HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 13 February 1992

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

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Brindal:

That a select committee be established to inquire into the report on the provision of primary and secondary education by the Education Department.

(Continued from 12 February. Page 2703.)

Mr M.J. EVANS (Elizabeth): I wish to complete very briefly my remarks on the matter of the select committee in relation to education. Last night I advised the House that—

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth will resume his seat. Will members please lower the noise level and resume their seats to allow the business of the Chamber to continue. The member for Elizabeth.

Mr M.J. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I was saying that I had previously advised the House of my support for this motion, which is to establish a select committee into education. I would like to canvass briefly a few of the matters that I think are of principal significance in this area. Obviously, when one starts to talk about primary and secondary education a vast array of topics come to mind, and many of these have already been the subject of extensive and expensive reports in the public sector. The Government has commissioned a number of studies and inquiries into many of the principal areas of concern.

It is not my view that we should attempt to repeat this process or, indeed, to second guess those outcomes. However, many areas have not been so thoroughly scrutinised, and one could imagine a quite substantial role for the committee in examining those areas. I refer to such matters as, for example, teacher education. There are many controversial aspects of teacher education that would profit from a review. Questions of assessment and the measurement of output of the education system would certainly rate very highly, in my opinion, in any activities that the committee might undertake, because it is critical in any profession—and teaching is one of the most important professions in our society—that you have an effective measurement of the outcome of the activities of those professionals. That is how you establish professional accountability and determine what progress you are making in this field.

Unfortunately, we have never been particularly successful at measuring outcomes in the education area, and in recent times our efforts in that direction have deteriorated somewhat. The Government recently established a number of assessment programs in schools, and I believe that we should examine very closely just how those projects are being established and what progress they have made. Curriculum development and the degree to which curricula should be standardised centrally or even nationally are other vital aspects. To what extent each individual teacher should reinvent the curriculum process each year is another matter that I believe needs close scrutiny, and the degree to which parents and local communities should be involved in that process also needs to be looked at.

Obviously, other questions such as the structure of education, the way in which we organise our primary and secondary schools as individual schools, and the way in which we integrate them into a regional subculture, which is certainly happening in the Elizabeth and Munno Para areas now, as my colleague the member for Napier would be aware, should be looked at. We are attempting to experiment with a regional grouping of schools, and that is proving to be quite a useful idea, but we do not have an adequate legal framework for that.

Those items that I have raised are just a summary and, indeed, only a brief selection of the matters that might come up because I am constrained by time this morning, but I would also like to summarise by saying that it has always been of some concern to me that one of the things least discussed in the Education Act is education. It contains a great many references to industrial matters, long service leave and structural organisational questions, but it sets out very few guidelines for actual education. The concept itself is not adequately dealt with in the Act, and I believe that the select committee would certainly profit from this Parliament exercising its role as the final arbiter in these matters, to give some guidelines to the Minister and to the department as to precisely what we expect from the system of education in this State and how we expect that to be undertaken.

Let us put a little more education back into the Education Act, let us give the public a chance to have a say on the issue, and let us ensure that the Parliament lives to the full its role of providing for the accountability of the Executive and for ensuring that we discharge our function as setting guidelines and standards for those who work for the people of this State in the vital area of education.

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): I am pleased to follow the member for Elizabeth and to echo his concerns about education. I am pleased to hear that he, like I, supports this very important motion to establish this select committee. There is no doubt that many South Australians believe that education is in a mess, and justifiably so. Parents feel that they do not have a say in the way in which their children are educated. They are often frustrated by their lack of progress, by class sizes and by difficulties in gaining access to a school of their choice.

One particular concerned group of parents who have made quite strong representations to me for a period of time are parents whose children need special education. Regrettably, this Government seems to believe that the only children who are in need of special education are those with recognised medical disabilities. Well, Mr Speaker, you are probably aware, too, that that is not always the case. Indeed, they may be children who, for one reason or another—be it attributable to their home environment, an earlier learning difficulty or some social problem—have a difficulty in learning. If those children's needs are not met now, whilst they are today's problem children in the classroom, they have the potential to be tomorrow's juvenile delinquents. For comparatively small inputs, those children can be assisted, their parents' minds can be put at ease, and they can gain access to the education that they deserve. But instead, what we have seen under the present system is this growing group of children who are increasingly denied access to the educational attention they need.

