of 20-30 years and yet the medical profession earns little kudos for this progress.

I have read similar *cri de coeur* in many medical publications over the past three years; in fact, the week before this report arrived I was reading a similar expression of view in an article in the *Australian Surgeon*. I believe that the views expressed in the editorial that I have just read to the House are relevant to the purpose of this Bill, and I am hopeful that, under the new legislation, the regrets of senior, key, and indeed, all responsible members of the profession today will find redress. Certainly, enormous thought has gone into ensuring that the board has the appropriate powers that it needs to ensure proper educational and clinical standards and in regard to its addressing that question of ethics.

Ideally, questions of ethics should not need to be controlled by legislation. Ethics depend really on attitudes which one learns at one's mother's knee, and which for the professionals are subsequently reinforced in their professional education. Those attitudes are reinforced by example and by teaching. Again, as I did earlier this evening in speaking to another piece of legislation, I point out that the University of Adelaide Medical School has a tradition of educational standards, clinical practice and ethics which has served the State very well. The Flinders University Medical School is developing its own fine tradition, and is making a name for itself and its graduates nationally and internationally.

The ethics which should be inculcated in a medical student in terms of attitudes to the responsibility towards patients, attitudes to colleagues, the profession and to the public at large should be addressed in medical school, but, because the professions can reflect only the society which they serve, medical schools and, indeed, all university faculties today in training professionals have a difficult task, because they are no longer dealing with the elite (as some might say) sections of the population. They are dealing with a much broader cross-section of the population, and consequently, their task in ensuring standards and attitudes is, I believe, somewhat more difficult than it was decades ago.

However, I recall, as Minister of Health, speaking to a senior Adelaide surgeon who has an international reputation, and also to a professor in the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Adelaide, who himself was trained at a United

Kingdom university. I was very encouraged to learn that they believe that the standards of medical practice and ethics in South Australia are second to none, and that the credit for this must go to the University of Adelaide and its long and fine tradition in training doctors in this State. As I have said, the Flinders University has picked up that tradition and developed it in its own characteristic way.

In terms of that tradition one must look at its proponents. On that basis I would like to pay a tribute to the leadership of the A.M.A. in South Australia and to the profession generally in South Australia, with whom I worked during my three years as Minister of Health. It was a very great pleasure to deal with such enlightened and conscientious leadership as that enjoyed by the A.M.A. in South Australia over the past four years. I dealt in turn with Dr Max Moore, Dr Jeanette Linn, Dr Brian Cornish, and Dr David King, as successive Presidents of the association.

I can say that, if the standards that they set for themselves and the example that they set for others to follow were followed throughout the nation, there would be no cases of fraud. There would be no substandard clinical practice, and there would be no slurs on the good name of the medical profession.

The Bill has been dealt with in detail in another place. I refer honourable members to The Hon. Dr Ritson's speech which examined all provisions of the Bill. I understand that the honourable member's contribution was helpful to the Minister and to officers of the Health Commission as well as the Ministry in determining the final content of the Bill.

One important initiative, which was not in the Bill that I introduced but which has been introduced into this Bill, is the power for the board to require parties to appear before the Registrar if it is satisfied that a complaint was laid as a result of a misapprehension or misunderstanding between the parties. The Minister in his second reading explanation said that this is essentially a conciliation clause based on the assumption that some complaints are really the result of poor communication. I expect that that clause will be used reasonably frequently and that the board in future, and the people who deal with it, will possibly have reason to be grateful for the further delay which this Bill has suffered, because I believe that that further delay has enabled even more careful consideration to be given to the legislation rather than to draft Bills.

The other question of interest is that of lay representation on the Medical Board. I recall raising this the matter publicly in a speech that I made to the Royal College of Pathologists, South Australian branch, some time during 1980. In that speech I addressed the question of medical ethics. I said that I believed it was important that a lay person, representing the public view, should be on the board, as I believed that the presence of such a person would be of immense value to the doctors on the board. In addition to that lay person, a legally qualified person is to be appointed to the board, and that will be of immense benefit. In the past the board has had to wrestle with extremely knotty legal situations and has keenly felt the lack of legal expertise.

I support particularly the provision in the Bill which was moved in the other place, namely, clause 8, which ensures that the board shall appoint one of its members to be President of the board. That clause is the same as the clause in the original Bill which I introduced, and I place great value upon it. The reason for its value is that the board is essentially a body responsible for the purpose of peer review. If that purpose is to be effectively fulfilled, the members of the board and the profession itself must have confidence in the person who presides over the board.

I believe that this provision, which simply perpetuates the system that has prevailed since the board was established, is very important to the profession and to the general public. It embodies a principle that the professions shall be self-regulating, quite separate from any form of political interference and able to organise their own affairs, including their own leadership, in the manner that they think is appropriate.

As I said, the Bill has been dealt with very thoroughly in the other place. The hour is late, so I do not propose to go into any further detail other than to again thank and congratulate all those who were involved in its preparation and to wish the profession well in the manner that this Bill operates to their benefit and to the benefit of the public that they serve.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): In my second reading explanation and in another place, due credit has been given to the member for Coles who, as the former Minister of Health, had a significant role to play in the presentation of this legislation during the time of the previous Parliament. Of course, the basis of the Bill that we are now debating was one in the presentation of which she, as I said, had a significant role. As the honourable member has pointed out, it has been updated. However, I would like to commend her on a thoughtful contribution to a Bill which is of great importance and which will have worthwhile benefits not only to the medical fraternity in South Australia but to the community generally.

Bill read a second time.

The SPEAKER: Before asking the honourable member for Mitcham to take the Chair as Acting Chairman of Committees, I think that it is a notable occasion because not only is he one of my former pupils from the Institute of Technology—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: We have all got problems.

The SPEAKER: I thought that that was no problem. However, interjections are out of order. I would make one comment, and that is that it is perfectly in order for either the Minister or the spokesman on behalf of the Opposition to indicate that certain sections be taken *en bloc* and sometimes that can be of great assistance. I ask the honourable member to take his place.

