HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 1 April 1987

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

PETITION: JUBILEE POINT

A petition signed by 149 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government not to proceed with the Jubilee Point project was presented by Ms Gayler.

Petition received.

QUESTION

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

GRAND PRIX BETTING

In reply to the **Hon. J.W. SLATER** (26 November).

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Turnover on the 1986 Australian Formula One Grand Prix was $168 507.50. This was received from the following bet types:

	$
Betting on the final result before grid positions known	17 729.50
Betting on the final result after grid positions known	105 887.00
Progressive betting on positions at end of	
20 laps	10 958.50
40 laps	5 654.50
60 laps	6 146.00
82 laps	22 132.00
TOTAL	168 507.50

This turnover was derived from:

Off-course telephone betting sales	19 165.00
Off-course cash betting sales	63 412.50
On-course cash betting sales (Grand Prix circuit)	85 930.00
TOTAL	168 507.50

Betting on the Grand Prix produced good value dividends, including a trifecta payout of $607.90 for betting on the final result after grid positions were known. A total of $133 241.40 was returned to clients in dividends. It is considered that the turnover achieved, comparable to an average Victorian Tuesday or Thursday race meeting, was most satisfactory for the first effort. This view is supported by many South Australians, interstate and overseas visitors who complimented S.A. TAB on Grand Prix betting operations.

Because this year was the first time South Australian TAB has operated on the Grand Prix many of the decisions were made on educated guesses, including the cost estimates which were in excess of management's. For this reason, a number of teething problems or opportunities for improvement were identified for example, progressive betting at the end of 20, 40, 60 and 82 laps proved confusing for some light/occasional users of TAB services. However, regular TAB clients understood this method of betting clearly and capitalised on it as indicated by the dividends paid for Keke Rosberg at the end of 20, 40 and 60 laps:

	Win $	Place $
20 laps	11.80	1.85
40 laps	1.55	.50
60 laps	.75	.50

A number of opportunities for improvement will be given serious consideration including:

—betting on the fastest lap during the Grand Prix;
—betting on final grid positions;
—providing only two progressive lap betting opportunities instead of four;
—special Grand Prix betting tickets to make the placing of bets easier;
—fewer selling outlets to be established within the Grand Prix circuit;
—fewer agencies to be opened for selling on the actual day of the Grand Prix.

COSTS

The costs incurred by TAB in providing a Grand Prix betting service are as follows:

	$	$
Agencies		
Wages (incl. staff overheads)	4 630	
Tickets	101	
Light/power	100	4 831
Telephone betting		
Wages (incl. staff overheads)	1 951	
Light/power	50	2 001
Computer operations/raceday control		
Wages (incl. staff overheads)	687	
Light/power	50	737
On track operations		
Wages (incl. staff overheads)	2 691	
Telecom/datel line		
—Installation	1 170	
—Rent	52	
Technical support	165	
Selling site facilities	2 201	6 279
Advertising/promotion costs		9 662
Total		23 510

The above costs have been audited and verified by the Auditor-General's Department and the Board's Audit and Efficiency Department.

DISTRIBUTION OF NET PROFIT

The following table indicates the overall financial result achieved from Grand Prix betting in 1986. In accordance with the Act for totalizator betting on other sporting events, the Government directed that on this occasion the net profit be distributed on the basis of 50 per cent being paid to the Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board and the remaining 50 per cent to the recreation and sport fund.

	$
Turnover	168 507
Income (20 per cent)	33 701
Allocation of income	
TAB capital fund (1 per cent)	1 685
TAB operating expenses	23 510
Payment to:	
Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board	4 253
Recreation and sport fund	4 253
Total	33 701

By providing a betting service on the 1986 Australian Formula One Grand Prix it is considered that SA TAB's image and credibility was improved immensely which is an excellent result but obviously this attitude cannot be quantified in dollar terms. Because the service was attractive to the public of South Australia, management considers that a betting service on the 1987 Grand Prix is desirable.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions, I have to advise that questions which would otherwise be directed to the Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries and Minister of Recreation and Sport will be taken by the Minister of Labour.

PUBLIC ASSETS

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier confirm that the Government has commissioned a leading Sydney banker and broker and appointed a committee of senior public servants to provide advice on selling off public assets? Information provided to the Opposition from a range of sources in the public and private sectors suggests that the Government's hidden agenda to sell public assets is an extensive one. I have been reliably informed that a committee comprising the head of the Woods and Forests Department (Mr South) and two senior public servants has been appointed to provide further advice on what has been termed 'the commercialisation' of Government activities. I have also been informed that the leading Sydney banker and broker Dominguez Barry Samuel Montagu Limited has been providing specific advice to the Government on the future of the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation and the Woods and Forests Department. In fact, within the last month a director of the bank has visited Adelaide to discuss these proposals with the Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In answer to the question, no, I will not confirm those things because they are not true. But I will put the factual position before the House because, as usual, the Leader of the Opposition has got half-baked information, he has confused a number of things that are happening and he has got it wrong. It does not worry the Opposition—its members are happy to get to their feet as the member for Light did yesterday—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Not at all.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The member for Light was right about one thing—the piece of material he had in his hand. He was wrong on every other particular.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the House to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member had a right to interject. He was one of many, and I should not single him out. To get to the point of the question, first, yes, certainly the Government has had a group with which Mr Peter South, head of the Woods and Forests Department, has been engaged, looking at the question of commercialisation of Government activities.

Let me explain what that means. It means identifying those skills, services, intellectual property and other resources that the Government has and trying to make some money out of them by ensuring that we can use them for profit for the State. A classic example of the way in which this is being done is through the organisation known as Sagric, which is a company that operates in the international market very successfully. It is an instrumentality of the State Government. It has some private sector advice. It works with the private sector but Sagric is using those resources and skills that we employ in the public sector.

There are many opportunities for this and, if we can earn money for South Australia because we have experts, for instance, in water, sewerage, quality control, agriculture and a whole series of areas, we will do it. Another good example is the Land Ownership and Tenure System.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Just listen to this first and I will tell you about Woods and Forests. The Land Ownership and Tenure System, which won an international award, has been developed in our own Lands Titles Office in the Department of Lands. We are able to market that technology and earn money to defray the expenses of the State. Many such opportunities exist. They have not been properly developed. That is a matter of high level investigation.

Secondly, there is also an exercise being conducted under the aegis of the State Development Department, which has called on the skills of the Dominguez Barry Samuel Montagu group to try to identify certain strategic areas in South Australia's economy that we believe should be providing greater control for South Australia, providing greater activity on the South Australian base.

For too long we have seen businesses pack up and leave this State and go elsewhere. We became known under the Tonkin Government as a branch office State. We believe that that must stop and it can only stop through a combination of public and private activity. For instance, in the banking and financial sector there has been this Government's action in amalgamating the State Bank and approving that the bank acquire a holding in Beneficial Finance, acquiring a 50 per cent share in S.V.B. Day Porter, a trustee company. All of these things have been done to strengthen the base of that bank, and most of them with either grudging acceptance or criticism of the Opposition.

Again, in the private sector, the Standard Chartered Bank has established its headquarters here. That is just one example in one area. We believe there are many more opportunities for South Australians and South Australian companies and, as part of our State development strategy, we are hiring the best brains in the country to see just how the Government can work with the private sector. It just shows how totally out of touch the Opposition is with business activities in this country, and in this State in particular, if it raises questions in the way that it has.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House is aware that the Chair exercises a certain amount of tolerance towards interjections. However, the Chair will expect the Leader of the Opposition to set a better example to other members because of his position of leadership.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Premier give the House an indication of his intention regarding the future of the South Australian Film Corporation? My question has been prompted by my interest in the corporation, which all members know I am proud to have in my electorate, and more particularly by an article in the *Financial Review* of 23 March which stated that it was the intention of the Federal Opposition to abolish the Australian Film Corporation. It has been said to me on a number of occasions that the State Opposition has been strangely silent on this issue.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thank the honourable member for his question and can certainly assure him that, whatever Mr Howard intends to do if he ever gets the opportunity (and I think that is most unlikely), we intend to continue with the South Australian Film Corporation and attempts to secure and develop South Australia's role in this very important industry for Australia. We do that in cooperation with the Australian Film Commission and private sector film makers. Our film fund, which was established recently to pick up the non-deductable items on certain film projects, has proved extremely successful. The fact that we have a base through the Government's South Australian Film Corporation has made all of that possible. Without it there would be no or perhaps at most a residual film industry only in South Australia. That is not idle boasting; the facts are there.

One of the real feathers in our cap has not received much reporting recently, and that was the decision by Lorimar Telepictures Productions (producers of *Dallas*) to do a pilot

shooting in the Barossa Valley of South Australia of a new American television series which was to be set in the Napa Valley of California. In fact, if the series goes into production in the United States it will be a wholly United States production, but in the search for a location in which to make a pilot where there were skills, techniques and the right sort of topography, background and climate, South Australia was chosen by this particular group. The pilot was made, using 65 local cast and crew. Over $1.6 million was spent in South Australia in goods, services and salaries.

The South Australian Film Corporation's Hendon studio facilities were hired to allow this to take place. Without the assistance of that studio that would not have occurred. In fact, I have had a letter from Lorimar indicating how spectacular its success was here, and this has alerted it to the opportunities that await film makers in South Australia, and the word will be spread around California.

As well as that, the SAFC is using its studio facilities to invest in three major interstate films which are in the post production stage at the moment—*The Initiation*, *The Time Guardian* and *The Lighthorsemen*. Of the $21 million total production budgets for those films (they are not corporation films, but they are using corporation facilities) half has been spent in South Australia. There have been local independent film industry projects—*Sebastian and the Sparrow* (a tele feature), *Point of Departure* (a dramatised documentary) and *The Dreaming* (a feature which will commence production in the second half of this year). There have been two other independent films—*Fever* and *Pals*.

There has been considerable activity during the past 12 months. The sound department of the Film Corporation, which is regarded as the best of its kind in Australia, is attracting business from all over the country. Again, that is an example of what is known as commercialisation. Instead of using that sound stage for the Film Corporation's own productions, we hire it out, using our skills and expertise to earn money for the corporation and the State. Over the next three months four films will be mixed, with more to be mixed as well—*The Time Guardian*, *The Lighthorsemen*, *Warm Nights on a Slow Moving Train*, *Vincent* (an important new film from Paul Cox), *The Shiralee* and *Point of Departure*. They are all being done in that sound stage, as well as the documentary productions that are going on.

Incidentally, shortly after *The Shiralee*—which will be a four hour mini series ready for delivery to both the Seven network and the BBC who have taken up that product—is completed, a pre-production of *Starship Home* will commence. This is an eight hour television series for the family audience and, although it has not been produced yet, it already has advance sales totalling two-thirds of its $4 million budget from the Nine network and Revcom Television overseas. So, members can see how important the Film Corporation is at the base of an industry that is earning money for South Australia.

SAOG

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: My question is directed to the Premier. How much is the Government paying for the advice from the Sydney merchant bank in relation to privatising—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: —or commercialising, as he calls it, part or all of SAOG, and will the Premier table all relevant documents to show the brief that the Sydney merchant bank has in giving its advice to the Government?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: In the Department of State Development lines there are provisions for consultancies to be undertaken. In fact, we have a series of them through any year over a range of matters. As the honourable member would be aware—and I am interested in the source of his advice—a local consultancy company or the local division of a consultancy company here in South Australia has had a lot to do with advising State Development on various possibilities. As far as the Dominguez relationship is concerned, I have already explained that they have been hired by the Department of State Development on a consultancy basis to look at a whole range of opportunities that we may have in this State, and SAOG could well be part of those opportunities.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As to the second part of the question—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Of course, there are so many major areas whereby we can get advantage for South Australia. As to setting out the brief and other details at this stage in that way, of course not. What does the Opposition want to do—have us negotiate in the market with our hands tied behind our back? Totally destroy our commercial viability? Do they really want to run South Australia aground? They have already cost us almost $50 million possibly in the last week. I hope you are proud of yourselves!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition to order.

SUBMARINE PROGRAM

Mr RANN: Can the Premier please tell the House of the status of a study which has been reported in the interstate media showing that Newcastle, in New South Wales, would be a better site than Adelaide for the construction of the $2.6 billion submarine replacement program? A report by Dr Rob Jensen, commissioned by the New South Wales Submarine Task Force, has received some coverage interstate, claiming that construction of the submarines in Newcastle would generate more economic activity than construction at Port Adelaide. It has been put to me by people involved in the electronics industry in my electorate that such a study is part of an attempt to undermine South Australia's position in bidding for this important submarine contract. It has been put to me further that another study has shown that some of the claims made by Dr Jensen are false and that this should be made public.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I appreciate the honourable member's question, because it is certainly correct, as he says, that Dr Jensen has carried out a study into the effects of construction of submarines in New South Wales and South Australia. This has been fairly widely reported on. Incidentally, the study was commissioned by the New South Wales Submarine Task Force to add some boost to the flagging campaign of New South Wales for this project.

It is also correct that media reports have emphasised that the New South Wales study is proof that New South Wales would be a better site than South Australia. That is just plainly not correct, and Dr Trevor Mules, Director of the South Australian Centre of Economic Studies, has issued a detailed report in refutation of Dr Jensen's claims. I might add that much of Dr Jensen's work has relied on work that Mules himself has done, methodologies that he has devised, as he is a world authority in this area. Mules has criticised the methodology used by Jensen and many of his assump-

tions. I think that refutation is clear but complex. Therefore, I do not intend to go into detail in the House, but certainly we can make available copies if the honourable member or other members are interested.

However, the important point brought out by the member's question is that the study shows that other States have not given up hope of the submarine project. There is an alarming tendency in South Australia to believe that it is in the bag, that we have got it or that we are there. That is not true and, until the decision is actually made by the Federal Government (and I hope that that will be soon), we cannot rest or relax in our efforts to ensure that South Australia stays right at the forefront of consideration. We have done all the groundwork, established a sound case and have certainly won the confidence of the two contractors which are bidding for the project, but that does not in any way mean that we can put it in the bag. On the contrary, pressures are certainly showing, as the publication of this study indicates, from other States, in particular New South Wales, to make a last minute run or bid for the project.

I conclude by saying that it is in that context that it is disappointing to note the gratuitous remarks reportedly made by the Leader of the Opposition. They may not have been correctly reported, as the venue was somewhere in Clarendon and perhaps the transmission distorted them. However, in a speech the Leader bemoaned the terrible state of the South Australian economy and selectively cited export statistics. Incidentally, he did not make clear that those statistics related to value rather than volume, and we all know what has happened, for instance, to barley prices internationally. To say that barley prices have fallen to a record low says nothing about the export efforts being made by this State. Again, I do not wish to weary the House with an analysis. I am quite happy to do so, if invited by the Opposition.

In this quoting of selective statistics the honourable member referred rather derisively to our efforts in the submarine project, saying that we had to raise our periscope above it, and so on. I find that an alarming attitude to a project the benefits of which go beyond the direct jobs that it provides. It is seen very much indeed as a symbol of how South Australia can do something and as a rejuvenation of our industrial base, with hi-tech industries and the sort of companies to which the honourable member referred benefiting from it. I hope that throw-away lines of that kind, which can only give heart to our opponents in New South Wales and elsewhere, can be resisted by the Leader of the Opposition. I know that it is a fairly vain hope, but I nonetheless make the plea.

SAOG

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Has the Premier had discussions in the last month with a director of Dominguez Barry Samuel Montagu Ltd specifically about SAOG and the Government's intention in relation to the future of SAOG, and will he say how that lines up with the statement made by him at the time of the last election that 'plans to sell off the public share of the Cooper Basin would destabilise our energy future"?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Plans to sell off our share would indeed destabilise our energy future. I stand by that statement, and it remains my Government's policy. I have not had discussions with the director of Dominguez about that matter.

BUS SHELTER

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Transport request the State Transport Authority to relocate a bus stop on Kelly Road, Modbury North? A constituent has previously requested that the bus stop and shelter opposite his house be moved less than 50 metres south on Kelly Road. Some time ago he requested this, but the STA declined to do it. My constituent has advised me that prior to the request and since then—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would appreciate it if members would not make interjections of that low calibre.