The Government claims that it is spending more on special education. That particular claim is made by demonstrating that more is spent on training teachers in special education methods. Well, that may be, but there is no point in spending the dollars on training teachers in methods for special education if, at the same time, they have 25, 26 or 30 other children to attend to. They do not have the time to devote to them, and there is a need for specialist education resources. I look forward to seeing this select com-

mittee, on its establishment, look at this as one of the many areas of education it will examine.

Of course, problems in education go beyond just that. Some parents are denied access to a school in close proximity to their home because, at the moment, schools are being closed willy-nilly across our State. Obviously, more thought must go into the need to close some of those schools and also in the projections as to their future growth, should population changes occur. None of those things seem to be examined as closely as they should be. Of course, parents are increasingly demanding the opportunity to comment on things such as disciplinary policies in their schools. For too long we have seen the naughty or misbehaving child simply let off the hook with bland threats which are unable to be delivered. In my day I received a couple of clips behind the ear, and I do not think it did me any harm, and I am sure that probably most members of this Chamber had a few clips behind their ear.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

Mr MATTHEW: Well, the bovver boy in the corner may well laugh. I think many in his Party would like to give him a clip behind the ear today.

Mr Brindal: He obviously he didn't get enough.

Mr MATTHEW: Perhaps he didn't get enough, as the member for Hayward says, but there is no doubt that parents should have a stronger role within their schools, ideally through school councils. They should have a say in the financial running of their school, in the type of principal they have in their school and, indeed, they should have a say in the disciplinary policy. I would advocate even further that we should look at the opportunities for principals to have a say in the type of teachers they have within their schools. This committee would have far-reaching powers. I welcome its introduction. I commend my colleague the member for Hayward for putting forward the motion. I commend the member for Elizabeth for speaking strongly on the need for its formation, and I support this motion with pleasure, as I believe it is an important one for the future needs of our State.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Whilst I have no argument with the main thrust of what members have already said about this select committee, my reservations are that in this Parliament we have just gone through a very tortuous process. It was tortuous because some members were not really happy with the way in which the new parliamentary committee system was set up, but it is with us now and we all hope that it will work and that it will work well.

The primary reason for establishing those parliamentary committees was to involve the whole Parliament in examining the running of Government. I accept that and I applaud it. A committee, which is known as the Social Development Committee, has, amongst its terms of charter, the responsibility for examining education. That Social Development Committee has joint house membership—

Mr Brindal: Good try!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, I heard an interjection, 'It's a good try.' As far as I know, the view that I am expressing is my view, and my view alone. In relation to this Parliament gaining the maximum use of its membership, if one examines the staffing of the committee system that has been established, this Parliament will have problems with regard to resources. I do not think that anyone would disagree with me in that regard. However, this motion seeks to establish a select committee whose terms of reference have yet to be established, but which I suggest would fall well within the charter of the Social Development Committee. It is for that reason that I have reservations.

I have no problem with the comments of the member for Elizabeth, the member for Bright and the member for Hayward. My concern is with the mechanism by which this particular subject should be addressed. It may well be that the views that I am expressing will be ignored not only on the other side of the House but even on my side. Now that a new parliamentary committee system has been established, and hopefully soon it will be up and running, I think that we should seriously look at whether we can go down this select committee path.

I recall in debates in another place that it was agreed that select committees could be appointed in addition to parliamentary committees, and I have no problem with that. I refer to a specific subject with narrow terms of reference that could be examined by a select committee. However, here we are talking about the provision of education in the primary and secondary areas. It is all embracing. The proposal is that almost a third of the State's budget be examined by a select committee.

I would have thought that it was fairly obvious that this was the ideal subject to be picked up by one of the new parliamentary committees. It may well be that the views I am expressing will be disregarded by other members in this place, but I suggest they seriously take on board what I have said. I have no problem with the subject matter of the examination. My reservations relate to the mechanism by which we go about it. As I said, perhaps people are convinced that it should be a select committee. I support the intention of this motion, but I do not support the mechanism by which it will be carried out.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the resolution and commend the mover for an initiative that will be of tremendous benefit to South Australia. Unlike the member for Napier, I disagree that this subject would be better dealt with by one of the new parliamentary committees. The subject of primary and secondary education is both highly specialised and vast in its implications. That parliamentary committee has a range of work to do, whereas this committee needs to be quite focused in its efforts on primary and secondary education.