In Committee.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I might point out that, as to the agreement of the member for Coles, clause 8 will be the one area that we will be discussing and debating. We will be happy to go through the rest of the measures in the Bill if you so wish it to be.

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order. Mr Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the House. I think that it is absolutely disgraceful.

A quorum having been formed:

Clause 1—'Short title.'

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I would just like to take this opportunity to say how very pleasant it is to see you in the Chair, Sir.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Baker): Thank you.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—'The President.'

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I seek your guidance on this, Sir. I assume that, because the Government is opposing clause 8 and proposes to insert a new clause 8, in my debate I can canvass the matters involved in both clause 8 and the proposed new clause 8.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Thank you, Sir. The Government opposes clause 8, an amendment which comes to this place from the other Chamber. I understand that initially, when the Bill was prepared during the time of the previous Government, it was proposed that the president or the

chairman of the board should be elected as a result of a vote taken by the board itself. The Minister of Health and the Government propose that the Government shall appoint one of the members of the board to be its chairman. That proposal was defeated in the other House, so we have received here clause 8 of the Bill in its original form.

As a result of that, the Government has further considered the matter, and we have agreed that we should tighten up our intention for clause 8. We propose that the Minister shall, after consultation with the board, appoint one of the members of the board who is a medical practitioner to be the president of the board. That satisfies some of the objection that the Opposition has, but we feel very strongly that boards of this nature ought to have the chairmen or the presidents or chairpersons appointed by the Government.

I, in my own area as Chief Secretary, know that I have a *quasi*-judicial body called the 'Parole Board', which is chaired by a professional person, and there is no way that the Government can have any influence over decisions made by the Parole Board. We have the same situation here. This board will, in a sense, be a *quasi*-judicial board. It has wide powers and will be entirely independent of the Government but, in common with most other decisions made by this and previous Governments, when they constitute a board on which they have a number of Government appointees and a number of representatives from the bodies that are influenced by such a board, the Government reserves to itself the right to appoint the chairperson (or the president, in this case). That will be done only after due consideration has been given to the opinion of the board, after consultation, and it will be insisted that the president will have to be a medical practitioner.

So, I really think that the difference of opinion that exists between the Opposition and the Government is as to whether or not the Government should accept the nomination of the board and have no powers to influence that or whether the Government should act as a Government and take this responsibility on itself and be seen to appoint the chairman of the board. I point the honourable member and her colleagues to the comments of the Hon. Mr Milne in another place when he discussed this matter. We do not always agree with that gentleman, but he and the Hon. Mr DeGaris were pretty well to the point in discussing this matter.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Did you read the Hon. Mr Burdett's statement?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I read the Hon. Mr Burdett's statement, but I was much more convinced by the Hon. Mr DeGaris and the Hon. Mr Milne. The Government will move that clause 8 be deleted and that a new clause, when we get to it, be inserted in its place

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Opposition opposes this amendment and supports clause 8 as it stands and as it originally appeared in the Bill that I introduced. The Minister may say that the difference between the opinion of the Government and the Opposition on this clause, now that it has been developed to ensure that a medical practitioner is President of the board, is narrow. The difference may be narrow, but it is fundamental, and it rests on the matters that I raised in the second reading stage.

We know that the Government's amendment will be carried, simply because the Government has the numbers to carry it, but I want to place on record the logic, the justification, and the argument as to why the Minister is wrong in principle in proposing this amendment. The Minister has said that there is no way that the Government can influence the board by its appointment of a chairman. That is patently nonsense. The Minister has the right to appoint a nominee, a medical practitioner, on the board.

It is certainly clear to the Chief Secretary, because he has excercised his right of appointment already, I expect, since he was appointed, and he knows that when a Minister is appointing someone particularly to a key position, such as the Medical Board or the Parole Board, he selects the best person, but inevitably he makes a subjective choice as to who that best person is. That is what judgment and political judgment is all about, and a Minister always exercises political judgment. It may not be Party-political judgment or Party-biased political judgment but, if we were honest, we would admit that that comes into it.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: You surprise me.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Of course it does. We would not deserve the name of politicians if it did not. The Minister exercises a broadly based political judgment when he or she appoints people to boards. The way this clause reads, there is absolutely no compulsion or requirement, legal or even moral, on the Minister to take the advice of the Medical Board after he has consulted with it. There is nothing to stop the Minister selecting a person whom he wants to be President, appointing that person to the board, and then recommending his appointment to the Governor.

The Minister might have consulted with the board, but there is nothing in the clause to say that he has to take a shred of notice of what the board says. The medical profession feels very strongly about this. I will elaborate again on the arguments that I made in the second reading debate. This board is essentially a board of professional review. It involves doctors examining the conduct of other doctors.

It cannot be equated to any other board function such as the Parole Board or, as debate in another place had it, to a judicial function. It is an important professional review function. If the doctors themselves are going to be reviewed by their peers, it is essential that they have the right to determine who will exercise leadership of the board in its exercise of that function. As I have said, this is a fundamental principle on which the Opposition differs strongly from the Government.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Minister who introduced this Bill (and I acknowledge that is not the Chief Secretary) is acting consistently in a philosophical sense with his general wish to exert as much tight, centralised control over all bodies, statutory or otherwise, under his authority. On the other hand, the Opposition believes in the principle that, generally speaking, people are best left to manage their own affairs in accordance with the law or administrative requirements.

I believe that this Bill is excellent, but it will be flawed if the Government insists on this amendment. Clause 8 as it stands is absolutely fundamental to the whole principle of professions exercising the right to regulate the behaviour of their own members. The question of the board appointing one of its members to be President is, in effect, symbolic of the whole role that the board exercises over the profession. The arguments put by the Chief Secretary in support of this amendment (and I believe that they were half-hearted arguments—he may not support the principle but he has no choice because the Government has put him in a position where he has to) do not stand up.