Mr GREGORY: I will start again. Some time ago he requested that the stop be moved, but the STA declined to do so. My constituent has advised me that the shelter is used as a stop by persons on the way home from the pub. This has resulted in litter such as broken bottles on the service road, empty bottles in his garden, damage to the bodywork of his van and a broken rear window of his van caused when a bottle was thrown through it.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the member for his question. I do not have the details of the previous request that was made to the STA by the member's constituent. I certainly take note of the member's question, and I will have the State Transport Authority investigate the matter to see whether the stop might be more appropriately placed elsewhere or whether the present site is the best place for the services that are provided. In any event, I will obtain an urgent report for the member and the House.

PREMIER'S REPLY

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Will the Premier explain what he meant when in answer to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition he claimed that the Opposition had cost the Government $50 million in the past week?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I said it was possible that the Opposition had cost the Government $50 million.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Members opposite were so busy interjecting that they did not hear what I said, so I will explain my remark. I have already referred in this Chamber to the ETSA transactions, which were misrepresented by members opposite. During the course of that I referred to the fact that certain transactions had not been concluded and said that using the matter as a political football, which was an attempt to breach commercial confidentiality, meant that some investors might simply be interested in taking their money elsewhere. It is that which will cost us probably $50 million. In fact, that is probably an underestimate, and over time it may be much more than that.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Explain the deal to the public.

The SPEAKER: Order!

SACON

Mr ROBERTSON: Can the Minister of Housing and Construction provide the House with an update on the efforts of the newly formed Sacon in attracting interest from interstate and overseas concerns for projects that will benefit South Australia's construction sector? In the Department of

Housing and Construction report of November last year the following reference is made to housing and construction:

The department is progressively seeking to increase its support to the State's building and construction industry by working in conjunction with private firms and other agencies.

In the light of that report, how is the project going and what has happened to Sacon in the meantime?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It always gives me much pleasure to respond to a positive question in this House during Question Time. Unfortunately, questions from members opposite are always fairly negative, and sometimes I am not asked a question at all. Sacon was registered as a business name by the Department of Housing and Construction in September 1986 with the object of helping the local building and construction industry to obtain and carry out work within and beyond the boundaries of this State. Since the name's registration, the department has assisted firms in the private sector to submit offers for consulting work in a number of overseas countries. Currently, an officer of the Department of Housing and Construction is on assignment in Tonga in a joint venture with the Adelaide consulting firm Pak-Poy and Kneebone to carry out a study of that country's Department of Public Works. This project is funded by the Australian Development Assistance Bureau and was won against considerable competition from overseas and within Australia.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Commercialisation.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, it could be seen as commercialisation, using the talents of the public sector in this State to benefit the people of South Australia. A number of other offers have been made to undertake assignments in conjunction with private sector firms, and these opportunities are being actively pursued. Some proposals are instigated by Sacon and others by the private sector firms which recognise the assistance that Sacon can provide. The Australian Trade Commission is already helping to publicise Sacon through its Commissioners around the world.

Sacon is a public-private sector partnership working in the interests of the State. The Department of Housing and Construction, at the request of the Government, is not simply playing the passive role of a source of contracts for the private industry. It is generating additional work for the industry by seeking out potential projects elsewhere and promoting the efficiency and quality of workmanship that exists in our State.

GRAND PRIX CONTRACT

Mr BECKER: Can the Premier clear up mounting speculation about the engineering management contract for the Grand Prix? It has been put to me that Barnard Project Management Limited was prepared to undertake this contract for $270 000. However, the Grand Prix Board has awarded the contract to Kinhill Stearns under terms which I am informed are likely to cost the board $600 000. While I make no reflection on either of these South Australian companies in raising this question, this particular contract has become the subject of a great deal of speculation in business and media circles, and it would therefore be helpful if the Premier was prepared to make a full statement about the matter.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Contracting is, of course, handled by the Grand Prix Board, which has the statutory responsibility to do so. As I understand it, Mr Barnard, who was originally employed on a contractual basis with the board and seconded from his company, went into private business. On that basis the Grand Prix Board, quite rightly, said that it would be only reasonable to tender for the engineering services contract (that is, call for tenders for it). This it did, and a number of tenderers, including a company with which Mr Barnard was connected, proffered their tenders. The contract, as I understand it, has been awarded to Kinhill on a competitive basis, based on an assessment of price, performance and all the other considerations that were called for in the specifications. That is where the matter rests, and I am confident that the board would have gone through the proper procedures and made the appropriate contractual award.

PORTRUSH ROAD MEDIAN STRIP

Mr GROOM: Will the Minister of Transport ensure that work commences as a matter of urgency on the construction of a raised median strip along Portrush Road, Payneham, near Marian Road? The object of such work to prevent motor vehicles from turning right from Portrush Road into Marian Road, thereby reducing traffic flow into the local area. Agreement was reached some time ago between St Peters council, Payneham council and the Highways Department over the construction of this raised median strip and the work was scheduled to be done this financial year. However, residents can obtain no clear answer that it will be done.

Traffic along Marian Road has been a serious local issue since 1980. A traffic flow study carried out in 1983 indicated 2 200 vehicles travelling the full length of Marian Road, which means that people were using it as a short cut, with 6 000 local trips and about 11 500 movements from adjoining sidestreets. Between 1980 and 1982, 65 accidents occurred and the problems have not abated: indeed, they have worsened. The problem in respect of Marian Road is that the Payneham council will not undertake further control over traffic flow along Marian Road or adjacent streets until the median strip is constructed to enable council officers to assess the benefits flowing from the restriction on traffic turning right into Marian Road. Two accidents have occurred in the past month in the western section of the road, and at least one accident has occurred in the eastern section. As the Minister will realise from my explanation, this matter is serious.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I will get an urgent report for him. As I understand the situation, that particular median strip will be dealt with, in a sense, in two parts. There has been agreement with Payneham council as to the design layout of the median strip between Payneham Road and Tarcooma Avenue, and I hope that work will start on that before the end of this financial year.

I was interested to hear the honourable member say that there had been agreement between Payneham and St Peters councils. I understand that agreement has not as yet been obtained and the department is working with both those authorities to resolve the differences that may exist, bearing in mind that the road services both councils. If early agreement can be reached and resources are available, it is hoped that that would be included in the 1987-88 financial year. The department expects at least half of the project to start this year. The second half, if agreement with the local authorities can be obtained, will start in the next financial year.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I just want to point out to the House the importance of median strips as they relate to road safety and major arterial roads.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Get on the list and ask a question. The importance of the road safety aspects of the median strip should not be underestimated, and I repeat once again for the benefit of all members who are here that it is a commitment of this Government to install medians in all metropolitan major arterials that are under the responsibility of the Highways Department.

TRANSPORT CORRIDOR

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Transport indicate precisely the procedures to be followed once the EIS, released recently on the selected option for the new transport corridor between Glen Osmond and Crafers, has been assessed by the Department of Environment and Planning? What negotiations have taken place between the State and Federal Governments on the funding of the new project? When is it expected that Federal funding will be available to enable that project to proceed? In the interim, will the Minister introduce a reduced speed limit and seek to have increased police surveillance on the existing road in an attempt to reduce the carnage on that section of road?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: To deal with the last question first, I would have thought that the honourable member himself would take up this matter with the police for the very reason that I think he would be advised that it is a difficult stretch of road to control because of the number of turns, and so on. It is difficult to get an indication of the speed limit and for police then to have to stop a vehicle on that stretch of road, which in itself creates a traffic hazard. The advice of the police to the Highways Department and to me as Minister is that it is not feasible to have police patrols stopping traffic along that stretch of road.

However, I do take the honourable member's question seriously. Motorists should treat that stretch of road with the respect that it deserves. A stretch of road that looks as if it is safe, having a very good seal and a reasonable line of sight, does not necessarily mean that that road is safe. I have said on many occasions, and I repeat now, that motorists using the Mount Barker Road should treat it with respect. It is very often the case that careless driving has been the cause of many—not all, I am prepared to concede—of the accidents on the Mount Barker Road. Some 80 per cent (I understand) of people who travel on the Mount Barker Road exceed the posted speed limits, so if we reduced the speed limit I suggest to the honourable member that we would have 100 per cent of motorists on Mount Barker Road exceeding the limit. We would then need massive police resources directed towards overcoming that problem. It is one of the reasons why we need to provide better access to Adelaide with a national highway road.

I make the point here today, because some people tend to misunderstand the logic behind the upgrading of the Mount Barker Road, that it is not a commuter road that services the people who live in the Adelaide Hills. It does, but the basic role of the national highway is to provide a commercial link between the major industrial bases in Australia—between Melbourne and Adelaide, for instance. Commuters in the Adelaide Hills will take advantage of the upgrade that will be provided by the Commonwealth Government funds. If it was not a national highway project the resources available to the State Government would be so inadequate that we would never be able to provide a new access.

The EIS will be on public display for some two months. That gives the opportunity for people such as the member for Heysen and the member for Davenport to make a submission to the EIS indicating their preferred option in relation to the number of options that are there. I would be surprised if the members do not take advantage of that and give us the benefit of their knowledge as to what they believe should be the decision that we should take; and then they will be happy to explain to the people to whom their option is likely to cause some discomfort why they prefer that option, because that is obviously a decision that the EIS and the Minister will need to make eventually.

After the period of public display, and we have had an opportunity for those affected and those with an interest to make comment to the Highways Commissioner, he will submit the recommendation to me as Minister. I will take that recommendation to Cabinet, my colleagues, and then it needs to be forwarded to the Federal Minister, who will need to approve of it because he will be supplying or providing all the funds. It is, after all, a Federal Government project and we, as the State Government and the Highways Department, are merely agents and will be in charge of the construction program, which obviously will be put to tender. It is still a fair way away from any final decision being made. The Federal Government then would be required to provide the funding in a forward funding program.

At this stage I have no idea whether the Federal Government will approve the recommendations that we forward to it. I suspect it will, and I certainly hope it will. However, it will need to meet all the environmental considerations and standards that the Commonwealth applies. The Federal Government would need to be certain that the best option has been recommended, and then provide the funds for it. In the very difficult funding situation that the Federal Government is facing, I have no idea when that will be fed into its road construction program. I am confident that we should have the earliest possible response from the Federal Government, so that somewhere around 1989 to 1990, or possibly later, that work can start. We are very much in the hands of the Federal Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

Mr M.J. EVANS: Will the Minister of Transport arrange for a full review of STA bus routes to the Lyell McEwin Hospital? The Minister will be aware that major building works had just been completed at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Many patients and their visitors travel to the hospital from throughout the northern region by public transport. The changes to the site layout resulting from the building improvements make this an ideal time to review the bus routes which serve the hospital. The opportunity could now be taken by the STA to effect a range of improvements to the general public transport service to the hospital, in consultation with the hospital board and the Elizabeth council.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I shall be happy to have the State Transport Authority look at his recommendation concerning the bus route service to the Lyell McEwin Hospital and bring down an early reply for him.

STREAKY BAY AREA SCHOOL

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Education give an indication to the House of the progress being made in the detoxification or checking of the Streaky Bay Area School

for residues of aldrin and, more particularly, will he say what action is being taken to maintain a monitoring program and the testing of children who have proved to have positive tests?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, and indeed for his assistance in this most unfortunate chapter in the proud history of the Streaky Bay Area School. I would like to put on record my appreciation of the work of the people in the Education Department who have been involved in assisting the school community throughout this problem and the many people in the Health Commission who have also spent a great deal of time and effort in trying to give the most professional advice to all involved. I hope we have all learnt a great deal about the proper management of our public facilities and that we know a lot more about the pesticide aldrin and, hopefully, other pesticides and the conditions under which they are used.

I understand that only one area of the school remains to be opened for general use and that the areas have now been declared safe for students and teachers to return. I also understand from the last advice I had that the final area would be available for use by the school and the wider community from the beginning of term 2. I need to check on the progress of that matter for the honourable member. I will certainly obtain a detailed report of where these matters stand.

Some weeks ago I received a telegram from the President of the School Council thanking officers of the Education Department for their assistance and involvement through this most difficult time. I am very appreciative of the cooperation of the School Council, parents, teachers and the community at Streaky Bay who obviously have had a very anxious time. I reassure the children and staff that their health has not been harmed by this episode. I notice that a request has been made for ongoing testing of those who were shown to have aldrin in their blood, and I will obtain a report from my colleague the Minister of Health about the proposals to be undertaken by the Health Commission in that regard.

'BUY AUSTRALIAN' CAMPAIGN

Ms GAYLER: Can the Minister of State Development and Technology advise the House of measures to promote the 'True Blue Buy Australian' campaign amongst South Australian manufacturers encouraging them to make their products more competitive with imported goods? Recent studies show that the 'Buy Australian' campaign launched in September of last year has raised public awareness about Australian made goods. In fact, 89 per cent of the population is aware of the campaign, 88 per cent know that its aim is to help the Australian economy, and 67 per cent of Australians are reportedly buying local products most of the time. According to research by the Advance Australia Foundation, local manufacturers are, however, resisting change.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question. Certainly, the State Government supports the campaign to buy Australian and, as I indicated in this place a couple of weeks ago in answer to a question from the member for Price on State Government support for purchasing from local manufacturers, it is quite extensive, involving the changes we as a Government have made to the legislation covering supply and tender processes, the support given to the Industrial Supplies Office and other activities in terms of Government procurement with respect to Government in particular. I mentioned on that occasion, and it is worth repeating, that every $1 million saved on imports is, by common assessment of economists, worth 35 to 45 jobs either created or saved. That is a worthwhile goal at which we should aim.

Indeed, the Industrial Supplies Office in South Australia in its first year of operation had 300 projects that came before it for attention and 100 of those projects did result in Australian goods being purchased which otherwise might not have been the case. A further 90 are still under investigation and so far in only 20 cases has the office not been able to find an Australian manufacturer producing the goods required. That is a very positive result indeed. It seems to have resulted in $67 million worth of business to South Australia, translating to 2 500 jobs either created or saved as a result of extra work going their way. That is the kind of economic picture that comes out of any 'True Blue' campaign—the fact that there is a real benefit to jobs in this country.

One of the problems is a product cringe that takes place in the minds of many Australians who do not believe that Australian products are good enough. In some cases that happens with manufacturers, who will not purchase other componentry in Australia but choose to go overseas. I had the head of a company in South Australia that manufacturers software for the construction industry come to me and say that his company is aggressively going out to export its product. I congratulated him on that. He said that his reason was to establish the company's credentials overseas, because not until it did that would it get major sales in this country, as many people in industry in Australia would not purchase an Australian product until it had been proven in London, the United States or Europe. That is a sad tale. It is good news for export earnings and good news for the company, but a sad fact of life that we have that product cringe.

The other point that needs to be made is that we manufacture a very wide range of products in this country, and in South Australia we have as diverse a manufacturing sector as any other State, including Victoria, which is considered the largest manufacturing State. People very often do not realise that there is an Australian product alternative. I commend the Advance Australia Foundation for the work it is doing for the 'True Blue' campaign and would like it to consider going on to promote just how diverse is the range of products we produce in this country, so that people do not automatically think they have to purchase overseas as they believe that there is no local alternative to purchase. Often there is, but it simply needs to be there for the finding.

IRRIGATION

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Water Resources advise whether the Government intends to upgrade the worst sections of the unrehabilitated areas of the Government irrigation distribution system in the Riverland in the near future? The distribution system to which I have just referred has been described by irrigators as the most antiquated and inefficient in Australia, wasting large volumes of water and adding significantly to the Murray River problems. It has been stated that the Government is again looking at some of the worst sections of the unrehabilitated areas in the Riverland, and I refer particularly to the Moorook and Cobdogla divisions. Everyone in the Riverland would be keen to know whether the Government has any intention of upgrading those areas.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: That matter will depend on the outcome of a visit which I intend to take to the river

shortly and of which I hope the honourable member has been informed. I am looking forward to Riverland hospitality.