It has always concerned and astounded me that the foundation levels of education in this State and across the country are deserving, apparently in the eyes of Governments, of fewer resources and less attention overall than tertiary education, yet all of us know and can testify that the profound and lasting influence on our lives and attitudes towards learning are established in our formative years, that is, in our primary and indeed our pre-school years. If any of us were asked which individual, apart from our own parents and families, has had the most powerful influence on our lives, we would name either a primary or secondary school teacher. For those reasons it is certainly important that Parliament examines the subject.

It is also important to realise that Parliament as a Parliament has never, to my knowledge, examined this subject in the way that is now being proposed. The last substantial report on this subject, examined by the Parliament, was the Karmel report into education, initiated by Joyce Steele as Minister of Education in 1969 and reported to, from recollection, the Hon. Hugh Hudson who was the Minister of Education in the Dunstan Government. That is more than 20 years ago. In the interim we had the Fitzgerald inquiry into education, initiated by the Commonwealth, which led to the establishment of the Schools Commission and to the involvement of the Commonwealth Government in pro-

grams and funding of primary and secondary schools. That was 1973—a long time ago. In the meantime there have been vast changes in the world and in education, but have they all been for the better, have they meant that our system is entirely relevant and is it acting in the best interests of children? That is its purpose, and all of us would admit that there is disquiet in the community amongst parents and amongst educators about our education system.

One thing that worries me very much indeed is that the energy, idealism and motivation that is so strong in teachers because of their sense of vocation seems to be gradually being quenched by not only cost constraints but also administrative structures which divert energy that should be put into the teaching of children into less productive areas. That is one aspect of education that I hope this committee will examine. Obviously, because the terms of reference are so wide, there will be no limit to what the committee can examine, but I hope that it will examine curriculum, administration and, possibly above all else, teacher training.

I will never forget an occasion late last year when a young man, newly graduated and in his first school, came into my office. He was a teacher of perhaps six months' standing and his rather mournful words were, 'We were taught about education; we were not taught about teaching.' He said, 'All the theories and philosophies of education in the world do not equip you when you are standing up in front of a class of hungry, unwashed 10-year olds who are unhappy and who can't read or write.' If our system is failing at that fundamental level, it is more than time this Parliament looked at it.

I am pleased that the examination will take place not by educators and experts, as was the case with the Carmel and Fitzgerald inquiries, but by representatives of the people whose children are being affected by the education system and whose lives, livelihoods and future depend on the quality of that system. I am delighted that the initiative was taken by my colleague, the member for Hayward, and that it will be supported—I believe and hope—by the House. I hope that the people who are members of this committee will be those who will give their all to it, because the outcome is so important for the future of the State.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I will not unduly take up the time of the House. I congratulate the member for Hayward for moving this motion. Whilst I have some of the reservations that have been expressed by the member for Napier, I believe that the issue is one that must be addressed, and this mechanism is really the best vehicle for addressing these issues.

I agree with the member for Coles: a number of issues need to be looked at seriously in this debate. Her history is correct in the sense that the Carmel report, which came down in 1970, was the last major overview of education services in this State. The interesting finding of the Carmel report was that the average high school would have 1 000 students and the average primary school would have 600. In fact, at that time the Carmel report regarding the provision of education services in our community was based on demographic predictions that today we would welcome in many areas.

No primary school in my electorate is anywhere near the size predicted by the Carmel inquiry; no high school in my district, nor in many other districts, is approaching those sizes. The issue is broader than the matters raised by the member for Coles. The honourable member said that we need to have a close look at curriculum—and I agree with that. The member for Coles argued that we would have to look at the administration, and I agree with that. She also said that that needs to be done in this House, and not necessarily by the best educationalists in the country, and I agree with that as well. However, a couple of other issues are timely and certainly need addressing, one being—and it is something about which I feel very strongly—the question of funding in our schools. If one compares some of the schools in the eastern suburbs with some of those schools in my area, one sees that the funding is deficient in the northern suburbs, in many of the country areas and in many other parts of South Australia.