There is no doubt that there will be resentment by the medical profession and that it will be well justified if the Government imposes its will on the profession in the form of insisting on this amendment and carrying it by the crude weight of numbers. I believe that the Bill will be the poorer if this amendment is carried. I believe that the Minister's judgment, rather than the judgment of medical practitioners in the choice of President, will one day—perhaps not this year, next year or in the immediate future—be exercised to the detriment of the operation of the board. I worked with that board for three years. I did not always agree with the way it operated, but I would have defended to the finish

its right to elect its own President. I defend that right tonight and I know that my colleagues will support me.

The Hon. G. F. KENEALLY: I do not underestimate the conviction with which the honourable member puts her case, despite the fact that she does not do me the honour of granting me the same sort of conviction when I put to the Committee the Government's arguments in relation to clause 8. I am somewhat surprised about the argument put to the Committee by the honourable member. The Minister appoints five of the eight members of the original Medical Board, yet the honourable member tells the Committee that the President's position is so influential that there ought not to be any Ministerial involvement with the appointment of President. However, the honourable member accepts that the Minister should have the right to appoint five of the eight members of the Medical Board, and in the previous Government the Hon. Mrs Adamson herself would have been the Minister. I do not think that the honourable member's argument can be sustained. There is an obvious inconsistency. The reason why my colleague in another place insists on this proposition has less to do with a philosophical desire to contract all the powers of statutory bodies, and so on, within a central structure; it is a desire for consistency to flow through all Government appointments and all Government boards.

This Medical Board has wide powers and peer review; I accept that. Nevertheless, it has been the practice of Governments since time immemorial, and it is certainly the practice of this Government, that it exercise its right in Government to make appointments. The honourable member seemed to suggest that any Minister might override the recommendation of the board. That is always arguable. I cannot speak for Ministers in other Governments, but I think it is fairly clear that this Minister in this Government has given to the House a clear indication that he will consider carefully the recommendations that flow from the Medical Board in determining the President of that Board. There is obviously a difference of opinion here that will be difficult to resolve. I assure the Committee that it is the Government's intention to hold fast on this amendment, to oppose clause 8 and, at the appropriate time, to move for the insertion of a new clause.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Minister referred to the five nominees of the Minister. He knows that one of those nominees is a legal practitioner and one a lay person, so there are three medical people on the board, one of whom is an officer of the South Australian Health Commission. The experience as far back as I can discover is that that person has not, in the past, been appointed as President by his peers on the board.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: I am not suggesting that.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I would not expect a Minister to appoint that person as President of the board because of the weight of his responsibilities as a senior officer of the commission. Therefore, we are left with two medical practitioners, one of whom—

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member misunderstands what I am saying. I was not saying that the Minister would necessarily appoint any one of those five members as President. I am saying that on an important board of this nature the honourable member has already conceded the Minister the right to appoint five of the board members, so the argument is consistent with his desire to influence the selection.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I take the Minister's point, but believe that he is missing mine. His raising the number of five members is irrelevant to the argument because two of the board members are not eligible to be appointed as President and one is unlikely, for the reasons I have given, to be appointed as President. Certainly the Minister has a right substantially to influence the composition of the board, because he appoints the majority of the nominees. I accept that argument. However, I say that, having appointed those nominees and the other nominees having been appointed by the University of Adelaide, Flinders University and the A.M.A., that group collectively should have the right to appoint their leader because of the nature of the function of the board.

It is late, and the Opposition is not going to win this argument. I believe that we have moral right on our side and, as I said earlier, I am sorry that a long-standing tradition will be broken. The Minister spoke of Governments having the right to appoint Presidents from time immemorial. We are presently repealing an Act that came into being in 1919. I do not know whether that can be described as 'time immemorial', but since 1919 the Medical Board has had the right to elect its own President. When the Minister's colleagues come into the House to vote in favour of this amendment, they will no longer have that right. I believe that that is a sad day for medicine in South Australia and I very much regret the Government's decision in this matter. The Opposition opposes the amendment.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause 8 stand as printed. Those of that opinion say 'Aye', and those against say 'No'. I believe the Noes have it.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Mr Acting Chairman, I want to divide on this clause, but I believed that you would be putting an amendment and that the division would be on that. Do we divide on both?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: An honourable member can call for a division on both. However, if an honourable member wants to divide on clause 8 it is on whether it should stand.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I would ask you to accept my call of 'Divide'. I thank the Chair for its indulgence.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (19)—Mrs Adamson (teller), Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally (teller), Klunder, McRae, Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Whitten.

Pair—Aye—Mr Evans. No—Ms Lenehan.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Clause thus negatived.

New clause 8—'The President.'

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

After clause 7, insert new clause as follows:

> The Minister shall, after consultation with the board, appoint one of the members of the board who is a medical practitioner to be the President of the board.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I oppose the new clause. The reasons for our opposition to it have already been stated.

New clause inserted.

Remaining clauses (9 to 77) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 4 May at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 3 May 1983

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SALARY TRANSFERS

68. **Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many primary school salaries were transferred to secondary schools in 1983 and why did this occur?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In February 1983, 25.1 primary school salaries were identified to be used as secondary school salaries. Following representations from a number of the identified primary schools to the Minister of Education, this number was reduced to 16.2 salaries. The Government undertook to maintain teacher numbers at 1982 levels for 1983. This required 231 extra salaries beyond those initially provided for in the 1982-1983 Budget. The additional salaries were allocated taking into account the Education Department's estimates of enrolments for 1983. The majority were allocated to primary schools. Actual school enrolments at the start of this year showed unexpected growth in secondary schools. It was therefore necessary to slightly modify the allocations to primary and secondary to respond to these needs.

CAMPUS CONCERTS

72. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many arrests have been made and charges laid against persons attending each of the concerts at Underdale C.A.E. Campus during the past 12 months?

2. What were the nature of complaints and reasons for arrests?

3. How many police officers and other persons were injured and sought medical attention?

4. Has the Police Commissioner given any reports to the Minister concerning these concerts and, if so, what have been his recommendations?