LEGISLATIVE CHART

Mr DUIGAN: My question is directed to you, Mr Speaker. Is there any possibility of a chart being prepared by your office to outline the steps involved in the legislative process and the route that any proposition must take prior to becoming an Act of Parliament? As you, Mr Speaker, would be aware, a large number of school students and other visitors to Parliament House want to become better informed about the workings of Parliament. Mr Speaker, you have often expressed a desire to make Parliament more accessible and more understandable. I have often been asked (as I am sure all members have been) by school and community groups within the electorate whether there is a written guide to the process that is followed in the passage of a Bill through this Parliament.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: And prior to its reaching Parliament.

Mr DUIGAN: Indeed, as the member for Coles said, prior to its coming before Parliament, too. All that I have been able to provide is a copy of the flow chart headed 'The making of an Act of Parliament', which is from chapter 11 of Pettifer's *House of Representatives Practice*, which, of course, relates to the Federal Parliament.

The SPEAKER: I thank the member for Adelaide (who foreshadowed his question earlier today before entering the Chamber) for drawing my attention to the ongoing problem of the lack of adequate and clearly expressed material to explain the workings of Parliament to visiting groups and schoolchildren. A chart such as that suggested by the member for Adelaide, explaining the procedure whereby Bills enter Parliament and become legislated as Acts, would be most useful provided that it was expressed in clear layman's language.

It is possible that the chart mentioned by the honourable member, which appears in Pettifer's *House of Representatives Practice*, could be adapted to the workings of the House of Assembly and the other place. Indeed, perhaps it could be put in even simpler language and we could arrange for it to be typed and photocopied for distribution. There is a difficulty at the moment with the leaflets that are currently distributed to visitors to Parliament, such as the House of Assembly booklets. They seem to be of an unsuitable reading age for schoolchildren and do not really contain suitable layperson's language for wider distribution.

I point out that, as far as the President of the Legislative Council and I are aware, we are the only Parliament in Australia which has not produced for school use a videotape on the operations of Parliament and on the history and architecture of the parliamentary building. I hope that that can be done before the centenary of this Chamber in 1989, which also coincides to the very day with the fiftieth anniversary of the Legislative Council Chamber. All these matters might be helped by the appointment of an education officer, as alluded to in Question Time yesterday by the Minister of Education (who is now trying to hide behind a Notice Paper).

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: A very good dorothy dix question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

LOW INTEREST LOANS

Mr S.G. EVANS: Is the Premier aware of any loan scheme that is available to low income families, in particular recent arrivals from other countries, to assist them in acquiring homes and businesses including farms and, if so, will he give details of such scheme or schemes to the House? More and more people are coming to me claiming that people—in particular, Vietnamese migrants—are receiving loans with interest rates as low as 4 per cent to buy homes and market gardens. Sometimes the market gardens are purchased from farmers or primary producers who have to sell because of the rural decline and because the interest rates are so high.

I am not sure of any scheme of this type, so I told my constituent that I would ask the Premier, because it could be a Federal matter of which the Premier might have some knowledge. If so, I would like to know the maximum period of such loans, the maximum amount and the interest rate. People coming to me are quite upset at this suggestion. I believe that the Premier may be able to help dispel this feeling out there in the community.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I know nothing of such a scheme and, from the shaking of his head, I take it that the Minister of Housing and Construction (who is well aware of all the schemes that apply in relation to housing) is not aware of such a scheme. There may be a scheme that is administered either by a particular financial institution or through the Federal Government. If the member has any further details, I will be happy to look into the matter if he gives them to me.

Incidentally, one must be careful about people making claims of this kind. First, a lot of people like to boast that they have this or that advantage which tends to show how canny they are, whereas on investigation one discovers that that is not quite so. Secondly, some people like to believe that other people are in a more privileged position than they. For instance, I have had drawn to my attention tales of people being given massive preference in public housing but, when I get down to investigate the specific case, I find that the facts are not in accord with what that person believes. In fact, I cannot remember any instance where anything irregular was going on, although that is not to say that it might not on occasion. So, if the honourable member, rather than just retailing the remarks made to him by his constituents, could ask them to particularise, it would certainly help him in assessing the matter, and I would be happy to investigate it further.

IGNITION INTERLOCKING UNIT

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Transport inform the House whether he or his department has had a chance to evaluate whether the ignition interlocking unit would be of benefit to road safety in South Australia? The *Sunday Mail* of 8 February on page 43 states that a revolutionary device that makes it impossible for anyone with a blood alcohol reading above the legal limit to drive a motor vehicle may soon be available to motorists in Australia. The press report suggests that many experts consider the device, an ignition interlock, to be the last word in the continuing battle against drink-drivers. The interlock unit connects a breath analyser to a vehicle's ignition system. To start the engine the driver must blow into the dash-mounted unit. Unless the blood-alcohol reading is below the limit, the vehicle will not start.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for providing me with a copy of the press statement

that accompanies the question. This ignition interlocking unit has been described in the press statement as a revolutionary device, but I am not too sure that that description is correct. I believe that probably it is part of the Cincinnatti Microwave Australia company selling its type of ignition interlocking unit. My advice is that at least one interlocking unit has been devised in Australia that works equally as well as those units that have been constructed or devised in the United States of America.

So, as a State Government, through the Division of Road Safety, we have investigated the effectiveness of these devices. Indeed, a committee of the Standards Association of Australia has been established and is studying this matter with a view to making recommendations to the State Governments. The article referred to by the honourable member says that both Victoria and New South Wales are planning the introduction of the unit but, as I understand it, it is an option which they are considering: they are still a little way from introducing the ignition interlocking unit.

As I understand it, it is not virtually foolproof as it is described in the article. For instance, a passenger who has no alcohol on his breath could breathe into the device and start the vehicle. On the other hand, a person who is affected by alcohol and has had, by law, one of these units placed in his vehicle might on occasion drive other vehicles that have no such device placed in them. In any event, the idea is very good. It has considerable road safety benefits if the system works. Therefore the State Government, along with other Australian Governments, is continuing to monitor the effectiveness of the ignition interlocking unit and, if the advice that we receive from the committee that has been established to consider the unit is favourable, the Governments will no doubt move to introduce such a device. However, we need to be absolutely certain that there is road safety value in it for the citizens of this State and of this country.

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs) obtained suspension of Standing Orders and moved:

That the select committee on the Bill have leave to sit during the sittings of the House tomorrow.

Motion carried.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Hon. T.M. McRAE

Mrs APPLEBY (Hayward): I move:

That three weeks leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Playford (Hon. T.M. McRae) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CONSUMER CREDIT AND TRANSACTIONS) BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Credit Act 1972, and the Consumer Transactions Act 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Consumer Credit Act 1972 and Consumer Transactions Act 1972 both came into operation in 1973. Their aim was to give protection to consumers who borrowed money or purchased goods on credit. They presently cover consumer transactions of up to the monetary limit of $15 000 where no security is taken over land, and up to the limit of $30 000 where security is taken over land.

These monetary limits were last reviewed in early 1982. Since then, their effectiveness has been significantly eroded by inflation. For example, many motor vehicles now cost more than $15 000. It is therefore proposed to amend the Consumer Credit Act and the Consumer Transactions Act to increase the monetary limit to $20 000 for loans where no security is taken over land. This limit is the same as that in the uniform Credit Act 1984 which has been enacted in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia.

It is not proposed at this time to vary the $30 000 limit where security is taken over land used by a consumer as a place of dwelling for the consumer's own personal occupation. This is because, first, there is no comparable provision in the uniform Credit Act 1984. Secondly, the current legislation does not equally regulate all credit providers in the market. Finance companies are the most tightly regulated by it. The legislation is therefore not competitively neutral and it would be unreasonable to place finance companies in a competitively disadvantageous position, by increasing a burden on them, which is not placed on their competitors in the home finance area, such as banks and building societies.

South Australia is a member of the working party set up by SCOCAM in September 1986 to draft new uniform credit legislation. This working party is addressing the specific issue of home finance contracts. It is also addressing the broader issue of applying the legislation to banks, building societies and credit unions in order that all these credit providers will be subject to the same rules.

The Bill also provides for future changes to the monetary limits which are specified in section 5 of the Consumer Transactions Act 1982 and section 6(3) of the Consumer Credit Act 1972 to be made by regulation. This will bring South Australia's Act into line with the uniform Credit Act 1984 in which the monetary limits can already be varied by regulation.

Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 and 3 amend section 6 of the Consumer Credit Act 1972 and section 5 of the Consumer Transactions Act 1972, respectively. These sections deal with the application of the Acts. The amendments alter the monetary limits previously fixed at $15 000 for credit contracts, consumer contracts and consumer credit contracts to $20 000. The monetary limit previously fixed at $30 000 for credit contracts and consumer credit contracts remains the same. Provision for future alteration of the monetary limits by regulation is made in the amendments.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOODS SECURITIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Goods Securities Act 1986. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill proposes amendments to the Goods Securities Act which was passed by the Parliament late last year and is expected to be brought into operation by the Department of Transport in the near future.

The Act as passed requires those lenders who seek registration of their interests in motor vehicles by which loans are secured to register, among other things, details of the debt or other pecuniary obligation. This requirement is related to the provisions in section 12 of the Act for ordering the priority of competing registered interests in the same vehicle. It is the basis upon which, in subsections 12 (5) and 12 (6), the maximum extent of a secured lender's priority interest is conclusively defined by the information given by the lender to the Registrar and by the time at which the information is given to the Registrar. These provisions were designed to provide a stable and certain basis to assist the resolution of any dispute which might arise concerning multiple registered interests.

The requirement to register details of the debt is unique, and is related to the fact that this Act goes further than any comparable Australian legislation in working out the problems of priority than can arise between competing registered interests. Although there were repeated consultations during the development of the legislation, it was only in the continuing consultations after the Act had been passed that industry representatives identified a cost benefit objection to complying with this requirement for the South Australian Act alone. They indicated to the Government that, in view of the relatively small number of vehicles in which multiple interests were likely to exist, they would rather use the methods available to them in the course of business and under the general law to protect their interests than be faced with the costs of adjusting their systems and procedures to comply with this requirement. As well, the then Registrar of Motor Vehicles has identified a cost quoted by consultants of $16 000 to adjust the existing software package adopted from the New South Wales system to operate the register.

In view of these recently identified factors, the Government has decided not to persist with the requirement to register details of the debt or pecuniary obligation. It may be noted that the major and significant benefits of this Act are unaffected by this amendment. The register will enable those who seek to buy, or to lend money on the security of, a motor vehicle to assess their positions before entering into transactions and then, having completed their transactions, to safeguard their new positions. Those who buy from second-hand vehicle dealers will be able to rely upon the checks made by the dealers. It is necessary to amend the Act in this way at this time in order to avoid delays in its implementation.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 5 (2) of the Act which sets out the information that must be contained in the register in respect of registered security interests. Paragraph *(d)* which requires details of the debt or other pecuniary obligation secured to be included is struck out. Clause 3 is a consequential amendment to section 9 of the Act which provides for certificates of registered security interests. Clause 4 is a consequential amendment to section 12 of the Act which provides for the order of priority of security interests in prescribed goods. The amendment strikes out subsections (5) and (6) which relate to the details of debt or other pecuniary obligation contained in the register.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW (ENFORCEMENT OF FINES) BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the law relating to the enforcement of fines and other monetary orders made by courts in the exercise of criminal jurisdiction; to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1934 and the Justices Act 1921; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This brief Bill seeks to make two significant changes to the law dealing with the enforcement of fines. A number of recent studies by the Research and Planning Unit of the Department of Correctional Services have highlighted concerns in the use made of imprisonment for persons who are in default of payment of fines.

Moreover, there is the prevailing interest of the Government to ensure that the prisons of this State are reserved only for real malefactors and perpetrators of more serious crimes. The Government is (and has been for a not inconsiderable period of time) confronted by the burgeoning problem of overcrowding in correctional institutions occasioned and exacerbated by the presence of offenders who ought not to have been there in the first instance. A report of the Research and Planning Unit of the Department of Correctional Services, based on statistics gathered for the 1984-85 financial year, has observed:

> Intakes of fine defaulters fell steadily for the first 6 months from July 1984 to a seasonal low over the Christmas period, then began to rise again in the new year. Overall, the numbers of fine defaulters received each month have been slightly lower than the number reported for February 1984 (224).
>
> However, despite fluctuations in actual numbers received, fine defaulters consistently represent two-thirds of the sentenced intake each month. This remarkable relationship has been observed for many years now although the reason is unclear... Over the 12 month period, fine defaulters accounted for 95.7 per cent of imprisonments under one month.
>
> On average, 35 fine defaulters were held in department institutions each day during 1984-85. This is an extremely conservative estimate obtained by excluding offenders also on remand and those who paid out their warrants (although most of these would have spent some time in gaol before paying). This represents about 5 per cent of the daily average prison population for the year, and compares favourably with the more accurate figure of 38.5 obtained for February 1984.
>
> Month by month estimates are not available but it is likely that with an increasing daily prison population but no evidence of increasing intakes of fine defaulters or longer default period, fine defaulters represent a decreasing proportion of the average prison population, although they maintain a steady proportion of sentenced intakes. It is clear however that with 100-200 fine defaulters still imprisoned each month, the problem of imprisonment for fine default is as pressing now as in early 1984.

This echoes strongly the main findings in the unit's November 1984 report that:

> In February 1984 nearly 80 per cent of all sentenced intakes to Department of Correctional Services institutions and police prisons were admitted for fine default only; 72 per cent were for non-payment of fines only and they occupied, on average, 42 beds per night—38.5 of these in departmental institutions.

Aborigines (36 per cent), women (8 per cent), and the 'not employed' (84 per cent) were over-represented amongst fine defaulters in comparison with their proportions in the general prison population. People in the middle age range of 25-45, and married people were under-represented.

Seventy per cent of fine defaulters imprisoned had default periods of one week or less. The average was 10.2 days. The average time actually served was seven days and over half the defaulters spent less than three days in gaol. The total impact on institutions for February was equivalent to one five-year sentence (except that 258 intake/discharge procedures were required instead of one).

The defaulters owed a total of $87 422 of which 21 per cent was recovered after imprisonment; 75 per cent of offenders served their entire default period. The administrative cost involved in processing the 258 intakes was estimated at $19 520—more than the amount recovered from defaulters in prison. Sixty-four of the defaulters had never been in prison before; 36 per cent of these were for non-payment of drunk driving, dangerous driving or speeding fine.

This Bill is aimed at redressing such imbalances. Firstly, it fixes the cut-out rate of imprisonment, in default of payment of a fine, at one day for each $50 (or part thereof) of the fine, or any outstanding balance of such fine. The present rate is one day for each $25, a figure that was fixed over five years ago. Obviously, the effects of inflation have seen the value of this figure substantially eroded. The Government believes the new rate set by the Bill is both in keeping with contemporary expectations and more realistic. This Bill will also enable any future adjustments to the rate to be made by regulation.

Secondly, the Bill enables persons who experience severe financial hardship in consequence of having to pay a fine to make application initially to the proper officer of the relevant court, and then to the Executive Director of Correctional Services, to work the fine off by community service. The proper officer is required to satisfy himself or herself that the payment of the fine would cause the applicant (or the dependants of the applicant) severe hardship. the Director is required to be satisfied that a position for community service work is available to the applicant. An unfavourable decision of a proper officer may be the subject of judicial review.

If the criteria are met the applicant is obliged to enter an undertaking with the Director, and the amount of community service that is to be performed is calculated at the rate of eight hours for each $100 (or part thereof) of the fine or any balance outstanding.

A copy of the undertaking is to be filed with the proper officer of each of the courts involved (that is, the Supreme Court, a district criminal court or a court of summary jurisdiction). The very act of filing the copy serves to suspend all enforcement and execution proceedings in relation to the fine. If the applicant fails to comply with his or her undertaking to do community service, a notice of cancellation of the undertaking is filed with the proper officer and all enforcement and execution proceedings (e.g. levy of distress, arrest and committal to imprisonment) are thereby revived.