A great deal of funding is left to parents and to local communities. Quite frankly, in some areas where a number of students are GAS or from low income earning families but may not qualify for the school card and do not have a great disposable income, the income of the schools, particularly the primary schools, is very low indeed. About 40 per cent of the student population at the local school to which my boy goes, Para Hills Primary School, is on the school card. As I understand it, the income of that school, from all sorts of fundraising, is about $7 000 to $8 000 in a good year—and this is not a good year.

I have checked with many other primary schools in my electorate, and the figure is closer to $6 000, because they have the same sort of problem, although they have even fewer students than Para Hills Primary School. I believe that we need to look at the funding question, because so much of the quality of education today is determined by the provision of extra resources that do not come with the physical structure of the building.

I refer now to teacher training. I think it is appropriate (and the member for Coles is right) that we should be looking at that issue. We should be looking around it, underneath it, through it and over the top of it. We should be doing that because we should ensure the best possible training for all the teachers who will be teaching the future generations of students who we know will be competing in a work force in a situation that will probably be as difficult as the one we are facing today. If we are serious about lifting the skill level of our community, we must address this question.

However, I also suggest that a great deal has happened in teacher training in the past 20 years, and it has been nearly 20 years since I worked for the Education Department. I do not know exactly how we can train a teacher other than by the apprenticeship model, which in many respects has much to commend it and is something that I hope the committee will look at. At the end of the day 20 years ago I was rejected for a teaching college scholarship in my final year at university but, five minutes later on the next floor, I was hired as a teacher.

I had never been before a class and, in fact, I was the only one with a degree who was employed in that school for that whole year. The reality was that anyone who had one or two years of tertiary education could have walked straight in as a teacher. Today, that does not happen. In part, at least, we have realised the necessity for training, and we do not allow those situations any more. This committee or the new Social Development Committee, of which I am a member, will need to address this and many other issues.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the motion. Because of correspondence and articles I have read in recent times, I decided to make a contribution to have on record some people's thoughts. The motion as moved by the member for Hayward is:

That a select committee be established to inquire into and report on the provision of primary and secondary education by the Education Department.

I am not sure that it should not go further than that, and that is what I wish to speak about. I support the motion, but I think that we should have included tertiary education, after having received the correspondence I have received in recent times. I will not identify the writers of the letters: I will merely read them.

The first document I wish to read is an article from the local Messenger Press newspaper that came out yesterday. The article relates to comments made by the principal of one of the biggest secondary schools in this State. Just over 1 300 children attend Blackwood High School. The principal is not playing politics: he is telling both Parties that they have their heads in the sand, in his view. Under the heading, '30 per cent of kids doomed to failure—principal', the article states:

One third of South Australia's school children could wind up as over-qualified, unemployed 'second-class' citizens because the education system and society are failing them, says a local school principal. Blackwood High School principal Dick Arnold said intense competition for tertiary places, introduction of the SACE certificate (South Australian Certificate of Education) and restructuring of the work force meant only 70 per cent of students would have a 'reasonable' career and full-time work. 'My fear is that 30 per cent of our kids will be classifed as second-rate citizens,' Mr Arnold said.

He said Blackwood High School had 320 matriculation students this year—70 of whom had returned for a year 13 to improve their scores. Mr Arnold said most had matriculated with ease last year but they needed to attain 'mind-boggling' scores to gain entry into high demand courses such as medicine, physiotherapy, arts and science.

'The number 59 as matriculation status is meaningless,' he said. 'Many of our students score 65 and over and even kids with 85 and 86 get knocked back.' Mr Arnold said the 1992 introduction of the SACE certificate, which was a prerequisite to tertiary institutions, also would preclude many students from a tertiary education. To qualify for a certificate students must pass a certain number of units over year 11 and 12 and these must include a specified pattern of subjects, some of which were compulsory.

Mr Arnold said students faced poor career prospects and a declining job market because unskilled jobs were becoming scarce and industry was employing fewer, more specialised people. 'It is a vicious, tangled cycle,' Mr Arnold said. 'Will this dispossessed group become a significant social problem? Both major political Parties have got their heads in the sand about these movements which are occurring simultaneously.'