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

1. Only one concert has been held at the Underdale C.A.E. Campus during the past 12 months, namely, on 25 February 1983 when one person was apprehended near the campus, having attended the concert. He was charged with offensive behaviour.

A cabaret was held at the college on 19 September 1982 by the South Adelaide Football Club when police arrested 20 people charging them with a total of 31 offences.

2. Reasons for the arrests included:

drunkenness	1
cease loitering	6
hindering, assaulting, resisting police	15
escaping custody	1
offensive language	2
disorderly behaviour	3
common assault	2
possess Indian Hemp	1

All offenders were arrested to preserve the peace of the area and to prevent continuing offences.

On 19 September 1982, 30 complaints, all concerning excessive noise coming from the premises, were received.

3. No injuries by police or other persons necessitating medical attention are recorded on either occasion.

4. Neither of the incidents referred to were considered to justify a special police report to the Minister. Members of the Noise Abatement Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning were in attendance at the concert on 25 February 1983.

MOTOR VEHICLE TAXES AND STAMP DUTIES

73. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Are receipts of motor vehicle taxes and stamp duties on budget and if not, why not?

2. Did a motor vehicle manufacturer or retailers pre-register motor vehicles before obtaining contracts for sale and, if so—

(a) who were they;

(b) how many motor vehicles were involved;

(c) what was the amount involved;

(d) why did this occur;

(e) what action was taken to detect this practice; and

(f) what action, if any, can be taken to prevent a repetition?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. Revenues from motor vehicle taxes (registration fees and drivers licences) are expected to be about $1 300 000 above budget as a result of greater than anticipated revenues from new and provisional licences.

With regard to stamp duties, there are some large lump sum transactions (e.g. on insurance business) which tend to distort the position during the year. The present expectation is that revenues will be below budget by about $2 000 000, largely as a result of depressed levels of activity for property transactions.

2. It is usual for manufacturers and dealers of motor vehicles to register large numbers of vehicles in their name for purposes of demonstration and sales. The number registered during December, 1982, was much greater than usual.

(a) While many dealers were involved, the major dealers were:

John H. Ellers Pty. Ltd.
United Motors Retail Ltd.
Claridge Motors Pty. Ltd.
Gilbert Motor Pty. Ltd.
Smith Motor Co. Pty. Ltd.
City Holden
Plaza Holden
Dutton Motors Pty. Ltd.
General Motor's Holdens Ltd. was also involved.

(b) 783 applications to register new vehicles.

(c) $21 000 plus third party insurance.

(d) From information available it would appear to have been a manufacturer promoted scheme in association with the dealer network to inflate new car sales statistics for 1982.

(e) The Motor Registration Division as part of its normal monitoring processes was aware of excessive new vehicle registration applications by dealers and subsequent applications for cancellation of those registrations.

(f) It is felt this was a one-off exercise because of the vehicle market position in 1982 and not likely to reoccur. Discussions have been held with dealer representatives from the S.A.A.C.C. with respect to monetary penalties for future occurrences. The Motor Registration Division will continue to monitor registration applications lodged by dealers.

COLLEGE CONCERT

82. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. Was a concert held on the grounds at the Underdale Campus on Saturday 26 February 1983?

2. Did members of the Noise Monitoring Unit attend and, if so, what was the result of their findings?

3. How many complaints were received from local residents by police, the college and Noise Monitoring Unit members about the excessive noise emanating from the concert during the evening?

4. In which suburbs did the complainants reside?

5. Did the Minister give his approval for the concert and, if so, why, when complaints and trouble had occurred previously?

6. What protection will residents be given in future concerning conduct and noise levels at concerts at the Underdale C.A.E. Campus?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. No. However, the question no doubt refers to a concert held at the Underdale Campus on Friday 25 February 1983.

2. Yes. The measurements taken showed that the noise was in excess of the noise levels recommended for the area.

3. Seven complaints were received by the Noise Abatement Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning, 30 by the Port Adelaide police and approximately 15 by the college.

4. Complaints received by the Noise Abatement Branch orginated from Lockleys and Flinders Park suburbs.

5. Yes. Resulting from apologies given by the college following complaints about a similar concert held in 1981, an undertaking to contain the noise of any future concerts at levels tolerable to neighbours and to cease all music by 11.00 p.m. and because a similar function in relation to the Orientation Fair held in 1982 generated no complaints, approval was granted. Factors affecting the granting of an exemption for this year's concert given that some concerts in the community are reasonable were:

(i) The absence of any complaints following the 1982 concert.

(ii) A statement given by the Orientation Show Director that arrangements had been made to ensure the noise levels from the band would be acceptable for surrounding residents and that reasonable care would be taken by the organisers.

(iii) That there was only one concert conducted each year and that it finish at a reasonable time.

(iv) The exemption stipulated that the concert would cease at 11.00 p.m.

6. As the noise levels monitored by the Noise Abatement Branch indicated that the concert may not have been arranged in accordance with the commitments given to both the residents and the Department of Environment and Planning, notices under section 10(1) of the Noise Control Act have been served on the Underdale Students Union Inc. and the management of the college. The notices require that all future outdoor functions comply with the noise levels prescribed under the Act. Exemptions will not be granted in future unless detailed plans are submitted by the organisers substantiating their ability to achieve disciplined noise control.

COUNSELLORS AND TEACHERS

91. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

In relation to school counsellors—

(a) are all of them trained personnel officers;

(b) are there any who are teachers allocated just another job;

(c) is it a fact that some are teachers who have done a special course or special training;

(d) what qualifications are required;

(e) how many are employed by the Education Department and which high schools have them; and

(f) have some high schools more than one on their staff and, if so, which schools and how many do they have?

2. How many Aboriginal people are employed as teachers in Government schools, at which schools are they employed and how many are at each?