If an applicant serves part only of the period of community service fixed by the undertaking then to that extent (and only to that extent) the outstanding liability to pay the fine is proportionately reduced. Enforcement proceedings can only be taken, if revived, in respect of the balance owing.

A maximum fine of $2 000 is set as the ceiling for the application of these provisions. Therefore, the maximum period for which any person can be required to perform community service is 160 hours. The minimum period of community service set by the Offenders Probation Act 1913 is 40 hours. Notwithstanding this provision, the undertaking entered into by an applicant can stipulate that community service be performed for a designated period as low as eight hours.

Finally, this Bill effects consequential amendments to other relevant enactments. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 contains definitions that are required for the purposes of the new Act. Clause 4 provides that a period of imprisonment for default in the payment of a fine must not exceed one day for each $50 of the amount of the fine up to a maximum of six months imprisonment.

Clause 5 sets out the mechanism by which a person who would suffer severe hardship in the payment of a fine may apply to work off the fine by community service. Clause 6 provides for reduction of fines by imprisonment or community service. Clause 7 is a regulation making power. Schedule 1 contains a transitional provision. Schedule 2 makes consequential amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Justices Act.

Mr S.J. BAKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stock Diseases Act 1934. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Section 9 of the Act allows for the appointment of a Deputy Chief Inspector of Stock. However, the Act does not specify the powers of the Deputy Chief Inspector.

The Chief Inspector of Stock is often absent from the normal base of operations, either on country duties, interstate or overseas. It is necessary that the powers, duties and functions of the Chief Inspector under this Act and any other Act can be carried out by the Deputy Chief Inspector in the Chief Inspector's absence.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 amends section 9 of the Act which deals with the appointment of inspectors and other persons for the purposes of the Act. The amendment gives the Deputy Chief Inspector in the absence of the Chief Inspector, all the powers, duties and functions of the Chief Inspector.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 2, after clause 7—Insert new clause as follows:

Insertion of new s. 109a.

8. The following section is inserted in Part VIII of the principal Act after section 109:

Certain work may be carried out by owner.

109a. (1) Where a person, who has applied to the Minister for the extension of a main pipe, the connection of land to a main pipe or any other work for which the amount payable under this Act is the cost estimated by the Minister, is dissatisfied with the Minister's estimate, that person may, subject to this section, arrange for the work to be carried out by a competent person of his or her choice.

(2) The work must be carried out under the supervision, and to the satisfaction of the Minister.

(3) The Minister will, at the request of the applicant, provide the applicant with plans and specifications of the proposed work.

(4) The applicant will pay the Minister the prescribed fee for the supervision and inspection of the work but is not liable for any other charge or fee under this Act in respect of the work.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That the amendment of the Legislative Council be disagreed to and that the following alternative amendment be made in lieu thereof:

Proposed new section 109a

Certain work may be carried out by owner.

109a. (1) Where a person, who has applied to the Minister for the extension of a main pipe or the connection of land to a main pipe (being work for which the amount prescribed by this Act is the cost of the work estimated by the Minister) is dissatisfied with the Minister's estimate, the applicant may, subject to this section, arrange for the work to be carried out by a competent person of his or her choice.

(2) Where—

(a) a person has applied to the Minister for the extension of a main pipe to land that the applicant has divided, or proposes to divide, or for the connection of such land to a main pipe;

(b) the regulations do not prescribe the amount, or the basis for determining the amount, payable for that work;

and

(c) the applicant is dissatisfied with the amount that the Minister wishes to charge for that work,

the applicant may, subject to this section, arrange for the work to be carried out by a competent person of his or her choice.

(3) Subsections (1) and (2) do not authorise the connection of the new work to the waterworks.

(4) The work must be designed by, or to the satisfaction of, the Minister and be carried out under the supervision, and to the satisfaction, of the Minister.

(5) The Minister will, at the request of the applicant, provide the applicant with plans and specifications of the proposed work.

(6) The applicant must pay the reasonable costs of the Minister for—

(a) designing the work;

(b) providing the necessary plans and specifications;

(c) connecting the work to the waterworks;

and

(d) supervising and inspecting the work,

but the applicant is not liable for any other charge or fee under this Act in respect of the work.

The explanations concerning this amendment and the amendment to the Bill with which we will be dealing shortly are similar.

As to the first new subsection, the amendment if accepted by the Committee allows contracts for extensions and connections for which a quotation is given to the applicant. It therefore only applies to extensions of main in non-urban areas and connections larger than 150 mm (or services greater than 50 mm). In both of these cases the applicant will be paying the full estimated cost. New subsection (2) allows contracts for land division. In effect, this legalises the present administrative procedures for contracts. Applicants who are dissatisfied with the department's quotation currently can request contracts but, as shown previously, very few in fact do so in the case of minor land division.

The member for Chaffey, when this Bill was before us previously, mentioned a case at St Marys. A contribution of $10 625 was requested for extension of mains to a land division. The developer requested contracts and sought quotations from contractors but decided eventually to have the mains constructed by the department. The contractor quoted on laying of mains only. The departmental component of the work for live connections, supervision, and so on, was $4 810, of which $2 830 was the live connection component.

New subsection (3) provides that the department must carry out all live connections, and members would agree with me when I say that subsections (4), (5), and (6) are self-explanatory. That is the scheme I lay before the Committee, and I think that it gets to the nub of the matters which the member for Chaffey and his colleagues raised previously. The amendment also takes account of some of the concerns that I raised and explains why I initially opposed what was then before us and why I continued to suggest that my amendment is an improvement on what has been sent back to us from another place. I commend my motion to the Committee.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: What has been sent back to us from another place is exactly the same amendment that we moved in this Chamber. I thank the Minister for his willingness to defer this matter from yesterday until today, because I wanted the opportunity to look closely at what he and his department were doing to our amendment. Principally, the variation from our amendment involves new subsection (2) *(b)*, which provides that regulations do not prescribe the amount and which brings into play all those connections the fee for which is prescribed by regulation.

At this stage, because the basis of what we were trying to achieve still remains, we are prepared to accept the Government's amendment in good faith; provided that the charges that will be imposed by the Government for design, plans and inspection will not be used as a means by which astronomical sums will be applied just to defeat any opportunity for a contractor to do the work at a more reasonable price. If that is shown to be the case and action is taken by the department, we will certainly use every endeavour at our disposal, including every form of media, to highlight what is going on.

The department has absolutely nothing to fear from what we are proposing. I believe that the department can be just as competitive as the private sector if it wants to be: that has proved to be so on other occasions. It was certainly proved while we were in Government, involving the rehabilitation work in the Berri area. When the challenge was thrown out to the department it performed on an equal basis with the then contractor in the area. It still meant that the department lifted its game by 95 per cent, which was acknowledged by the Director-General. So, the intention of what we are trying to achieve will be preserved. Obviously, a vast number of connections that will continue to be carried out have been eliminated by the inclusion of new subsection (2) *(b)*, but we are prepared to accept it in good faith at this stage. We will watch with keen interest how the provision is put into practice. If action is deliberately frustrated, we will be having a lot more to say about the matter.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I support the motion. It is commonsense that the Government has accepted this proposition. In relation to the department carrying out the connection, I also will wait and see what happens in the future. I think it can work quite sensibly, and I congratulate the Government on accepting an amendment that should have been inserted in the Act a few years ago.

Mr MEIER: I am pleased to see that the Government has brought this amendment forward which basically is the same as the amendment that the Opposition proposed. It caused me great concern that the last time this Parliament met it appeared that the Government was not going to accept such an amendment, and that concern was echoed by quite a few land developers, real estate agents and owners at a meeting on Friday 20 March at Maitland, when the Yorke Peninsula Coastal Planning Study was put forward for discussion. All members may not be aware of this, but

that planning study has been going on for many months and basically has been concerned with the provision of water to the peninsula. The single biggest obstacle that was seen by developers was the lack of water. In fact, it is a real eye-opener to notice the number of developments that are going ahead or are planned for promotion on the peninsula in the near future.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: You mean reticulated fresh water, don't you? You've got water all around you.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr MEIER: The member for Alexandra raises a very relevant point; I mean reticulated fresh water. I remember a Bluey and Curly cartoon, where the hotel was flooded and their boat was going over it, and Bluey said, 'Now I understand what was meant by "Water, water everywhere and not a drop to drink",' but of course that has nothing to do with this debate.

Before being interrupted, I indicated that there were a large number of potential developments going ahead on the peninsula, and I will detail those to indicate the importance of this amendment in relation to the future development of one section of South Australia. There are 200 allotments proposed for Port Broughton, 150 allotments and a motel at Point Turton, 150 allotments at Port Vincent, a further 85 allotments at Port Vincent, 100 allotments at Edithburgh, 42 allotments at Wool Bay, 62 allotments at Stansbury, 100 allotments, a marina and a hotel/motel at Port Vincent (and this project is costing in the vicinity of $6 million), another 80 allotments at Point Turton, 100 allotments at Port Victoria, a caravan park at Point Turton (costing in the vicinity of $1.5 million), 260 allotments at Marion Bay, a tavern and units at Marion Bay, and the Marion Bay caravan park, stage 1. They are the types of projects that could be put in jeopardy if appropriate reticulated water facilities are not available. What the developers were worried about was that some of the quotes put forward by the E&WS Department have been exorbitant, and they know from experience that private contractors can undercut the department in many cases.

I draw attention to a specific example of what I regard as an outrageous estimate from the E&WS Department for one individual subdivided block at Minlaton. This block (and I put this in writing to the Minister two or three weeks ago hoping that an answer would be forthcoming) is in part section 129 in the hundred of Minlacowie. A 200 metre extension of water pipe is required. It does have to go under the road, but currently the property owner has a meter on the rest of his property, and he was hoping that it could be tapped from that point. The E&WS Department estimate was $29 815 for 200 metres of water pipe. Before this constituent sent in the application he was of the opinion that he probably would be able to do it for something like $4 000 or $5 000. Thankfully, I point out that this amendment will allow that constituent to do the work himself or through private contractors.

I express one reservation about the amendment, and that is that the E&WS Department has to connect the work to the mains. I cannot see that that should be at great cost. Under the Bill also the E&WS Department will provide the necessary plans and specifications. How much does one have to pay for the plans and specifications? If we deal with certain planning sectors it can escalate out of all proportion. I hope that the Minister can give an assurance that the E&WS Department plans will be at rock-bottom prices.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The member for Alexandra indicates that there will be no charge, but the amendment indicates otherwise.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: No charge is justified; it's a service—love and affection by the department—courtesy of the Minister.

Mr MEIER: I wish the member for Alexandra was right, but I expect that the amendment does not provide that. As I have said, my concern is that we should see that the costs do not escalate unnecessarily. If they do we shall have to review the legislation forthwith. I endorse the sentiments expressed in the amendments. I am thankful that the Government has once again seen the light in view of the Liberal Party's promoting an idea that we knew was the correct way to go in the first place.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Far be it from me to hold up the workings of the House, especially in a situation where we on this side of the Chamber agree with the Government. There are occasions when we ought to give credit where it is due, and this is one of them—remote as that may be. From time to time we witness situations where the Government shows a bit of commonsense, and I believe that it has done so in this instance. The opportunity for the private sector to do its own work, particularly where physical labour and/or locally owned equipment is involved, does not often occur in situations under the administrative authority of a Government.

However, for once we see a proposal that clearly enables that to occur. In fact, it has occurred from time to time in the past where representations have persisted on behalf of constituents, and those constituents have been able to carry out their own work, albeit subject to plans and specifications laid down by the department and also to inspectorial surveillance during the laying of the pipes, and so on, for those projects.

I was not joking when I previously indicated my support for the department's service to extend to the provision of plans and specifications at no charge in relation to private work. It is in the department's, and accordingly the public's, interest to have proper planning and specifications. I firmly hold the view that, in circumstances embraced by this amendment, that service should continue to be extended without fee. I support the retention of an inspectorial surveillance over the work wherein a departmental officer visits, if not on a full-time basis, at least during the laying of pipes by a private contractor in the case of a private service or in the case of an extension to an existing service.

Talking about the need for these extension services, I take the opportunity—as did my colleague—to cite an area of the State where an extended reticulated supply is long overdue and is indeed most required. The American River project is well known to those members who have been around this House for a few years. It is certainly well known to the Minister of the moment, and I would urge him to pick up at his earliest convenience the notes of a speech delivered by his colleague the Hon. Terry Hemmings during the recent opening of the American River Motel, on Kangaroo Island, owned by the Doig family. Incidentally, that motel has been rebuilt following the burning down of the original about 12 months ago.

At that opening, and during his address, the Minister indicated in quite clear terms his Government's support for tourism and its recognition of the need for infrastructure and essential services to enable the tourism industry to grow and flourish, and suggested that he and his Government would be doing everything within their power to enable that to occur. That in itself was a fairly broad sweeping statement which Ministers of all political persuasions tend to deliver from such platforms, but the Minister's colleague, the Hon. Terry Hemmings, went further than that, and the details of his speech, I repeat, I would wish the Minister to pick up,

because quite clearly he and those who followed his opening address dealt specifically with the water issue on Kangaroo Island. They spelt out the situation of the geography and the fact that there are large volumes of good quality water on the western end but with very little supply to vital parts of the eastern end, not the least of which are American River and Penneshaw, and the urgent need for the system's extension to those townships.

I will not expand further on that issue, despite its great importance to that community and the State's tourism industry at large, except to say that at the very earliest convenience I hope that this Minister will pick up the comments, if not the clear commitments, of his colleague in relation to that subject. I support the amendment proposed in this instance without reservation.

The Hon.D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank members for the consideration they have given to this further amendment and give an assurance that in the future the department will be very reasonable in the quotations that it brings forward. I believe that in the past that has largely, if not invariably, been the case, but I cannot promise the largess for which the member for Alexandra was looking in relation to his earlier comments. However, in relation to his later comments, which dealt generally with water supply on the island and which are not strictly germane to this debate, naturally I will be keen to try to get together the resources so that we can give a more adequate supply to that community. That is something that perhaps we should be talking about whether or not this Bill is before the Parliament.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment would render the Act unworkable.

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 2, line 5 (clause 5)—After repealed insert and the following section is substituted:

Certain work may be carried out by owner.

46. (1) Where a person, who has applied to the Minister for the extension of a sewer, the connection of land to a sewer or any other work for which the amount payable under this Act is the cost estimated by the Minister, is dissatisfied with the Minister's estimate, that person may, subject to this section, arrange for the work to be carried out by a competent person of his or her choice.

(2) The work must be carried out under the supervision, and to the satisfaction of the Minister.

(3) The Minister will, at the request of the applicant, provide the applicant with plans and specifications of the proposed work.

(4) The applicant will pay the Minister the prescribed fee for the supervision and inspection of the work but is not liable for any other charge or fee under this Act in respect of the work.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That the amendment of the Legislative Council be disagreed to and the following alternative amendment be made in lieu thereof:

46. (1) Where a person who has applied to the Minister for the extension of a sewer or the connection of land to a sewer (being work for which the amount prescribed by this Act is the cost of the work estimated by the Minister) is dissatisfied with the Minister's estimate, the applicant may, subject to this section, arrange for the work to be carried out by a competent person of his or her choice.

(2) Where—

(a) a person has applied to the Minister for the extension of a sewer to land that the applicant has divided, or proposes to divide, or for the connection of such land to a sewer;

(b) the regulations do not prescribe the amount, or the basis for determining the amount payable for that work;

and

(c) the applicant is dissatisfied with the amount that the Minister wishes to charge for that work,

the applicant may, subject to this section, arrange for the work to be carried out by a competent person of his or her choice.

(3) Subsections (1) and (2) do not authorise the connection of the new work to the undertaking.

(4) The work must be designed by, or to the satisfaction of, the Minister and be carried out under the supervision, and to the satisfaction, of the Minister.

(5) The Minister will, at the request of the applicant, provide the applicant with plans and specifications of the proposed work.