I just want to make one comment about the unskilled labour market. I think we need to rethink our immigration program, because many of those who come here, especially those who claim and succeed in obtaining refugee status, are in the unskilled market area, often to the detriment of our own local people, because they sometimes work for people of their own ethnic backgrounds at reduced rates, and the authorities have difficulty catching up with them. I wish to read two letters; the first, from a constituent to the Executive Officer of SATAC, states:

I am writing to you concerning the information published in *The SATAC Guide 1992* concerning the opportunities available for entrance to courses at South Australian tertiary education institutions. I believe that the information contained in the guide is misleading and borders on being professionally negligent, in the view it conveys to students seeking entry to tertiary education.

Even if one accepts that the statistically derived higher education entrance score is a reasonable basis on which to assess the likely performance of students in higher education courses, and I do not, the publication of cut-off scores which reflected the enrolment numbers in 1990 is of no value whatsoever. I find it very hard to believe that between the Department of Education, the private school system and the tertiary education institutions that it is not possible to make a much more reasonable assessment of the likely cut-off score in any one year.

SATAC's performance in this respect is not excused by the references in the guide to the information not being 'provided for the purpose of predicting an applicant's chances of gaining entry to any particular course'. By publishing the scores that is precisely the use which readers make of them. If the cut-off scores are so widely variable from year to year and are not useful as an indicator of likely success in obtaining a place, then they ought not be published in this way.

My daughter has this year been a victim of the misinformation which SATAC has seen fit to publish. Expressing her wish to attend courses in junior primary teaching with published cut-off scores of between 59 and 61.8, her aspirations which on that basis were quite reasonable have now been dashed. Not only has the SATAC system seen to it that her performance of two high achievement and three competent achievement scores with an aggregate of 70 out of 100, is scaled down to 64, but even with such a scaled score she cannot expect an offer of a place in any tertiary education institution. Suddenly the thrill and reward of successfully completing her public examinations at the end of year 12 is turned to bitterness and disappointment. Competency no longer provides an open door to further learning; instead, by way of statistical 'mumbo jumbo' and the publication of information which leads to erroneous conclusions, SATAC leaves good students with the abiding impression that they are failures.

Not to be satisfied with this wonderful contribution to the education of young people, SATAC goes further and demonstrates its bureaucratic insensitivity to human concerns. Why, when SATAC must have been aware of the enormous sense of disappointment and anxiety which the publication of first and second round offers would bring, were they published in the daily press on the Saturday of a long weekend? The privacy of disappointment should be respected. My daughter did not grant SATAC permission to publish her name in the newspaper, and I do not believe that SATAC has any legal obligation to publish the offers in the newspaper. This practice should cease forthwith.

I am also concerned at the timing of notifications to students. Not only did the giving of notice on a long weekend increase the level of anxiety because there was nowhere to turn for expert advice, but these offers were made so close to the beginning of the new school year and first semester at TAFE that alternative options were in many cases already closed off. Whilst I appreciate that SATAC's task is far from easy, there is in my view substantial room for improvement in the organisation's performance. The organisation must be underpinned by much more sophisticated educational planning with accurate assessments of potential demand and opportunities for places. The organisation must also be focused on its clients who are the applicants for admission, bearing in mind their human feelings of joy and disappointment. I trust that you will before the next guide is produced and future offers are made, seek to remedy some of the issues which I have raised.

I shall now read part of another (three-page) letter that was sent to me by the same person. He says:

My family and I have just finished one of the most tormented periods in our lives, quite uncertain about what if anything we could do to deal with problems which seem to us to be way beyond our control. I refer of course to the annual torture of sitting for and then awaiting the results of the gamble as to whether there will be an opportunity to go on to higher education or whether, in a situation where there are no jobs for young people, it is off to try and find work.

I have just watched as my eldest daughter spent a year of her life working solidly towards her matriculation, only to see her now dashed hopes fading into the distance, not because she didn't work hard or get good marks but because there are insufficient opportunities and the system has got at her.

He then offers me some comments which I would read to the House if there were time. I have had several letters, but this is the longest one and the one into which most effort has been put. However, I have had letters from families who may not be very articulate, in effect, asking, 'Where do we go from here? Our son and daughter'—brought up in a poorer family in this case—'have suddenly found that they have nowhere to go.'