3. How many Aboriginal people are working in Government schools as career counsellors and at which schools are they working?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. *(a)* None of them are expected to be, in an industrial sense 'trained personnel officers'. All, however, fulfil some of the functions of careers officers, but they are dependent upon the Commonwealth Employment Service and the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations for the provision of up-to-date data on employment possibilities.

(b) In a few small high schools (400 or less students) and a few area schools there are no senior student counsellor appointments. In such schools it is necessary for principals to allocate career advice or student counselling duties to appropriate teachers as an extra duty.

(c&d) Most of the current 137 senior student counsellors have undertaken part-time, unpaid, inservice courses in their own time. Many have completed the Diploma in Education Counselling approved by the S.A. Institute of Technology. There is no specific pre-service requirement for specialised training. Counsellors are appointed by open advertisement, they must have least six years teaching experience and are recruited from among very highly regarded teachers with proven records of effective student and staff relationships in school leadership and evidence of high integrity and powers of judgement. Relevant academic experience is an advantage but not a pre-requisite. Competition for appointment is very high.

(e&f) (Refer attached list)

2. Fourteen Aboriginal people are employed as teachers in the following Government schools:

Amata Aboriginal School
Ceduna Area School
Moorak Primary School
Kingston Area School
Pennington Primary School
Munno Para Primary School
North Adelaide Primary School
Port August Primary School
Taperoo Primary School
Yalata Aboriginal School
Ernabella Aboriginal School
Glossop High School
Elizabeth Downs Junior Primary School
Pennington Primary School

3. There are no Aboriginal people working in Government schools as career counsellors.

SCHOOL ASSISTANTS

97. **Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Minister reverted to the 1979 staffing formula for school assistants and, if so, how many additional staff have been appointed and what is the total cost of this initiative?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes. This has resulted in 123 full time equivalent staff being appointed (School Assistants). The total cost for the 1982/83 financial year is $795 000.

WATER FILTRATION

122. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What is the estimated cost and proposed timetable for the complete filtration of the Adelaide water supply, and what is the estimated annual cost per ratepayer (that is, component included in rates) for the work to date on the filtration system?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The estimated capital cost for complete filtration of the Adelaide water supply is $164 000 000 using 1982-83 values for future expenditure. It is expected that the complete filtration programme will be completed in the early 1990's, depending on Commonwealth funding. The estimated annual average cost per metropolitan ratepayer for the work to date on the filtration system is $29 as at last financial year (1981-82).

LAND TAX

124. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What is the estimated revenue to be derived in 1982-83 from land tax, and what is the total cost of collection (that is, salaries, postage and computer expenditure)?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Estimated revenue to be derived in 1982-83 from land tax is $23 800 000. Estimated cost of collection is $1 060 000.

O'BAHN

129. **Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister give an undertaking that the whole O'Bahn project from the City of Adelaide to Tea Tree Plaza will be completed by 1986 and, if not, why has the Government decided to defer parts of the project?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: No. The Government wishes to further review the merit of the section between Darley Road and Tea Tree Plaza before reaching a decision on the completion of the whole route.

130. **Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: When will the Minister decide what type of track will be used in the O'Bahn project for the Darley Road to Tea Tree Plaza section and why has he been unable to make a decision on this in the past 4 months?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: A decision on the busway section between Darley Road and Tea Tree Plaza is expected during 1984. This matter requires careful review and the programme for construction does not require such a decision to be made immediately.

PLANNING ACT

135. **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. How many submissions have been received by the review committee appointed to oversee the implementation of the new Planning Act and associated regulations?

2. Has the time now lapsed for submissions to be made to that committee and, if not, what is the closing date?

3. Will the Minister make available to the Opposition a copy of the initial report from the committee which is expected to be completed in April and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. 73.

2. The closing date was 25 February 1983. However, as many of the submissions received after that date have comment of great value, all submissions received are being considered.

3. This matter will be raised with the committee at the appropriate time.

MOUNT LOFTY BOTANIC GARDEN

136. **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: What process will be adopted in formulating plans to re-develop the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden following the damage caused by fire on 16 February?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The staff, administration, and board of the Botanic Gardens have made regular inspections of the damage caused by recent bushfires in Mount Lofty Botanic Garden, as well as noting evidence of fire-retardent plantings elsewhere in burnt areas of the hills. Based on available local evidence, and in conjunction with overseas information provided by a computerised library search, the following points are considered basic in formulating plans for the redevelopment of Mount Lofty Botanic Gardens:

(1) Upgrade water supply and distribution systems to extend throughout all planted parts of the garden, with greater emphasis on metal fittings.

(2) Plant 50-100 metre wide fire-retardent tree and shrub belts to better insulate botanical plant collections from fire-prone native vegetation. Fire breaks, tracks and clearings were shown to be inadequate.

(3) Cease adding to botanical collections until improved fire-protection and water supply is available. The present nursery operations will need to be redirected to the raising of large numbers of fire-retardant trees and shrubs.

(4) Maintain existing botanical collections as well as possible with existing staff and funding resources.

(5) Increase the number of knapsack fire fighting units in each section of the garden.

(6) Maintain the existing two Landcruiser fire-units and extra 'slip-on' unit, with permission being sought for the Chief Fire Officer to assume 'Fire Boss' status when Mount Lofty Botanic Garden is under fire threat.

(7) Improve radio communication system between Adelaide Botanic Gardern headquarters and Mount Lofty Botanic Garden in times of emergency.

(8) Initiate research project on comparative quantitative combustibility data for foliage samples of native and exotic plant species to more clearly determine the basis for fire-prone and fire-retardant species.

(9) Attempt to reduce fuel loads in native vegetation in the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden by slashing on a regular basis, subject to availability of manpower.

HERITAGE COMMITTEE

140. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Have there been any changes in the membership of the South Australian Heritage Committee since the change of Government and, if so—

(a) what are they;

(b) why were they necessary; and

(c) if new members have been appointed, what interest does each represent and why was each selected?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes.

(a) Resulting from vacancies arising from the resignations of Mr J. Smyth at the expiration of his appointment and Mr R. Cook, Mrs J. Brine and Mr V. McLaren were appointed to the South Australian Heritage Committee.