(6) The applicant must pay the reasonable costs of the Minister for—

(a) designing the work;

(b) providing the necessary plans and specifications;

(c) connecting the work to the undertaking; and

(d) supervising and inspecting the work,

but the applicant is not liable for any other charge or fee under this Act in respect of the work.

This amendment has been circulated to all members. It is identical with the last amendment except that the proposed new section would be numbered 46. The amendment is word for word with the amendment in the previous Bill and the explanation would be word for word with that of the previous Bill, so I do not propose to repeat it. I urge the amendment on the Committee.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: The comments I made in relation to the Waterworks Act amendment apply equally to this amendment. Therefore, I have nothing further to add other than that I believe that the intent of our amendment is now carried through and, as I said before, we will monitor it very closely to make sure that the intent is put into practice.

Motion carried

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment would render the Act unworkable.

IN VITRO FERTILISATION (RESTRICTION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March. Page 3569.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): The first baby born as a result of *in vitro* fertilisation was Louise Brown, in 1978, at Oldham General Hospital in England. Drs Steptoe and Edwards had been working on the *in vitro* progam since the mid 1960s and had achieved a small number of pregnancies, all of which miscarried. Other pregnancies followed at Oldham. Well over 500 *in vitro* fertilisation babies have now been delivered throughout the world.

In 1979, two successful pregnancies resulted in Melbourne, at the Royal Women's Hospital, after about 100 patients had been treated. One miscarried, but the other went on successfully and Candice Reed was born in that year. Both English and Australian groups still had many disappointments and it seemed really good news when it appeared that conception rates of about 10 per cent could be possible.

I understand that the first steps in initiating a program in Adelaide were taken in 1980 at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Within a few months two pregnancies occurred, but unfortunately both miscarried. There was quite a long interval without success, but in May 1982 the success of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital program began and has continued well, with ongoing pregnancies. The first delivery from the Adelaide University team occurred in January 1983, when twins were born. Since May 1982 the conception

rate has been about 20 per cent, which is similar to the results being achieved in Melbourne and by other well established groups in other countries. In 80 per cent of cycles, that is, the IVF procedures, a laparoscopy is performed. Of those 80 per cent have an embryo transfer and 20 per cent conceive. In 1986 there were about 600 cycles at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, involving 414 couples and resulting in 104 pregnancies. With such a low percentage success rate many women still have more than one try for a successful pregnancy under the IVF program.

If it were not for that program there would be hundreds of couples desperately waiting to adopt a baby. The waiting time is considerably longer than the initial waiting time to be allowed to participate in the IVF program. At one stage the waiting time was about three years. I understand now that there are about 700 on the waiting list and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre have a waiting time of about 12 months. Personnel conducting the programs are satisified with the 12-month waiting period. People who want to come on to the program are so deperate to commence a family that, by the time they go through the preparation and waiting period, which is not an easy procedure for a woman, many fall out from the program. It is tragic that it is the woman has to carry the brunt of the stress and strain of the whole procedure.

Personally, I consider the IVF program unnatural, but that is my own personal opinion and belief; in fact, the whole question of *in vitro* fertilisation is extremely emotive. Church people are making their stand to prevent the continuation of the process and asking their congregation to examine their conscience and their faith. I see nothing wrong with that, but on the other hand it is not for me to decide and say to a women what she shall or shall not do with her body. Whilst I believe in nature and in God's will, I appreciate the immense benefits that the IVF program brings to many and certainly the traumas that are experienced by those who wish to participate.

I understand that one IVF cycle costs $3 100 and covers all clinical, pathological and hospital fees. About $2 500 is recoverable from Medicare or health insurance, and the patient pays about $600. In the case of holders of health benefit cards, there is no cost. On these estimates the program for 1986 at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was valued at between $1.8 million and $2 million. One cannot measure the worth, in dollar and cent terms, the real joy of the 104 pregnancies achieved and the success that it will bring to so many families. It is unfair to say that it is an expensive program, as we cannot measure it at all. The human achievement is the ultimate result and goal.

The one thing I find hard to accept is that approximately 50 per cent to 60 per cent of clients accepted into the program have had some form of sexually transmitted disease and some, unfortunately, on more than one occasion. This has contributed to their infertility. It is a fact of life. Because of the difficulty in discovering such sexually transmitted diseases, many couples are not aware that they are passing them on. It is difficult to detect.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr BECKER: That is true. Often it is not necessarily the woman's fault, and in the bulk of cases it would be the man's fault. I understand that many young couples are very ignorant of the various types of sexually transmitted diseases, and I hope that from these programs we will develop a greater awareness in the community of the problems that can be experienced. I believe the AIDS program will contribute in many areas what has been glossed over in the past. We have come of age in considering this issue. Although the taxpayers are paying dearly for some peoples' permissiveness, we should not judge the program on that basis, as it is totally unfair.

This legislation outlaws any attempt by any person or private enterprise to commence commercial IVF programs. As one person put it to me, it could well be a conspiracy between the university, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Wakefield Street Hospital. I cannot prove that, and it is an unfair comment, because much money has been spent in establishing the programs over the years very successfully at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (the one closest to me) and a contribution has been made by research funds from the Adelaide University.

To manage and coordinate the IVF program, a company is to be formed in South Australia called Reproned Pty Ltd, and it will be 100 per cent owned by the University of Adelaide. It is an unusual step to protect a program developed by the taxpayers and the university research funds. The legislation in effect stops any individual or other organisation from establishing similar programs until the parliamentary select committee reports early next session. In fact, the moratorium now being established gives the Minister of Health the power to decide who amongst those qualified have the right to perform in the IVF program. It excludes, regrettably, one person from establishing a commercial clinic in South Australia, but the people who really lose are the clients who were attached to that person or who wanted to be part of his program.

The legislation before us contains a sunset clause and will operate until 30 November 1987 or until such time as the select committee has reported and any resultant legislation has been enacted. That is the short term safeguard as far as this House is concerned. From a legislative viewpoint we are entering the unknown—a whole new era in creating life and perhaps in the process destroying some life also. Therefore, we should await with great interest the report of the parliamentary select committee. On behalf of the Opposition, I support the legislation.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I rise on this occasion not to voice opposition to the proposition but to draw attention to a few of the concerns I have about I guess the general principle of the legislation. I want it made plain that I have been a member of the program and also made plain at this point in my remarks, following what the member for Hanson said, that in the circumstances of my own case it was not a sexually transmissible disease which produced the infertility in myself or my wife. Indeed, the cause of that infertility lies dead, not in this country but elsewhere. The consequences of that unfortunate event were not discovered by me to be as serious as it turned out to be until more recent times, indeed, subsequent to my arrival in this place.

I had guessed that there might be a problem, but not to the extent which ultimately became clear. The advances made by the two units at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and at the Flinders Medical Centre here in South Australia have placed them at the forefront of the development of the *in vitro* fertilisation technique throughout the world; and of course it is now to be extended to the Wakefield Memorial Hospital. It will be restricted to those three institutions.

I think it is unfortunate that a married couple who wish to become a parent is denied that opportunity on the arbitrary criteria which may be subjectively determined by a Government instrumentality, even though the couple might be able and willing personally to meet the expense of becoming a parent in as near to natural fashion as possible. It should be recognised by members that some people were previously excluded from the program at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital simply on the basis of their age. To my mind

that was unfortunate because in my own case I became too old to further participate.

I had not realised that age was so crucial. In my judgment I would have made no worse a father than anyone else (and my wife no worse a mother than anyone else) and notwithstanding the fact that we were older than someone thought we should be to participate in the program, we were willing to be involved, and possibly could have been successfully involved, in the program if we had been allowed to meet its cost and obtain the professional services from any source, in some other institution.

If it is to be a feature of the legislation that in the future people are precluded from the publicly funded program on the basis of their age, then I believe that future legislation should at least permit private instrumentalities, recognising that there must be a code of conduct, to participate in providing a service to certain members of the general public who want to pay for it (that is, within the framework of acceptable criteria and if they qualify to be participants). I will address that question and not confound members with what they might otherwise think is bafflegab.

I do not think that anyone who is not married should be allowed to participate in the program, and I mean that in the strict legal sense. If one is not prepared to go along to the State's properly appointed authority with one's partner and register your willingness to be associated with your partner in a lawful marriage, then I do not think that you are demonstrating the measure of commitment and responsibility that is required to become a parent. Even though people who are not impaired from becoming parents can do so through natural causes resulting from sexual intercourse outside of marriage, nonetheless I believe that marriage should be an essential precursor for participation in this procedure.

That would exclude the three things which are now possible biologically. In the first instance, it is biologically possible for someone to collect semen from wherever they wish, inseminate themselves and then become pregnant to the male who provided the semen. I deliberately chose those words because it is biologically possible for a male, taking quite a simple course of sex hormone injections, to carry a foetus full term, deliver a child through caesarean section and then effectively and successfully become a mother in the sense that they were pregnant even though they retained the status and sex organs of a male. That male status, in biological terms, would have been suppressed by the administration of hormones during the course of the confinement. That is possible. That has horrendous implications, in my opinion, because it means that individual men who are kinky or bent in some way—and who in my opinion would not make ideal single parents in any sense—could become parents as a consequence of the development of this and other biological scientifically known phenomena, having medical treatment satisfactorily and hygienically administered along the way.

The second set of circumstances which I draw to the attention of the House involves two men who may each decide to receive semen from the other in a homosexual *de facto* relationship and have two children. I think that is equally abominable and inappropriate. I have no argument with a person's sexual proclivity, if that is the way they want to be. However, I have some argument about their suitability as a parent when it comes to deviations from what is obviously natural. I emphasise the fact that I deliberately chose the word 'natural' and not the word 'normal'. Normal is what it is for the individual. I suppose that could be put in another way to show the absurdity of the proposition, that is, by saying that celibacy is not hereditary.

Mr Robertson interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, I thought that someone would get the point. So clearly then, homosexuality *per se* is not hereditary. It is learnt behaviour. I draw attention to the unsuitability of such persons becoming parents and to other unsuitable people who have expressed an interest in the procedure such as the radical feminists who live in lesbian relationships and who do not even have to take a course of hormones to ensure that they carry a foetus full term and parturiton. As the law stands at the present time, such people could easily procure semen and inseminate themselves I think that is inappropriate.

Such people should not be given access to any registered medical facilities—either public or private—and indeed should not be included in any program. However, I have certainly read articles and heard discussions amongst lesbians to the effect that they should not be denied access to what they consider to be the legitimacy of motherhood even though, in my opinion, they are not suitable to become parents in those circumstances. I would be appalled if any Government decided to tax citizens to provide homosexuals—whether male or female—with the opportunity of becoming parents at taxpayers' expense and to raise those children in a homosexual environment.

That would be undesirable and unwise. If sexual proclivity is indeed a consequence of the interaction not only between factors of XX or XY chromosomes in the nucleus of the cells of the individual but also between the inherited material that is to be found on other chromosomes elsewhere in the nucleus and other external influences in the environment of the individual, then such influences (and the conscious prejudice which arises in the minds of people that have been subjected to those influences) should not be passed on to those children either inadvertently or deliberately by allowing them to be born into situations where the practice of homosexuality is considered to be the only or the most desirable practice. I consider it the opposite regarding the raising of children, and the law elsewhere says that.

So, even though the narrow ambit of this Bill simply makes it impossible for any other institution in this State to provide IVF services until November or thereabouts in order to give time for the select committee to finish its deliberations and submit its report, I place on record now, so that it can become part and parcel of the information about which members have some conscious awareness, all these matters to which I have drawn attention. I do not think that it is either legitimate or fair to make arbitrary cutoffs in respect of who can be involved in the program based on physical factors such as age, and not on psychological factors such as sexual proclivity. I believe that successful parenting is less likely to be influenced by age, say, than by emotional stability or the capacity to have demonstrated material stability and therefore the creation of a reliable, dependable material environment which can give sound emotional support to the baby who is born as a result of the procedure, wherever it has been undertaken successfully.

Mr D.S. BAKER (Victoria): This Bill already has a sunset clause placed in it by the Legislative Council, so I cannot see why a moratorium should be placed on private enterprise entering the field until the select committee hands down its report. I will not go into the whole issue of *in vitro* fertilisation or artificial insemination, except to say that the placing of this moratorium on the program and awaiting the report is a shortsighted view, and it may be that in the longer term quite Victorian views may dominate. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

The Government views with considerable concern proposals by commercial entrepreneurs to operate private for profit clinics marketing *in vitro* fertilisation services.

I might pose the question: 'So what?' Thousands of doctors in Australia market health services of an immense range and, in many cases, of great value. There are no restrictions on clinics or doctors marketing such services as radiology, psychology, psychiatry, gynaecology, surgical processes, tattoo removals, plastic and cosmetic surgery, childbirth, and abortions. Further, the following paramedical services must be considered: chiropractic, naturopathic, and homoeopathic. Then there are the paramedical religious services such as those provided by the scientology clinics. Indeed, the list goes on and on.

There is no restriction on the extent to which such services may be provided by the Government or, as in most cases, by private enterprise. Are we to place a moratorium on all new advances in medical technology for people operating in the private enterprise field, or are we to allow a person to consult his or her doctor and accept the doctor's advice on where that person should go? The Minister's second reading explanation continues:

The Government is concerned not only that adequate safeguards are needed to ensure that the development of such clinics does not jeopardise the quality of services delivered to South Australian patients but also that no radical changes which could affect quality occur at a time when a select committee of the Legislative Council is examining the whole area of reproductive technology.

I find this sentence rather peculiar. Does it mean that, if the Legislative Council select committee was not investigating the whole area of reproductive technology, there would be no need to ensure that such clinics would not jeopardise the quality of the services delivered? What other moratoriums do we require to prevent private clinics from operating? There is a need to ensure proper services for the patients of the medical profession and, as long as those clinics are operating under strict guidelines, why do we need moratoriums?

If such controls are needed, let us have a licensing and inspection service from the existing Government experts. In many professions peer review standards operate, and many guidelines have already been set down under which people in private medicine must operate. Indeed, they are happy to operate under those guidelines. The figures that I shall now give answer the question why so many clinics are needed. In 1985-86, there were 15 856 attendances at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; 413 couples were admitted to the IVF program; and 700 persons were on the waiting list. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital says that it cannot devote additional resources to IVF cases, so a satellite service has been set up at the Wakefield Hospital. This source is operated by a private company owned by the Adelaide University, and it will operate under the quality standards that have been set by the QEH.

If this can apply to a private company that is owned by the university, why cannot the same quality standards apply in respect of private clinics, at least until we have the Legislative Council select committee's report? I should be extremely concerned regarding the final report of the select committee concerning the establishment of facilities and the appropriate consideration of ethical matters. However, preventing any private clinics from operating in the present climate is unusual when a demand exists.

As I said previously, if the Government wishes to wait for the select committee report, let the private sector operate under strict controls in the IVF field. Indeed, it should be allowed to operate under the same controls as those operating at the QEH and under strict peer review standards. This happens in other professions already, and it operates well. The only problem here is that we have an emotional issue, and it worries me that the emotions and perhaps the prejudices have been allowed to take away the benefits that can be derived by many South Australian couples who have waited for a long time, and, as we all know, the waiting list is getting longer. I will be interested to see this Bill when it comes back from the select committee.

Mr De LAINE (Price): On behalf of my colleague the member for Albert Park, I wish to register his support for this Bill. He is unable to participate in the debate because of his Amdel select committee commitments, but he supports the Bill because of his close association with Queen Elizabeth Hospital and his strong support of the *in vitro* fertilisation research program.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I thank members for their contributions to the debate. I understand that the Opposition is supporting this measure, and it is one that I certainly commend to all members.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Prohibition of *in vitro* fertilisation.'