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): In addressing the Parliament on this subject, I wish to put aside the adversarial role and try to look at it from a bipartisan point of view. In doing so, I am concerned about the track down which we are going, and I must express my reservations about this motion, which is as follows:

That a select committee be established to inquire into and report on the provision of primary and secondary education by the Education Department.

I feel that the Parliament is not being taken seriously on this matter, because the motion is so broad that it defies the intelligence of a member of Parliament that a select committee could accomplish just that. I believe that the Parliament should have before it specific terms of reference so that we can grasp exactly the way that this inquiry will go.

I listened with great attention to the members for Coles, for Playford and, indeed, for Davenport on their deliberations into this matter. However, after listening to them I am even more uneasy about this proposition. The reason why I am uneasy about it is that the debates that we have heard thus far on this subject have related to education resources and funding—which in itself is a very huge area of expertise—and teacher training. I wonder what the Parliament will do with respect to looking at teacher training, which is also an enormous issue. Will the parliamentary committee look at truancy? Will the committee look at class sizes? Speakers have already suggested that the committee will look at curriculum issues. Will the committee look at the amalgamation of schools and at the cooperation between TAFE and the Education Department? What about child-care education?

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I accept the interjection being made by the member for Custance, and it is very nice to see him have a very strong run for preselection. I accept the interjection that he is looking for rural education. What about the huge question of asset replacement in the Education Department? Estimates submitted to another committee of which I am a member suggest that there is a need for asset replacement in the Education Department involving over $400 million in the next budget. What about the social welfare question raised by the member for Coles in relation to hungry children going to school? Will that be included in the terms of reference of this inquiry?

We do not have the terms of reference before us. If all of the things that I have mentioned are included in the terms of reference the committee's task will be impossible; it could not be done by a committee of this House. The amount of research material, assistance and expertise that would be needed to guide the parliamentary committee on this subject—if we include all of those subheadings that I have presented to the House—would be impossibly expensive. Not only that, I take issue with the member for Coles when she says that it is good that these matters are not being taken up by educators, although I understand that some former educators will be included in the membership of the committee. However, by and large, it will not be taken up by educators. If I may say so, in the kindest terms, there will be a group of amateurs trying to grasp this very huge subject. Mention was made of the Fitzgerald report—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I beg your pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr FERGUSON: I am sorry, Sir, but I am always deeply interested in the interjections of the member for Murray-Mallee.

The SPEAKER: The member for Henley Beach should not be interested in interjections; they are out of order.

Mr FERGUSON: Of course, Sir, and I accept what you are putting to me. Mention was made of the Fitzgerald report. We in this House know of the huge amount of effort that went into the Fitzgerald report.

Mr Quirke interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: I beg your pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections from both sides of the House are out of order.

Mr FERGUSON: I am at fault, Sir. A huge effort has been put into various inquiries into the Education Department. Unless the select committee has available to it resources of that nature then, I suggest, the report it will bring down can be only half-baked. What we are talking about—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr FERGUSON: The member for Murray-Mallee is quite able to enter the debate. I will listen carefully to what he has to say. Unless the resources available to the committee are the same as those available to the other committees that have been conducted throughout Australia, we leave this House open to ridicule and the results, which are affecting the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of South Australians, will be less than desirable. In future I hope that backbenchers and those not involved in setting up a committee are given a rundown of the exact terms of reference when proposals are put forward, so that we do not fly blind and accept the decision of the Parliament in relation to a matter that eventually might hold the Parliament up to ridicule, and I strongly suggest that that is the situation we may find ourselves in with this committee.

Despite my words this morning, I will support the motion. I am pleased that my words are being taken down and recorded in *Hansard*, because I wish to refer to them in future. I want to make sure that we have looked at the pitfalls that might occur with respect to this committee. I do not think that we should go into it in a half-baked way, and I fear that that is what we are doing.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Having spent my working life in education, I can say that this topic is very close to my heart. I support the establishment of the select committee. I acknowledge the points made by the member for Henley Beach, that it is a big task. Obviously the committee will have to determine quickly the issues it will focus on. Education is one of the key aspects in our society, economy and cultural life, and it is something that the Parliament should be involved in. It is a pity that the Parliament did not become involved in it much earlier. This select committee will not be a witch-hunt but will look positively and constructively at aspects of primary and secondary education to see how we can do things better.