(b) vide (a)

(c) The new appointees were selected for their proven competence and experience in heritage conservation matters. Mrs J. Brine is Senior Lecturer in Architecture at the Uni-

versity of Adelaide and, as a member of the Commonwealth Inquiry into the National Estate and the Interim Committee on the National Estate and more recently a founding member of the South Australian Heritage Committee, she brings wide experience in architectural and heritage conservation matters at national and State levels to the committee. Mr V. McLaren is a grazier from the South-East of the State, who, as a trustee of the World Wildlife Fund and a council member of the National Trust of South Australia, brings wide experience in conservation of the natural environment and heritage conservation in rural areas to the committee.

A.B.R.D. ROAD FUNDS

143. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What is the forward programme for A.B.R.D. road funds in the respective categories of allotment?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The A.B.R.D. programme beyond 1982-83 is only indicative and to publicly reveal the contents may give false hope to proponents of particular projects. If the honourable member cares to approach me, I shall be pleased to discuss the possible programme on a confidential basis.

RYEGRASS TOXICITY

150. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What research work is being undertaken to control the spread of annual ryegrass toxicity?

2. Has the Department of Agriculture embarked on a plant breeding programme to develop an equally productive annual grass to supersede annual ryegrass and, if so, what stage has the programme reached and, if not, why not?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. A major consideration of annual ryegrass toxicity is that after introduction to an area the disease is estimated to take 10 to 20 years to build up to toxic levels. In consequence, the actual number of infected farms will be much greater than the present known distribution, and prevention of the disease's spread virtually will be impossible. Accordingly, research into A.R.G.T. by the Department of Agriculture is concerned with developing agronomic management programmes which prevent build-up of the diesease to toxic levels in infested paddocks. This approach will help reduce the rate of spread of A.R.G.T. and the programme, which is in its fourth year, shows encouraging signs. The Department of Agriculture also is monitoring both the spread of the disease and how often infested paddocks become toxic. Currently, 465 paddocks are known to be infested, and six were reported as toxic in the 1982-83 summer period.

2. Not recently. The Department of Agriculture has examined a range of grass species from time to time during the past 50 years or so, but no reasonable prospects have been identified as an alternative to annual ryegrass.

ALLOCATION OF ROAD FUNDING

152. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What are the criteria for the allocation of road funding available to non-metropolitan councils under the Australian Bicentennial Road Development Programme?

2. How much money has been allocated to each of the district council areas in South Australia under the programme?

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

1. Funding under the Commonwealth Government's A.B.R.D. programme is allocated by road category, viz. national highway, rural arterial and local, in the case of non-metropolitan councils. A.B.R.D. national highway and rural arterial funds have been allocated to specific road projects, the projects being selected on the basis of their priority State-wide.

On the other hand, only some of the A.B.R.D. local road funds for S.A. have been allocated to specific projects, the major proportion being disbursed among councils. In the case of non-metropolitan councils, the disbursements have been made on the basis of equal weighting of a council's road length, population, area and road effort (excluding road grants).

2. At this stage, the Commonwealth Government has only approved allocations for the current financial year. The anticipated A.B.R.D. expenditure in each district council area in 1982-83 is as follows:

District Council Area	Amount $'000	District Council Area	Amount $'000
Angaston	5	Meningie	11
Balaklava	6	Millicent	9
Barmera	4	Minlaton	6
Barossa	5	Morgan	6
Beachport	6	Mount Barker	8
Berri	5	Mount Gambier	9
Blyth	4	Mount Pleasant	5
Brown's Well	8	Mount Remarkable	13
Burra Burra	58	Munno Para	29
Bute	6	Murat Bay	15
Carrieton	12	Murray Bridge	13
Central Yorke Peninsula	9	Naracoorte	359
Clare	6	Onkaparinga	7
Cleve	14	Orroroo	7
Clinton	6	Owen	4
Coober Pedy	2	Paringa	3
Coonalpyn Downs	1011	Peake	7
Crystal Brook	4	Penola	8
Dudley	2	Peterborough	8
East Torrens	6	Pinnaroo	8
Elliston	13	Pirie	6
Eudunda	6	Port Broughton	3
Franklin Harbor	9	Port Elliot & Goolwa	6
Georgetown	5	Port MacDonnell	5
Gladstone	3	Port Wakefield	3
Gumeracha	5	Redhill	4
Hallett	10	Ridley	8
Hawker	9	Riverton	4
Jamestown	6	Robe	5
Kadina	7	Robertstown	7
Kanyaka-Quorn	6	Saddleworth & Auburn	6
Kapunda	5	Snowtown	7
Karoonda-East Murray	14	Spalding	3
Kimba	10	Stirling	13
Kingscote	211	Strathalbyn	8
Lacepede	9	Streaky Bay	14
Lameroo	8	Tanunda	3
Laura	3	Tatiara	19
LeHunte	20	Truro	5
Light	8	Tumby Bay	10
Lincoln	1013	Victor Harbor	6
Loxton	11	Waikerie	10
Lucindale	7	Warooka	7
Mallala	7	Willunga	19
Mannum	5	Yankalilla	6
Meadows	230	Yorketown	6

MEDIA BLACKOUT

154. **Mr BLACKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Does the Government intend to amend the Electoral and Constitution Acts to allow for full electronic and print media coverage of State election campaigns until eight hours preceding the opening of polling booths and, if so, will campaign advertising using any media be banned on polling day until the close of the polls?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The rules covering electronic blackout on media coverage derive from the Broadcasting and Television Act, which is a Commonwealth Act. There are no amendments that can be made to the State Electoral Act or the State Constitution Act which would either extend or reduce the coverage of State election campaigns by either the electronic or the print media. The Governor-General's Speech at the opening of the 33rd Australian Parliament contained these words:

The Broadcasting and Television Act will be amended to remove the ban on political news and comment applying to radio and television stations in the three days before Federal and State elections.