Mr BECKER: Can the Minister say why it is necessary to establish the program in this way? Is the idea of establishing the private company one way of attracting higher salaried staff? I understand that one member of the QEH team resigned and took up a position in America at a salary estimated to be about $250 000. Another person left the program and was offered a higher salary, but obviously considered that the salary was not high enough. As the Minister at the table knows, medical specialists employed in hospitals or universities are paid a salary and are then entitled to earn 25 per cent over and above that salary. Any other additional earnings must be paid into the hospital for that particular program.

During the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee inquiry into hospitals in South Australia, we discovered that there were many such professional staff in hospitals earning very large incomes through private practice at hospitals who did not pass that money onto the various hospitals in accordance with the regulations. On the other hand, at the heart clinic at Royal Adelaide Hospital, the specialist in charge (whose name escapes me at the moment) religiously paid in every cent and could account for every cent that he earned. He was most methodical in ensuring that the money earned was paid into the program. I wonder if this proposal is part of the reason for establishing the program in the way that it is established.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The reason the private company has been established is that QEH is unable to provide additional resources to expand reproductive medicine services for which there is a large demand, as the honourable member would appreciate. In fact, the honourable member alluded to this earlier. Recognising the need that exists, Cabinet recently endorsed the proposal for the establishment of a satellite facility at Wakefield Memorial Hospital, which would use the expertise that is available through the QEH. This matter was raised earlier. Repromed Pty Ltd is a private company owned 100 per cent by Adelaide University. It is expected that any of the profits generated by this private company will be spent on initiatives in obstetrics and gynaecology particularly, but not exclusively, in reproductive medicine.

In a sense, although it is a private company, it is expected that the profits from that operation will go back into reproductive medicine research, and that is a perfectly valid role

for the university to be involved in. This private company was established merely to allow well established specialists or facilities to be available to meet the large demand that could not be met within the resources of the QEH.

Mr BECKER: From the way that the company and the program is now structured, will any member of staff who earns 25 per cent income over the base salary be able to keep that money, or will it be paid into the program?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I am not able to inform the honourable member exactly what are the rules relating to salary 25 per cent over and above base income. I will get the answer to that question for the honourable member. I do not expect that the resolution of that query will affect the way the Committee votes on this matter. If it did, I would have to obtain that information immediately. I will refer the query to the Minister and obtain a reply. It would be much better for me to do that than to make a guess at this stage.

Mr BECKER: The fate of the legislation does not hinge on that question. I will support the legislation, but it is a question that has faced the Health Commission and the old Hospitals Department, as well as people interested in the health field, since 1978-79. No-one has resolved the problem of excessive incomes earned by some of our health specialists. At some stage a decision has to be made in that respect. I gave the example of the program losing someone to an overseas posting because they were able to earn a salary of about $250 000 a year. In one respect we have been training staff who are quite capable of earning large sums of money, not because they overcharge but simply because of their worth. This applies to many specialists, and it is just an old chestnut that keeps cropping up.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I certainly appreciate the query and the comments of the honourable member. As it is a private company, I would expect that the honourable member's concern would be accommodated within the structure of the company. It is important to point out that no specialist employed by QEH will provide clinical services. All the clinicians currently involved in the program are employees of the University of Adelaide. While they are not employees attached to the QEH, they are attached to the University of Adelaide. I suggest that the honourable member will want clarification of that. In those general terms I will provide the information as soon as I can.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March. Page 3570.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): This legislation updates and modernises the current Act, which was established and assented to on 5 December 1974. A brief history of the Occupational Therapists Act is contained in the Annual Report of the Occupational Therapists Registration Board of South Australia for the year ended 30 June 1986. It states:

> In 1964 Mrs Joyce Steele was appointed by the occupational therapy profession to convene a steering committee that would bring to fruition the establishment of a School of Occupational Therapy in the State.
>
> In 1968, Mrs J. Steele, with the agreement of Cabinet, appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of Dr B.J. Shea, to inquire into all the various paramedical disciplines.
>
> Following the establishment of the School of Occupational Therapy at the South Australian Institute of Technology in March 1971 Mrs J. Steele MP (member for Davenport) introduced into Parliament a Bill for an Act to provide for the registration of occupational therapists on 9 August 1972.
>
> On 23 November 1972 the Bill was negatived.
>
> A similar Bill was reintroduced by the Hon. Don Banfield (Minister of Health) on 25 September 1974 and passed by Parliament.
>
> The Occupational Therapists Act 1974 received assent on 5 December 1974.
>
> On 18 December 1975 the Governor in Executive Council approved the appointment of the following members to the inaugral Occupational Therapists Registration Board of South Australia in advance of the Act coming into force to enable preparatory work in the regulations to proceed:
>
> Mr M. L. W. Bowering (Chairman)—Legal Practitioner
> Dr B. Nicholson—Medical Practitioner
> Dr J. R. Clayer—Medical Practitioner
> Mrs M. R. Farrow—Occupational Therapist
> Miss C. Bearup—Occupational Therapist
> Mrs T. F. Lyons—Occupational Therapist
> Mrs M. Jeffrey—Occupational Therapist
>
> The term of appointment was for three years.

The number of registered occupational therapists has grown from 79 as at 30 June 1977 to 247 as at 30 June 1986. It is estimated that the total number of occupational therapists resident in South Australia is 226. Page 10 of the Annual Report of the Occupational Therapists Registration Board of South Australia (year ended 30 June 1985) states:

> 11. Amendments to the Act—
>
> The board is pleased to report that amendments to the Act are now in the process of being drafted by Parliamentary Counsel. The major amendments which have been sought over the past eight years are as follows:

As I said, this current legislation updates and modernises the Act. It is a pity that for over the past eight years the Occupational Therapists Registration Board has sought some form of amendment, and this sums up the whole legislation. It continues:

> *(a)* Limited and Provisional Registration—
>
> It is essential for the efficient operation of the board and health units employing occupational therapists that the Act provide for these types of registration.
>
> Provisional registration enables the Registrar to register a person until the board grants full registration. This would facilitate early registration of graduates and other persons with prescribed qualifications and consequently avoid financial embarrassment to occupational therapists who cannot take up a position until registration is granted.

As I understand it, this helps people coming from interstate and overseas and those who have just graduated. It continues:

> Limited registration would enable the board to register a person on the basis of his or her qualifications and then when satisfied as to competence or experience, grant full registration. In this way health units would get the services of much needed occupational therapists under appropriate conditions restricting practice.
>
> Limited registration would also allow overseas persons to teach or undertake research or study in South Australia, to practise for a short period of time, and bring new skills and ideas to the profession.
>
> It would also facilitate the use of locums from overseas to ease the burden of a shortage of occupational therapists. Most importantly, it is also a way of attracting Australian trained persons back into the work force.

That is very important, and I think that every member would want to encourage it. The report continues:

> Occupational therapists are predominantly female and many will leave the profession to have families and then want to return. It would be most desirable to be able to grant such persons limited registration, perhaps enabling them to practise under supervision at a teaching hospital, while they upgrade their skills and acquire necessary experience.
>
> *(b)* A Majority of Occupational Therapists on the Board—
>
> The board considers that the Act should ensure that its membership comprises a majority of occupational therapists. This happens to be the case at the moment however there is no legislative guarantee that this will always be so.

As I indicated, all members on the inaugural board were occupational therapists and three were other persons not associated with the profession. I can appreciate the concern of occupational therapists not having total control of their destiny. While it is difficult to do so in a legislative way, I hope that that will always be the policy of the Government of the day—to ensure that occupational therapists make up the majority of the board. The report continues:

(c) Penalties—

Maximum penalties under the Act are set at $200. The nurses Act 1984, for example, sets maximum penalties of $5 000 or six months imprisonment for holding oneself out as a nurse when unregistered.

Penalties under the Occupational Therapists Act obviously need upgrading.

That has been attended to in this Bill. It continues:

(d) Power to Delegate—

The ability to delegate powers and functions to the Registrar, individual board members or committees is a tool which can assist in the efficient operation of a board. It would be a valuable power to have and again it is commonly held by other registration boards.

This Bill gives power to delegate to the Registrar, and of course that is a wise move. It continues:

The board has requested that Parliamentary Counsel in drafting amendments to the existing Act consider the shortcomings of the Act in light of other modern registration Acts and, if it is felt that a new Act is appropriate, the board would certainly be happy for one to be drafted.

I think that the amendments go most of the way towards meeting the requests of the Occupational Therapists Registration Board. I was particularly pleased to have the opportunity to speak to the Registrar about the legislation and to receive an update on the role of occupational therapists on what is happening today concerning trends in the profession. Now that we have a modern work care *cum* workers compensation program and legislation, I see the role of occupational therapists as being of immense value to industry and commerce. I do not think that they are being used as much as they should be. I think that any large employer should seriously consider having full-time occupational therapists on the payroll. In the document 'Courses and Careers' in relation to occupational therapy, issued by the South Australian Institute of Technology, one finds that the description given in June 1986 would fit well into work care programs, if we are genuinely concerned about workers in this State. The document states:

WHAT IS OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY?

Occupational therapy is a rehabilitative procedure guided by a qualified occupational therapist who uses self-help, manual, creative, recreational and social, educational, prevocational and industrial activities as treatment media. The purpose is to maximise ability, and to fulfill the person's needs by achieving optimum function and independence in work, social and domestic environments.

Occupational therapy may be recommended for one or more of the following purposes:

As specific treatment for psychiatric patients.

As specific treatment for restoration of physical function—to increase joint motion, muscle strength and coordination.

To teach self-help activities—those of daily living such as eating, dressing, writing, the use of adapted equipment and prostheses.

To help the disabled homemaker readjust to home routine with advice and instruction as to adaptations of household equipment and work simplification.

To develop work tolerance and maintenance of special skills as required by the patient's job.

As prevocational exploration—to determine the patient's physical capacities, interests, work habits, skills and potential employability.

As a supportive measure—to help the patient to accept and utilise constructively a prolonged period of hospitalisation or convalescence.

For redirection of recreational and vocational interests.

For assessment and treatment of developmentally disabled children.

For corrective treatment of children with perceptual-motor, sensory-integrative dysfunction and/or learning disabilities.

Occupational therapy is used extensively as a treatment measure in psychiatric hospitals, general hospitals, rehabilitation centres, special schools, geriatric institutions, penal institutions, home care programs, drug care programs, hospitals for the chronically ill, etc.

The occupational therapist works toward the rehabilitation of the patient in conjunction with the doctor, the nurse, the physical therapist, the speech pathologist, the social worker, the psychologist, the vocational counsellor and other specialists to return the patient to the greatest possible independence—physically, mentally, socially and economically. The therapist must be able to plan and implement an activity-based treatment program designed to improve the physical and/or mental state of the patient.

One of the occupational therapist's main functions in any area is to establish confidence and independence in the patient and to do this it is necessary to be able to teach the patient how to cope with normal day-to-day activities. These include such things as dressing, undressing, washing, toileting, cooking and eating. Equally important is the development of social skills in patients of all ages.

I will not go on with the whole of this document but I think that everybody can gather from that description the very valuable role within the community and society and in the workplace of the occupational therapist. I think it is only fair and reasonable that the legislation that governs their practice be modernised, that it be workable legislation, that it certainly protects them and their profession, and for that reason the Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr ROBERTSON (Bright): I will take the opportunity to lend my support to the Bill. It seems to me that anything that gives additional credibility to one of the disciplines of natural therapy ought to be supported by us, at least on this side of the House, and any measure that produces some sort of self-enforcement mechanism, such as the establishment of a board, ought to be welcomed not only by members in this House but by the public at large. I am sure that the measure will be welcomed by occupational therapists and, by implication, by other branches of natural therapy, because presumably it will set a precedent that other disciplines of natural therapy can follow.

The legislation provides both mechanisms and penalties in line with many other modern Acts, as the second reading explanation implies. It is not unlike similar boards set up to regulate and provide self-regulation for groups such as teachers, lawyers, and so on. The medical areas—such as doctors, dentists, chiropractors, physiotherapists, nurses, psychologists, opticians and chiropodists—are already covered by similar legislation. It seems to me that with an increasing recognition and patronage of the various natural therapies, we ought to be looking at similar legislation for people such as acupuncturists, iridologists and naturopaths, to name but a few. It has become quite clear in the 1980s that various disciplines of natural therapy are being accepted by the public at large and the fact that people support many of these disciplines without recourse to reimbursement from the health funds suggests that they feel there is good value in doing so.

The present board provides ministerial appointments of legal and medical people, a consumer representative and an occupational therapist, which gives the Government in power, I guess, a reasonable degree of supervision of what is going on in the area and a reasonable degree of oversight of that discipline on behalf of the public of South Australia. Also under the legislation, the Institute of Technology will have the power to appoint an occupational therapist to the board and the Australian Association of Occupational Therapists will also have the power to appoint two occupational therapists. It seems to me that this gives the required degree of control and supervision of the profession. It enables people entering from overseas to seek registration and be

duly examined and certified before being registered. It enables and encourages people coming back into the profession to be readmitted by the board to the profession as a practitioner. I welcome those two moves.

In conclusion, it appears to me that occupational therapy, along with many other natural therapies, has reached a point where we ought to be moving in a direction that legitimises and supports those therapies, and I look forward to the day when other branches of the natural therapies are similarly recognised by the public and the Parliament of this State.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Transport): I just want to thank and congratulate the members for Hanson and Bright for what has been a very constructive contribution to the debate and seek the support of the House for the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Membership of the board.'

Mr BECKER: I have no dispute with any other clause. As requested by the registration board, the penalties are increased substantially and in line with other modern legislation. Proposed section 5 *(f)* provides:

> one will be a person, nominated by the Minister, who is neither a legal practitioner, a medical practitioner nor an occupational therapist.

I am a great believer in a consumer being represented on the board and currently the person who sticks out like a sore thumb, without any reflection on that person, is a physiotherapist, if I remember rightly, and I cannot understand why that person should be there. I just think the drafting of this clause is clumsy. I thought we were going to put our legislation into much easier wording in the future. I hoped that the clause would simply refer to a consumer without it being so negative in the way that the clause is written. I am seeking assurance that subclause *(f)* will give the Minister the opportunity to appoint a consumer to the board. What guarantee can we have that that will occur in the future?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The honourable member is correct in his desire that a consumer representative be a member of the board. I note that he feels that this clause is clumsily worded. In fact, subclause *(f)* does ensure that a consumer representative be appointed and that that consumer representative is not a legal or medical practitioner or an occupational therapist. The possibility existed that a consumer representative could be placed on the board and be a member of one of those professions. It was deliberately worded to ensure that the consumer representative was exactly that—someone totally independent but a user of the services. It is to meet the needs that the honourable member has rightly pointed out to the Committee should be represented on the board.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 13) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

REGISTRATION OF DEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March. Page 3565.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Government supports this Bill, which provides for plans deposited in the general registry office to be corrected or varied in a manner similar to the way in which plans under the Real Property Act can be corrected. The Bill also brings into effect an improvement—a more modern way of dealing with regulations—and I understand it will allow regulations to be brought forward in a speedier fashion. Therefore, the Opposition cannot see any problems with that exercise as they still have to run the gauntlet of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, a quite proper course of action. If it was to allow for action to be taken by way of proclamation, I would be having a considerable amount to say, because it would be an undesirable course of action.

I have received advice from the Law Society stating that in relation to the Registration of Deeds Act Amendment Bill it has some reservations about giving the Registrar-General power to alter ancient documents. With similar powers in the Real Property Act the society was not aware of any real problems caused by that procedure and assumed that the Registrar-General would use the power with appropriate discretion. I seek from the Minister an assurance that discretion will be used in exercising this power and that the welfare of the community will be observed on all occasions when this power is exercised. It is very important, when Parliament passes over any of its authority to statutory officers, particularly in discussing documents dealing with property, that all care and caution be taken before we allow any corrections or amendments to be made unless they are absolutely essential to speeding up legitimate transactions. With those few comments I support the proposal.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands): I thank the member for Eyre for supporting this measure and concur with the remarks he has made. I am sure the amendments will be welcomed by the industry as they overcome problems that had arisen in the areas particularly of environment and planning. In addition to the big cost savings, up-to-date plans will assist the searching public and be of particular benefit to members of the South Australian Institute of Surveyors. The other matter that the member for Eyre raised from the Law Society is more historical. We are talking about plans and maps in particular, and not so much the content of them in this amending Bill.