We have a fine teaching force and a long-established education tradition, but I believe that we can look at ways of making them better. For example, the committee, with input from the department, could be looking at ways in which the school day could be used more efficiently and effectively. I have some concerns about whether the school day, at both primary and secondary level, is used in the most productive and constructive way.

There are many areas that Parliament should be concerned about with respect to education, and one of the central issues is social education—the development of values in schools. That is an area in which the Parliament should have an interest and concern, because within schools, along with the family and elsewhere, children develop their values. Today in our society we see the consequences of the breakdown of those values. I do not blame the school system for that; I only point out that the schools have an important role to play, and we should look at ways in which those values—concern and respect for people and property—can be enhanced. I do not see this select committee in any way being a witch-hunt—an attack on teachers or on the Education Department. In general I think that their record has been good, but it can be made a lot better.

Another issue I am concerned about is the way in which computers have been and are being used in schools. Primary

schools have spent a lot of money on computer equipment and have put a lot of effort into computing studies, yet in many cases there is quite a gap between what occurs at the primary school level and what occurs in early secondary school years. We have keen primary school students who have keyboard skills and so on entering secondary school only to find that in some high schools computers do not get much use until in the latter secondary school years. We should look at that because much community and taxpayer money is invested in computers at the primary school level and we should be ensuring that that usage is continued and extended in the secondary area.

Another issue that needs to be looked at, and the department is looking at it now, is whether or not we should continue to have year 7 at primary school level or whether we should be moving to the junior high school situation and, indeed, whether or not we should be having senior high schools. Many other States end primary schooling at year 6 level and we should be looking to see whether we should go down that path.

That is an important area given what has happened in recent years where there has been an undertaking and a commitment that junior primary students have a minimum time in the junior primary area. As a consequence, it means that we are now getting much older primary school children in year 7 but, with problems involving puberty, adolescence and the like, we have to look at whether it is appropriate for children of that age to be at primary school and mixing with younger children or whether they would be better at a conventional high or junior high school. We should consider the flow-on effects of that in respect of senior high schools.

We need to look at the question of technology high schools. I attended a technical high school and it is regrettable that such schools were abolished under the pretext of transferring those practical skills to high schools. I do not believe that that has happened. In our society we need to get away from the tendency to look down on technicians, craftspeople and technical people as if somehow or other they are inferior to white collar people. We need to get away from that silly attitude, which is doing our economy and manufacturing industry much harm. Whether or not we call them technology or technical high schools, the name is not so important as what happens in such schools.

In conclusion, there are many aspects relating to Aboriginal education that need to be examined. Obviously, the committee cannot look at everything. We have had many inquiries in the past, for example, the Karmel and Keeves inquiries and the primary review which involved much input from Marilyn Gilbertson and others. I see the committee building on that and looking at issues of public concern relating to education in an attempt to make what is basically a good system of education even better. Therefore, I support the establishment of the committee.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I support the motion of my colleague the member for Hayward. The committee's area of inquiry would include a consideration of services provided in rural South Australia and it is for this reason that I feel I must support the establishment of the committee. I appreciate that the member for Hayward has first-hand knowledge of the difficulties in rural South Australia, as he was a teacher in the Far West of this State.

I represent a rural electorate and am very aware of the problems occurring in rural communities, particularly the problem of providing education to any reasonable standard in many circumstances. This matter has taken up an increasing amount of my time. It is a key issue and I hope the committee can find ways to alleviate the problems involved in country education. I appreciated the opportunity of speaking to the Minister last night.

I refer to problems in Burra and at Risdon Park Primary School in respect of staffing levels. We have a problem with distance education, although it is a good concept. Schools in the Barossa Valley are in a key area. One school is already linked to the video network and I hope that they can all be linked up and have a service provided in this way. Distance education is working well at one level but it does not work so well in small country schools because the provision of services and equipment is not there. I support the establishment of the committee and I offer my assistance if required. I look forward to positive results.

The Hon. M.D. RANN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE LAW AND PRACTICE RELATING TO DEATH AND DYING

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Thursday 19 March 1992.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON BUSHFIRE PROTECTION AND SUPPRESSION MEASURES

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended until Thursday 19 March 1992.

Motion carried.