CROWN LANDS

159. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. How many square kilometres of unalloted Crown lands does the Government intend to transfer to the Yalata Aboriginal Community?

2. Does the Government intend to transfer any of the unnamed conservation park?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

1. Not yet determined, but approximately 78 000 km².

2. No.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

172. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many people are employed on a permanent basis in the State Emergency Service at its headquarters and in regions, respectively, and what are the responsibilities of each?

2. What are the main responsibilities of the service?

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

1. The people employed on a permanent basis at the State Emergency Service Headquarters at present are:

The Director who is responsible for establishing and directing the development of the S.E.S. organisation in accordance with its role as determined by the State Disaster Plan and the oversight and direction of the S.E.S. response to a disaster situation.

The Staff Officer (Rescue and Communications) who is responsible to the Director for the development of a competent S.E.S. rescue and communications service based on the local units of the S.E.S. organisation within South Australia and the directing of the S.E.S. rescue and communication service in response to the dictates of any operation situation.

One Clerical Officer who provides clerical, stenographic and secretarial assistance.

There are three Regional Officers employed on a permanent basis and based at Adelaide, Murray Bridge and Port Augusta. They are responsible for the development and servicing of organisations within their regions in accordance with policy and guidelines determined by State headquarters.

2. The main responsibility of the State Emergency Service is to develop within the community a means of cohesive response by volunteers to disaster situations which extend beyond the capacity of the normal statutory services.

PRISONERS LEAVE

173. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What criteria are used to determine weekend leave for prisoners?

2. Are those prisoners who do not return to gaol following weekend leave part of the statistics which relate to escapes from the prison system and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: There are no provisions for weekend leave under the Prisons Act which is currently in force: therefore, no escapes in South Australia have occurred as a result of such leave.

WAGES PAUSE

178. **Mr BAKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What is the estimated saving in wages and salaries paid to Government employees (permanent, casual and daily paid) from the wage pause 1982-83?

2. If the pause is extended until 31 December 1983, what saving will accrue during that six months (assuming in its absence wage adjustments would be in accord with consumer price index rises and no catch up provisions existed)?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. The allowance provided in the 1982-83 Budget for salary and wage increases in 1982-83 is likely to be exceeded by some $14 000 000. To that extent, there is no saving from the wage pause. However, in the absence of the wage pause, it could have been expected that the over-run would have been greater—perhaps to the extent of a further $25 000 000 or so.

2. The extent of the savings would depend on the assumptions which are made about wage increases (and rates of inflation) in the event that the wage pause was extended until 31 December 1983. Perhaps the best indication which can be given is that a 1 per cent increase in salary and wage awards has an annual cost to the recurrent operations of the Consolidated Account of about $13 000 000.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS

181. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. How many juveniles were charged with driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs in the periods July to December 1981, January to June 1982 and July to December 1982?

2. How many of these juveniles appeared in court on charges related to these offences?

3. What were the ages of these offenders?

4. How many of these offenders were males and how many were females?

5. How many of those who appeared in court:
   (a) were placed under detention;
   (b) had their detention suspended;
   (c) were placed on a bond under supervision;
   (d) were placed on a bond;
   (e) were fined;
   (f) were discharged;
   (g) were placed under guardianship and control; and
   (h) had their licence disqualified?

6. How many of these offenders were dealt with by the Children's Aid Panel?

7. How many of these offenders had previously appeared before the Children's Aid Panel?

8. How many of these children were interstate offenders?

9. How many of those charged:
   (a) were first offenders;
   (b) were second offenders;
   (c) were third offenders; and
   (d) had offended more than three times?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The replies are as follows:

		July/Dec. 81	Jan./June 82	July/Dec. 82
1.		80	68	79
2.		80	66	79
3.	13 years	0	2	0
	14 years	3	2	0
	15 years	4	3	6
	16 years	25	24	23
	17 years	48	37	50
4.	Male	76	64	76
	Female	4	4	3
5.	*(a)*	0	0	0
	(b)	0	0	0
	(c)	0	1	4
	(d)	2	0	0
	(e)	71	63	70
	(f)	9	4	6
	(g)	0	0	0
	(h)	68	55	27
6.		0	2	0
7.		43	29	45
8.		2	1	1
9.	*(a)*	30	35	27
	(b)	13	10	17
	(c)	9	10	8
	(d)	28	13	27

HOUSE PURCHASES

182. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing: In relation to the answer to Question on Notice No. 63, in which suburbs have each of the seven detached houses and the 15 attached houses been purchased?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The seven detached houses are located at:

Modbury Heights	1
Redwood Park	1
Modbury North	2
Ridgehaven	1
Modbury	2

The 15 attached houses are part of a design and construct contract located at Holden Hill.

183. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing: In relation to the answer to Question on Notice No. 64, in which suburbs are the 126 single units, 27 detached houses, 15 attached houses and the rental stock of 128 units situated?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The properties are located in the following suburbs:

Single Units

Dernancourt	7
Holden Hill	108
Ridgehaven	1
Wynn Vale	10
	126

Purchased Houses

Holden Hill	5
Hope Valley	1
Modbury	5
Modbury North	11
Redwood Park	1
Ridgehaven	3
St. Agnes	1
	27

Attached Houses (Design and Construct)

Holden Hill	15

Cottage Flats

St. Agnes	20

GOLDEN GROVE

184. **Mr ASHENDEN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing:

1. How much land does the South Australian Housing Trust presently own in the Golden Grove development area?

2. Is it anticipated that the trust will be purchasing any additional land within the area?

3. If the trust presently owns or plans to purchase land in the area, for what specific purposes will that land be utilised?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. At present the South Australian Housing Trust does not own any land in the Golden Grove development area.

2. The trust has no specific plans at this time to acquire land in this area. However, at a later date, individual parcels of land or houses may be acquired.