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

VALUATION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March. Page 3566.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): This Bill allows for changes in the methods used for determination of site value and unimproved value of individual units in a deposited strata title plan. The second reading explanation stated that changes will ensure a more equitable valuation of individual units and provide a more equitable apportionment of rates and taxes. The present site value and unimproved value are determined by reference to the value of the whole parcel of land on which a series of strata titles has been issued, with the individual value of each unit being determined by the unit entitlement of each unit in relation to the aggregate unit entitlement of all units in a defined strata plan. The Bill provides for the unimproved value or site value of a whole parcel of land to be assessed, for the capital value of all units to be assessed and for the unimproved or site value of a particular unit to be calculated as a value that bears to the unimproved value or site value of a parcel of the same proportion as the capital value of the unit bears to the aggregated capital value of units defined on the plan. That is a fairly complicated description.

The Opposition has sought some advice in relation to this matter. The Land Brokers Society has asked whether in consequence of the Bill there is any intention to change the value of unit entitlements as a result of this method of evaluation. We ought to get an explanation from the Minister on that when he responds. The Law Society makes the point that the proposal would reduce the value and therefore the tax payable where the owner allows the unit to become run down and will increase the value and tax of an owner who maintains and cares for his property.

In practice, the alteration's main effect would be to substantially increase the cost of the valuation. A block of six units now requires only one valuation (the unimproved or site value), although after the amendment seven valuations will be required, involving the site or unimproved value plus the valuation of each unit. In the vast majority of cases, it could be expected that the different methods of valuation would arrive at the same or practically the same result.

The letter from the Law Society also suggests that the present method of valuing units be retained but that, where the Valuer-General considered that the present method was inappropriate or where a strata corporation so requested, the method of valuation proposed in the Bill should be used. I would be most grateful if the Minister would respond to those matters. The Opposition will reserve its position and, if satisfactory answers are not forthcoming, we will have to move amendments in another place to ensure that this matter is fair and reasonable and does not have unforeseen effects on people who live in units. We are aware of the problems already faced by these people with some of the taxes that are levied on them at present. The valuation of land throughout the State is currently causing a great deal of concern.

Mr Acting Speaker, you and other members would be aware that the present valuations on rural properties do not reflect the drastic downturn in the prices of properties across South Australia. I am amazed at some of the valuations that have been placed on properties in recent times. I make that point while this matter is being debated. The Opposition will support the measure at this stage of the debate but, if satisfactory replies are not forthcoming, amendments will be moved in another place to clarify the matters that I have raised.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I will take this opportunity to make some comments about valuations while we have this legislation before us. This Bill gives the Valuer-General an opportunity to separate (if you like) units on the one site and value each one separately. At the same time, the Valuer-General's Department may also apply an overall valuation to the site. An injustice already exists in our society whereby a person or persons who might own a piece of land could apply to have a resubdivision on the land but subsequently could find that they were compelled by law to bear the cost of putting on power, sewerage, water, footpaths, roads, and so on, thereby creating separate titles. Because of the cost involved, they could not create separate titles.

The department does not always value proposed and approved resubdivisions as separate blocks. However, it argues that where there are no sewerage facilities in the area but water is available, and the land has road frontage to each of the allotments that may be created, it has a right to value each allotment separately, even though they are only proposed allotments and the titles have not been issued. Most owners find that to create the separate titles, make the aprons into the blocks and do the other work that needs to be done involves cost which is quite beyond them at that time. At a time when interest rates are very high and, if the owner is already running on quite a large overdraft or on borrowed money, it is an injustice in my view if he cannot move ahead to establish separate titles, when the Valuer-General is valuing each title separately, because the property is much more valuable than it would be if it was valued as one piece of property. This is particularly so if the owner continues to use the property in the way that it has been used for several years or decades.

I had to appeal against a decision in a particular case and lost. However, I have been approached by a person with a property on the South Coast and he has decided to mount a case after I showed him what happened in my case. That person will argue his case and, if need be, he will eventually appeal if he can get it before the courts. He has a letter where the Engineering and Water Supply Department agreed that his tax would be based not on individual allotments but on one allotment. The Bill gives the Valuer-General an opportunity to tax as separate units the individual units that are created, regardless of whether they are owned by one owner as a complex or whether each unit is owned by different individuals. It is difficult to argue against that. However, I share the reservations of the member for Eyre, and I hope that the Minister will provide some answers.

Many people are concerned about the Valuer-General's Department, but not because it does not carry out its duties responsibly. In the main, I think it does a reasonably good job in arriving at fair valuations. The difficulty comes because the economy of this country and indeed the prices obtained for properties are going up and down like yo-yos. By the time a property owner obtains a valuation, it is outdated. For example, the valuations that we are working on at the moment were done in, I think, about April or May last year. People did not receive bills for water rates, sewerage rates, council rates, land tax, and so on, until just before Christmas (and I believe some did not receive them until just after), and they were based on that valuation.

During that eight-month or nine-month period land valuations plummeted—not just in the rural sector (as mentioned by the member for Eyre) but in many other sections of Adelaide. So, an individual who had their property valued in February this year would notice a big variation between that valuation and the price obtained by a neighbour who sold their house or business. Naturally, these people approach their MP, write to the department or complain at the local church or pub about the shocking valuations that have been placed on their properties. The Valuer-General is therefore caught in a cleft stick, as are Government agencies and local government which use the valuation as a taxing measure.

Of course, a property owner would not complain when the reverse situation applied, and I admit that. That is human nature. If in that eight-month or nine-month period since May last year there had been a huge increase in the prices obtained for properties, property owners would think that the value placed on the properties in May last year was quite fair; in fact, they might even think that it was fairly generous, because it would be below what they would receive if they sold their properties. That is where we have a difficulty. It was a lot worse when we had five year valuations, doing a fifth of the State at a time.

So, the community has difficulty in living with that situation, but one of the cussed parts of the actions that we allow is that we do not show on the water and sewer rate notice or on any other notice that we send out, except on the land tax bill which comes later, what the previous valuation was, what the new valuation is, and when the

new valuation was placed on the property. We would save many people coming into our electorate offices and many letters that go to the Valuer-General and to the Minister, as well as much money, just by putting on those notices what last year's valuation was and underneath it the new valuation and when it applied.

After all, people cannot relate how the Valuer-General can arrive at a figure for, say, January this year which is higher than the sum that they can get for their property in their view because they do not realise that the valuation was made in April or May last year. They think that the Valuer-General has a computer, presses a few buttons, and adds on a percentage that has occurred because of inflation or whatever. Then they say that the Valuer-General or his officers are wrong because their valuation is much higher than expected as a result of a downturn in the market.

I have previously made the point to the Deputy Premier and I re-emphasise it now because, if private enterprise tried to do what the Government does (and I do not blame any departmental officer: the Government makes the decision) and not inform the customer when the valuation was placed on the property, as well as of the previous valuation, even though the customer had it on the document last year, an officer from the Public and Consumer Affairs Department would be around very soon asking that the extra detail be placed on the document. That is not unreasonable: indeed, it is a fair request. I do not attack the Government for not doing it. This relates not just to this Minister, because the valuation made by his department does not reach the customer until the Land Tax Division has sent out its account: that is sent out later than the water and sewer rates and council rate notices, which first apply the new valuation.

That is not an unreasonable request. The valuation that is placed on the property is used as a tax. One does not have to own a property. Indeed, one can have a property worth $150 000 and owe $100 000 on it by way of mortgage on which interest of 18 per cent or 20 per cent per annum must be paid. Yet the Government comes along and taxes one on the debt. That is the truth of the matter. One is taxed on the debt as well as on the little capital value that one has in the property.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: What's the answer?

Mr S.G. EVANS: It is an unjust tax and, in reply to the honourable member, I am relating the land tax to the valuation. The answer is that we have exempted the farmers outside certain parts of metropolitan Adelaide. For example, farmers in the council areas of Stirling, Happy Valley, Willunga or right through to Gawler must pay the land tax unless they prove that a substantial part of their income (indeed more than half) comes from rural pursuits. People within that border who find that, because of the rural downturn, they cannot get an income from their farm and have to go out to get an income to live may find that the income they get from outside is more than they get from their farm, so they must be taxed. For example, a person at Kangarilla had to pay an additional $3 000, so he went out and earned another $7 000 and had to pay yet another $3 000 in land tax because of the need to supplement his farm income. The member for Gilles has asked what should be done about it. I say that all land of rural pursuit should be exempted. Then the Valuer-General would not be embarrassed by people trying to argue about the value of land in those near metropolitan areas.

So, the Valuer-General's valuations play an important part in some sections of our community. In the land tax area in particular the individual private home is exempt. Most of the people on land having a rural pursuit, whether two acres or 20 000 square kilometres, are exempt. However, business properties in the city and other places, whether used for manufacturing, retailing, wholesaling, storage or whatever, are not exempt. So, a person who may own a block of shops valued at over $200 000 will charge the tenants according to those valuations for the land tax that comes in at 24c in every $10 of valuation.

Big money is involved. Yet the individual shop, if valued in its own right, would not command that amount. The comparison of valuations and land tax is making things difficult for many people. This Bill raises again in my mind the concept of why we place individual valuations on land which has a subdivision or resubdivision approved but in respect of which the titles have not been allotted and the land has been used not for the intended purpose but for the purpose for which it was used before the original application for subdivision was submitted and approved. There is an injustice there. We are saying to people that one day new titles might be created to that land, so we will tax them on what we think they would get for the land if they sold it today. However, if the subdivider applies to the Lands Titles Office for the titles, the next valuation from the Valuer-General is virtually on them before they get the titles. That is how slow it is to get titles now, even though the procedure has been sped up. I do not say that it takes 12 months, but it takes quite a while. So, there is no harm, except that the Government or someone who has authorised it has seen this as a tax raising measure.

Obviously, if approval is obtained for a subdivision, possibly of 50 blocks, but the titles have not been created, the owner cannot use the land for the purpose required. It is impossible to use it for the purpose of selling allotments and having houses built on them. Yet the agencies say, 'We will value each block separately and tax you on each one separately.' Yet the water may not be connected and other services may not have been provided. The titles are not there. In fact, the titles may never be produced. One argument might be that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has water going past a property, and it might get more money if it could charge for individual allotments. The land tax people might think the same, except that they would lose if a title was created and a house was built on the land as a private individual's home.

Government agencies and local councils are saying that this is not a bad idea, that the Act gives them the opportunity to do this, so they will do it. It is a discretionary power and councils are not compelled to do this. They believe that such action will force people to pay the Land Titles Office a few bob for the titles, force them to connect each allotment to the water main, or force them to pay council rates for each block with a house on it (they will not be able to buy a block and keep it for long because of the high holding charges on allotments nowadays).

What we are saying through Government and local government agencies is, 'People have approval to subdivide, they have approval to get the titles—make them get the titles.' If that is not the reason, what is the reason, other than increasing revenue? There is not further cost to the local council. The land is used for the same purpose as in the past and incurs no further costs. What can be the reason, other than what I have suggested? I have asked the Minister to look at the matter, and I know of at least two cases. I believe there is an injustice. I will wait to hear the Minister's reply to my comments and to those of the member for Eyre in relation to how valuations will be applied to individual units and groups of units in the future.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands): I see these amendments as being a small and important step in pro-

viding a more equitable basis for the sharing of rates and taxes in strata plan developments. Although they are technical in nature, the amendments establish valuation equity and give a fairer distribution of rates and taxes for each unit in a strata title complex. I feel sure that occupiers of a strata title block of units will welcome the changes, especially in the light of changing values of individual units.

Dealing with some of the comments made by the member for Eyre, I point out that this Bill will not result in increasing individual valuations at all, nor will it increase the overall value. There will be no increase in site or unimproved values resulting from this measure. Total site values and capital values are already being determined, and it is only apportioning the site and unimproved values that this measure alters. It will not increase the number of valuations determined: It merely changes the apportionment of the individual valuations.

The comments of the member for Davenport really have no relevance. This measure deals with the apportionment of values for existing assessments of home units. They are already separately assessed and the comments are not relevant to the measure. This Bill provides for a more equitable distribution of the rate burden. That is all it is about; a more equitable distribution of the rate burden. In many instances the unit entitlements determined in a strata plan are inequitable, hence the need for this measure. I thank Opposition members for their contributions. As I have stated, I see the Bill as an important step towards providing a more equitable distribution of the tax burden in this area.

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

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March. Page 3566.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): The Opposition supports this Bill but has one or two amendments that will be moved in another place if satisfactory responses are not provided here. The Bill deals with circumstances where moneys secured by a mortgage have been paid by the mortgagor but a discharge of the mortgage cannot be obtained because the mortgagor is dead or cannot be found or is incapable of executing a discharge of the mortgage. The Bill proposes to add a circumstance in which a mortgage can be discharged: namely, where, in the opinion of the Minister, a mortgagee has 'refused to execute a discharge of the mortgage without sufficient reason'. The principal Act allows moneys to be paid to the Treasurer. The Bill seeks to substitute the Minister for the Treasurer. That is a course of action that we are seeing in most pieces of legislation, and there is no problem with that proposal.

Both amendments have merit. However, there is a difficulty in relation to the additional circumstance in which the Minister may discharge a mortgage. The second reading speech describes a case where a mortgagee has been paid in full but has left the country and has not replied to requests to execute a discharge of the mortgage. It cannot be said that from these facts alone the mortgagee has 'refused' to execute a mortgage. In addition, it does not take into account the possibility that although moneys may have been paid to discharge the mortgage there may be personal covenants in the mortgage which have not been complied with and in relation to which the mortgagee desires to take action. It is the Opposition's view that a preferable course is to allow the Minister to execute a discharge of the mortgage where:

1. all moneys outstanding have been paid;
2. the mortgagee has been given notice of intention to discharge the mortgage;
3. the mortgagee fails or refuses to execute a discharge without sufficient reason; and
4. the mortgagee has not taken legal action within a specified period to prevent the discharge.

The Opposition has had discussions with the Law Society, the Real Estate Institute and the Land Brokers Society concerning this matter. The Law Society stated its view, as follows:

> The desirability of the amendment giving the Minister power to execute a discharge where, in his opinion, the mortgagee has refused to execute a discharge without sufficient reason: whether a refusal to give a discharge is justifiable is a matter of law which can best be determined by the court.
>
> I doubt whether the proposed amendment would give the Minister power to execute a discharge in the case mentioned in the explanation of the Bill. It appears that the mortgagee failed to answer correspondence but he has not refused to give a discharge. If the amendment is to be passed, the words 'failed or' should be inserted before 'refused' in section 146 (1) *(d)*. Prior to the 1978 amendment, where a mortgage had been repaid but no discharge had been given, the Registrar-General had power to register the discharge where the mortgagee was 'dead or absent from the State'.
>
> I submit that it would be better to give the Minister this type of power than that proposed in the amendment. Similar comments apply to the amendment to the Bills of Sale Act.

I understand that this particular proposal has been brought into the House because of the difficulties that one particular person has had with a gentleman of ethnic background who left this country, went back to his native country and refused to answer correspondence. It has placed—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: Mr Trimboli?

Mr GUNN: No, I do not think it is Mr Trimboli. Another gentleman has been most difficult and has caused a great deal of stress, worry and inconvenience to one person. The Opposition has put forward these constructive suggestions, and if the replies are not satisfactory we will move suitable amendments in another place. We support the Bill, with those reservations. I foreshadow that amendments will be moved if the answers are not satisfactory.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands): I thank the honourable member for his support of this measure. Although only isolated instances occur, a particular person has been unable to discharge a mortgage because of the absence of the mortgagee, and this has caused undue problems for the mortgagor. These amendments overcome the problems and will give the Minister of the day power to intervene and, after acting within the due processes of the law, discharge the mortgage and provide peace of mind for the parties involved.

The member for Eyre raised a number of points. Really, the purpose of this Bill is to introduce a remedy where a mortgagee will not give a satisfactory reason for not giving a discharge, and absence from the State may be included. However, the mortgagee will be asked to give satisfactory reasons. A particular case has been drawn to the attention of Treasury where the mortgagee had received final payment for the mortgage debt but had left the State to live in Greece without having executed a discharge to the mortgage, and all efforts by the mortgagor to gain a discharge of the mortgage failed.

This Bill seeks to overcome that problem and, if it goes through as proposed, it will do so. As I have said, there are only a few isolated cases, and they do not occur very regularly, but this Bill will take account of any such cases that may arise in future.

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

BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 March. Page 3567.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): This is the final legal matter that I have to deal with today. Over the past week or so I have received substantial briefings from my colleague, and I appreciate the briefings I have received from officers of the Minister's department. My knowledge of the law has, I believe, been expanded somewhat in having to deal with these complicated matters and the various legal ramifications.

This Bill is similar to the one with which we have just dealt. Bills of sale are registered at the General Registry Office over chattels to secure advances made by a lender to the owner of those goods and chattels. Where all moneys have been paid under the bill of sale the Treasurer may execute a discharge of the bill of sale in circumstances identical with those specified in the Real Property Act for mortgages. This Bill seeks to do the same as is proposed in the Real Property Act Amendment Bill, and I make the same observations in relation to this Bill as I made in relation to that measure. I propose that amendments be inserted in this case similar to those involving the Real Property Act Amendment Bill, if no satisfactory or adequate explanations are given by the Minister. I thank the Minister for making his officers available to give me a briefing some days ago in relation to these complicated matters. The Opposition supports the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

Ms GAYLER (Newland): In today's debate I want to focus on the high priority that I believe should be given in the next South Australian State budget to children's services. Vital children's services funded in the State budget include preschooling in Education Department child/parent centres and Children's Services Office kindergartens, child-care facilities—provided in full day care centres and casual care centres, and family day care in care givers' homes.

In all these areas South Australia leads the nation in the quantity and quality of services for children under primary school age. We are also streets ahead of comparable nations such as the United States of America, where parents are left to fend for themselves in finding and paying for preschooling and child care. Parents in the United States are stunned and envious to hear of the way our State Government organises and funds children's services here. However, excellence achieved in South Australia is certainly no ground for complacency. At a time of shrinking public funds, annual across the board budget cuts and calls for lower taxes, competition for funds becomes fierce. Questions of priority to be given to various essential services becomes paramount.

I unashamedly consider that children's services and preschooling in particular should be a top priority, along with our economic development programs designed to generate growth and jobs for young South Australians. It is vital that no youngster misses out on the crucial early years of education and social and language development, and help with special learning, developmental or behavioural difficulties. The State Government's commitment to guaranteeing that all four to five year olds have the opportunity of four terms of preschooling is a commitment very much welcomed by parents in my electorate. So, also, is the 1985 election policy commitment that the Government would 'work towards an optimum staff/child ratio of 1:10 by 1989' in child/parent centres and kindergartens.

Funds allocated in 1986-87 for 102 Education Department child/parent centres totalled $3.9 million, of which $3.7 million was for staffing. The other funds were for 307 Children's Services Office kindergartens, amounting to $20 million in total funding, and $19 million for staffing costs. The allocation of staff numbers for preschools in late 1986 for the 1987 school year, according to a child/staff ratio, has meant a reduction of staffing for a number of my centres which had already achieved the 1989 target of 1:10 staff/child ratio. I refer to the St Agnes child/parent centre, the Ridgehaven child/parent centre and Banksia Park family centre. In each case, parents, grandparents and staff are gravely concerned at the staffing reduction. I share their concern, not simply at the change in staff numbers, but because of what it means in terms of child supervision, time and attention which can be given to individual development, and extra help to those with special learning or behavioural difficulties, in terms of the time which staff can devote to playgroup activities and library services, and in terms of stress on teachers and aides alike.

To make matters worse, unlike kindergartens, which are not attached to a primary school campus, child/parent centres are not entitled to temporary replacement of aides who are away for one reason or another, such as sick leave. They are therefore reliant on the primary school of which they are a part cooperating to provide a back-up aide or, alternatively, on parents who are able to help in covering absences. I have raised all of these matters with the Minister of Children's Services, the Minister of Education and the Premier. In a letter to me dated 12 March this year, the Premier outlined the Government's position on this matter. The letter states:

> I refer to your representations late last year concerning the level of preschool services in the Tea Tree Gully area. I am aware of your strong, personal commitment to children's services in your area and appreciate you bringing the matter to my attention.

He goes on to say:

> The Government remains committed to the delivery of high quality services to preschool children throughout the State and is working towards an optimum staff-child ratio in preschool centres of 1:10.

Subsequently, dealing with staffing arrangements, the Premier said:

> Staffing for preschool centres is based on the number of four-year-olds attending the centre at the time that reallocation decisions are made. If a centre has a declining enrolment then the office has a responsibility to ensure that these staff are allocated to centres that have an increasing number of enrolments. The office recognises that numbers of children will rise and fall at centres and numbers are constantly monitored throughout the year. Should the office become aware that a centre has a large increase in enrolments then every effort would be made to meet this increased enrolment. Indeed, enrolment numbers are reviewed during term 1 to assist in this process.

In his conclusion, the Premier stated:

> I can assure you that the demand for children's services across the State is under active review and will receive particularly close attention in the formation of the 1987-88 budget.

Following a deputation to the Minister of Children's Services in December 1986, I again met with the Minister in

March 1987 to press for a resolution of the staffing shortfall in the three centres—St Agnes, Ridgehaven and Banksia Park.

I know that departmental staffing officers have met with staff in my centre to monitor the situation and review enrolments and to help with the adjustment of programs within the available staff. Nevertheless, the key problem of inadequate staffing remains. Each of my centres estimates increased enrolments again in term 2: Ridgehaven up to 101 students, St Agnes to 70, and Banksia Park to 63. So, I take the opportunity to urge the Minister to improve the staffing of these centres so that the high quality of service provided to young children can be maintained. In spite of the very difficult budget outlook for the 1987-88 financial year, I also urge on the Government improved funding for preschooling and hope that the State Government will give children's services funding the high priority it should be afforded.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): I see that I do not get the spare two minutes that was left after that fine dissertation that was read for eight minutes by the member for Newland. If she had slowed it down, she would have taken up the extra 20 per cent that she had to spare. The member for Newland, prodding from the back bench, has obviously made the Minister very uncomfortable. I point out to her that CPCs are not only attached to primary schools but are also attached to area schools. Whereas she is complaining about the fact that staffing levels in her primary school CP centres had already reached 1989 levels, on this occasion she was lamenting the fact that they were reduced to the current formula levels. I must remonstrate with her to the extent that she is way ahead of many of the area schools and CP centres in Murray-Mallee which do not have anything like 1986-87 staffing levels for the service of the youngsters in the communities that they serve.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I think our seats are not marginal enough for the Labor Party to be very interested in whether or not the people react. I think that is the way we are often viewed. I will do my best, as I am sure my colleague the member for Chaffey will also do his best, to ensure that the conscience of Government, of whatever political persuasion, is pricked as often as necessary, from whatever position I sit in, to do a fair thing for all people, regardless of where they live.

I now draw the House's attention to a problem that has continued to increase in its severity and effect over recent years, that is, the problem of competing recreational activities in the Lower Murray, on the river and its immediate environs, particularly the conflict that arises when people using boats for various activities wish to occupy the same space as other people indulging or engaging in other activities not compatible with the boating activities. If you are sitting in a boat fishing, you are terribly upset if the dinghy from which your line is cast is suddenly rocked by some lair tearing past at 80 knots in a speedboat designed for nothing more or less than the purpose of enjoying the thrill of speed—not that I mind that lairs do that; if they want to do it, let them. But let us not have the resulting confrontation that is occurring on an increasing level where some people are even threatening to take shotguns with them when they go fishing. The next driver of a powerboat who comes too close and puts a heavy wake through their dinghy and upsets it or, alternatively, comes so close that it literally cuts off the lines, will be holed below the waterline.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: What do you do?

Mr LEWIS: What do I do? I sit around and watch birds, the feathered kind, with my binoculars. That is an activity which a large number of people enjoy in the Lower Murray. When they have time off, traditionally on weekends, and are watching birds and their interactions with each other, they do not want to find the pattern of behaviour disturbed by somebody who has a megaphone on their exhaust tearing past at a great speed within a few metres of where the birds are doing their natural thing and frightening them. In their taking flight, of course, the notes made of the behavioural patterns are completely useless because they are not taken through to any sort of conclusion. That disturbs me. It does not matter whether it is a pelican or a blue wren that you are looking at—the end result is the same.

I note the mirth of members in expectation that I was talking about other than my interests in the feathered kind of birds. I am not talking about women in maillots and other attractive bathing costumes, adorning the platforms and river banks with their form, whether swimming or simply sunbathing. I am talking about those animals that are the object and interests of aviculturists—real birds that indeed also have two legs, the differentation being that they have feathers. I know that some humans are said to have beaks also, sticky or otherwise, so I will not use that as an attempted means of distinguishing between the birds to which I refer and the birds that members opposite may find amusing.

All that causes problems. The way in which these problems can be addressed is to zone the river. By zoning the river we should simply allocate activites compatible with one another in specific areas and indicate where those activites can take place by appropriate siting of buoys and other signs on the river bank. They need not be environmentally intrusive and visually polluting of the vista. The signs and buoys can be quite sensitive as well as effective without being any of those undesirable things. The zoning of activites such as water skiing and boating, separate from fishing, swimming and birdwatching, would alleviate the problem as well as simplifying policing of it.

In addition to zoning of the river we also need to introduce measures, by amendment to existing legislation, that would enable us to detect people who are in control of speedboats when under the influence of alcohol or another drug. Presently, it is not lawfully possible to prosecute somebody who is drunk when in control of a boat. We need to be able to do that. A legislative amendment is necessary to enable police and Department of Marine and Harbors inspectors to conduct breath testing of drivers whom they suspect may have had too much too drink. The whole of the river from the mouth through the lock networks as far up channel as is possible to navigate needs to remain navigable and open to navigation. Wherever we have zoned the river for activities other than boating there needs to be a speed limit. The speed limit in the North Arm I believe is 8 knots. One does not plane at that speed in a normal hull boat that one might use for water skiing or for fishing—at least I do not. We need to have the means by which it is possible to detect breaches of this regulation of speed limit wherever imposed. Presently we do not have the means of detecting breaches and therefore legislation needs to be amended to enable policemen to use the hand-held radar speed detection equipment and provide the necessary evidence to prosecute people who offend against those laws.

The final factor that needs to be given some attention by the Government immediately, certainly before next summer, is the means by which it would be possible to prevent further deaths occurring. Very recently we saw a death at Murray Bridge when a boat blew open, down the bow. It

peeled the sides of the boat back. The boat was defective. It had been improperly repaired. Inspectors need to be able to put 'defect' stickers on such boats.

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

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I would like to use my time tonight to inform members of what is happening at the Cowandilla Primary School in my electorate. On Tuesday 24 April I was invited to visit the primary school by the Principal, Dennis Vance. I asked Dennis whether he would give me a conducted tour over the primary school, which he most certainly did, in the company of the Principal of the Cowandilla Language Centre, Marie Iadanza. I was pleased to be able to meet many parents of the school children whilst inspecting all the facilities. It is a very old area and I am pleased that all facilities are being used to capacity.

I asked Mr Vance whether he would send me a letter so that I could bring to the attention of the House what is happening in some schools in older areas. His letter states:

The amalgamation of the junior primary school and primary school has proceeded relatively smoothly. Enrolments at the school have remained stable. This year the child/parent centre has moved to the two teacher unit in the centre of the school. The move has been most successful. The upgrade of the centre has ensured an excellent start to their program. Our resource centre is now a feature of the school and should do much to assist a positive learning environment throughout the school.

Parents and community groups are gradually utilising the former CPC building on Brooker Terrace as a community and neighbourhood centre. The arrival of the secondary languages centre has been greeted positively and with purpose. We plan to share oval, canteen, pool, science, maths and resource centre, computer facilities and recreation resources. We have already commenced sharing some of these resources with considerable benefit to both schools.

The letter states that there is to be further redevelopment. I congratulate the parents, the school council, the principals of both the primary school and the Cowandilla Language Centre and the Minister of Education, because it is excellent to see a school area being used to fullest capacity.

While I am expressing those congratulations, I point out that I have received a letter from the Principal of the Cowandilla Language Centre, as follows:

I write to inform you about Cowandilla Language Centre which recently relocated from Gilles Street. The centre is a secondary school for secondary age students who are new arrivals and who have little or no English. The students attend the school for about 30 school weeks after which they enrol in a secondary school of their choice. While at the school the students study English as a second language, maths, science and social studies.

The emphasis on the latter three subjects is not only on content but also on the specific language skills required in these subjects. As well as preparing students for high school, students are also given experiences which will enable them to adjust and live in a new community. For example, they go on excursions to the market, the Art Gallery and to recreational facilities, etc. Currently, the school has 47 students—34 migrants and 13 refugees.

Students come from many different countries. Currently, they come from Vietnam, China, Kampuchea, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, Indonesia, Argentina, Greece, Cyprus, Hungary, Lebanon, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, France and Italy. Unfortunately, the school moved before work was completed but despite this there have been a number of positive occurrences. These include:

1. The sharing of the primary school library [which is excellent].
2. The use by our students of the canteen and the dental clinic.

I will come back to that later, if I have time—

3. The positive interaction of our students with the primary schoolchildren. The two schools have the same lunch break and it is pleasantly rewarding to see the children not only playing together but also communicating together.
4. Even though there are two schools on the campus, the local community is already seeing it as one campus. Examples of this include the Language Centre's representation on the future of the campus and the representation of one Language Centre person on the Primary School Council (this is yet to be filled).

Once the upgrading of the Language Centre has been completed, I feel that there will be more sharing of facilities and resources.

Housing and Construction workmen are to be praised for the work they have done. It has been a difficult situation for both the staff and the workmen. The workmen have been cooperative in our requests which have been to minimise the disruption to the students educational program. There is still some outstanding work which we anticipate will be completed in the not too distant future.

As mentioned previously, the Language Centre and primary school community have been involved in discussions regarding the longer-term developments of the campus.

The letter then lists a series of proposals, and I have sent a letter to the Minister supporting those proposals. The letter concludes:

(*f*) the removal of transportable block of four classrooms which currently act as a physical boundary for both schools.

These proposals were put to a parents meeting on Wednesday 25 April, at which they expressed approval of the proposals.

The removal of that transportable block will eliminate the barrier between the two schools. I have spoken to the Minister and support the school in its endeavour to have it moved.

As I said I would do earlier, I return to the dental clinic on the site and refer to information about people who are treated there, as follows:

The school dental clinic at the Cowandilla Primary School was originally constructed in the 1979-80 financial year, but was destroyed by fire in March 1985—

I played a big part in getting it rebuilt; I took a deputation to the Minister of Health, and it has been rebuilt—

As at March 1987, staff at the Cowandilla school dental clinic provide dental care for approximately 1 450 preschool, primary and high school students in the surrounding area. The number of children enrolled at the Cowandilla clinic is as follows:

	Children
Cowandilla Primary School	237
Cowandilla Child Parent Centre	4
Cowandilla Language Centre	45
Netley Primary School	167
Plympton Primary School	135
Richmond Primary School	65
St John Bosco	43
St Joseph's, Kurralta Park	32
St Joseph's, Richmond	82
High schools	556
Primary schools from other areas	83
	1 449

The clinic is open for four days per week under the control of the District Dental Officer, Dr John Diamanti. It is staffed by two dental therapists (one for four days per week and one for one day per week) and a dental assistant. The second dental therapist also works at the nearby Flinders Park clinic. Statewide, the School Dental Service treated 174 308 preschool, primary and secondary school students in 1986 compared with 165 093 in 1985.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 2 April at 11 a.m.