3. The primary purpose of any land which might be acquired would be for the provision of housing.

TITLE SEPARATION

185. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Housing:

1. What, if any, recoupment of the cost for 'separation of title' for a duplex unit applies to a first purchaser in the event of the second unit being sold or, alternatively, does the second purchaser obtain the benefit of purchase without separation costs and what are the details in either case?

2. What consideration has been given to the South Australian Housing Trust bearing half the cost of title separation until the second sale or indefinitely and, if any, what are the details?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

1. All first purchasers of a Housing Trust unit are given a written assurance that, in the event the neighbouring unit is sold, half the costs associated with obtaining separate title will be refunded. Four such refunds have been given.

2. The media release announcing details of the proposed sales stated that calculated into the sale price would be 'any cost incurred in establishing separate title to the property'.

Had the trust been required to share the costs of obtaining separate title to the 130 units sold, at an average of $4 500 per sale, the trust would have forfeited the use of $288 000, approximately the equivalent of seven to nine new units of rental accommodation.

PUBLIC SERVICE

188. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Has there been a decline in the number of public servants under the age of 25 years during the past four years and, if so, to what extent?

2. What recruitment programme is to be undertaken to rectify this situation?

3. Has there been an increase in public servants in the 30 to 45 age grouping and, if so, to what extent?

4. Could we soon be faced with an 'ageing' Public Service and, if so, when?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. There has been a decline in the number of public servants under the age of 25 years during the past four years amounting to 1 395 persons or 38.5 per cent. The number employed in 1979 was 3 625, while in February 1983 this number had declined to 2 230 persons.

2. For several years, the Public Service Board has undertaken specific recruitment programmes to employ school-leavers. In addition, the Public Service Board is encouraging the employment of a wider group of young people to all available vacancies. Both strategies are based on a close monitoring of base-grade vacancies as they occur and a close monitoring of the changing age profile of the Public Service. The Public Service Board is examining a range of strategies for implementation in the 1983-84 financial year, designed to further extend the employment opportunities for a range of young people.

3. There has been an increase in the number of public servants in the 30 to 45 year age group during the past four years amounting to 1 249, or 27.5 per cent. The number employed in 1979 was 4 547, while in February 1983 this number had increased to 5 796 persons.

4. The Public Service Board has identified a trend towards an ageing Public Service which is related to both low levels of recruitment and to the fact that a higher proportion of older applicants is being recruited to a smaller number of vacancies. This is a current trend which will be addressed by implementation of the strategies mentioned earlier.

SPORT LOTTERY

197. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: Will the Government establish a sport lottery and, if so, when, what type of lottery and prizes will be offered and what will the price of each ticket be and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Sports lotteries are under active consideration by the Government. Details of the lotteries are yet to be determined.

EASYBET MACHINES

198. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: Has the Minister (since becoming a Minister) been invited as a guest to attend a meeting in Sydney by Automatic Totalizators Limited, at their expense, to investigate all facets of *Easybet* ticket-dispensing machines and, if so, did he attend and, if so—

(a) when;
(b) who accompanied him;
(c) what arrangements were made for a trial of the machines in South Australia;
(d) how many machines were agreed to be used on trial and at what locations;
(e) were shopping centres discussed as suitable locations and agreed upon for a trial; and
(f) did he take the opportunity to visit any other organisations including poker machine manufacturers and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Minister of Recreation and Sport was in Sydney on a matter pertaining to his water resources portfolio. While in Sydney he took the opportunity to inspect *Easybet* ticket-dispensing machines:

(a) on 8 February 1983;
(b) unaccompanied;
(c) not discussed;
(d) no arrangements were made;
(e) not discussed;
(f) no.

TREE PLANTING PROGRAMME

201. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Why was the tree planting programme along the embankment referred to as E. & W.S. Work Package 1, as part of the River Torrens Linear Park beautification, not proceeded with late last year?

2. How many trees are proposed to be planted?

3. What is the estimated cost of the trees?

4. Who supplied or will supply the trees and which varieties have been chosen?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The replies are as follows:

1. The decision not to proceed with the tree planting programme in Work Package 1 of the River Torrens Linear Park Scheme was influenced by the drought conditions, which disturbed the propogation programme of the nursery supplying the plants. The effect of this was a non availability of some species. This matter was referred to the Consultant Landscape Architect and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, relying on his expertise, accepted his recommendation to defer planting until all species were available. The Consultant Landscape Architect stated that omitting species due to an unsuccessful attempt at propogation, or accepting unsuitable species for the sake of meeting the required number of plants, would be compromising the original planting scheme and would be detrimental to the River Torrens Linear Park development.

In retrospect it would now appear that this decision was correct when considering the drought conditions of winter 1982 and the unusually hot, dry summer of 1982-83. Had the planting been carried out during the spring when originally planned, there is no guarantee that the desired rate of success would have been achieved and additional maintenance costs would have been incurred by the Government.

Planning of trees has commenced in Work Package 1 and is expected to be completed by 28 June 1983.

2. 25 930 trees and shrubs are to be planted.

3. $10 372.

4. The supplier of plant materials is *Anstey Park Nursery.* As mentioned earlier there are 25 930 plants comprising 33 species. They are as follows:

Species

Acacia pendula
Acacia pycnantha
Acacia rotundifolia
Acacia stenophylla
Baeckea behrii
Callistemon macropunctatus
Callistemon salignus
Callistris preissii
Cassia artemesiodes
Cassia nemophylla
Casuarina meullarana
Casuarina nana
Casuarina stricta
Correa reflexa
Eremophila longifolia
Eutaxia myrtifolia
Eucalyptus camaldulensis
Eucalyptus cladocalyx
Eucalyptus largiflorens
Eucalyptus odorata
Eucalyptus platypus
Grevillea lavandulacea
Hymenosporum flavum
Melaleuca decussata
Melaleuca halmaturorum
Melaleuca lancelata
Melaleuca wilsonii
Myoporum insulare
Myoporum montanum
Myoporum parvifolium
Pittosporum phylliraeoides
Phragmites australis syn. P. communis
Typha augustifolia