COUNTRY RAIL PASSENGER NETWORK

Mr VENNING (Custance): I move:

That this House calls on Australian National, in cooperation with the State Transport Authority, to proceed toward the re-establishment of a country rail passenger network with priority being given to services to the Iron Triangle and the South-East.

I appreciate the opportunity provided by the House today for me to move this very relevant motion. Listening to the news report this morning, I believe the time is right for this motion to appear on the Notice Paper today. We heard this morning of the announcement by the Federal Government that the forthcoming economic statement will include a major undertaking to update the Adelaide-Melbourne-Brisbane railway service, which will include the changing of the gauge between Melbourne and Adelaide. It is all very relevant and important to this State, and it is a great sign of the times.

I take no credit for the increase in Government and public interest in our rail infrastructure, but I remind the House that the rail issue in South Australia, particularly the South Australian rural rail infrastructure, has been raised by me many times in the 19 months I have been in this House. I did not come here as a knight in shining armour for the railways: it has evolved that way and, together with agriculture and transport generally, it has taken up much of my time and effort.

This motion is very relevant today. Public opinion demands that the Government look at its obligations. Last year an inquiry was conducted at Broken Hill into the provision of rail services in South Australia. When the Premier opened that inquiry, he stated that the Iron Triangle was very important, as was the South-East service, in the

rural rail network service in this State. We have all been talking about it but nothing has happened. Although previously silent, the Minister is now making encouraging noises about looking at our country rail service. He supports the idea of Federal Government involvement in returning some of our rail infrastructure.

I note, too, that other members of this House are very supportive of this push, particularly the member for Stuart, the member for Whyalla, myself, of course, the member for Mount Gambier and the member for Heysen—they are all very interested in what happens. The mayors of the major cities in the north of the State have left no doubt about their point of view, particularly Mayor Crisp, Mayor Baluch, Mayor Reid and Mayor Black of Broken Hill. They have all been very heavily involved in this relevant and timely push to look at our country rail services, and I remind members that not one of those services is running today.

I have not heard much comment from the STA, but I am confident that it would not object to the use of its almost redundant heavy railcar (the series 2 000). Of course, it would probably need new seating and the provision of toilets. It is vital that this service come into Adelaide Railway Station, and I am told by Mr Russell King and the STA that there would be no problem in running a third rail line into Adelaide Railway Station. Initially, it could come in on the suburban service.

I now pay a tribute to the Rail 2 000 group, which has been asked to provide a mediator and a consultant to the Federal Government on these issues. I met Mr David Lewis here last night, and I pay a tribute once again to him and to his group for the very strong interest that they have taken. So, it would appear that it is full steam ahead.

As I said, most South Australians would agree that the Government has an obligation—I repeat: an obligation—to provide a rail alternative to the rural regional cities of South Australia. People in Adelaide take it for granted, but the people in the rural parts of South Australia have no service at all. We talk about decentralisation. We realise that half of this State's income comes from outside of Adelaide. Even if the system only broke even or if it made a slight loss, there should be an obligation by the Government to provide this service so that people can catch the train to Adelaide. It happens in every other State of Australia; why does it not happen here?

The time is right to let all of those authorities in other levels of government know that this Government supports the push. The time is right for this House to come out in support of it, so that Mr Brown can blow the whistle to herald the return of the South Australian country rail passenger network. I hope that this Parliament will support this motion to call on both State and Federal Governments, whether Labor or Liberal in the years ahead, to proceed towards the re-establishment of the country rail passenger network in South Australia. I commend this motion to the House.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ALICE SPRINGS TO DARWIN RAILWAY LINE

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That this House calls on—

(a) the Federal Government to immediately construct a standard gauge railway line from Alice Springs to Darwin;

(b) the Premier to make the strongest representations possible to the Federal Government in relation to the construction; and

(c) all Federal members of Parliament in this State to lend their support.

This particular proposition is not only long overdue but would have long-term economic benefits to all South Australians and to the nation as a whole. It was first promised in 1911, and years went by before the Fraser Government agreed to build the railway line from Alice Springs to Darwin. That was a firm undertaking. Survey work had commenced and, with the unfortunate election of the Hawke Labor Government, the program was steamrolled, purely because of the political control and manipulation in New South Wales.

The history of that sad saga of events goes briefly as follows. The then Leader of the Australian Labor Party, Mr Hawke, promised in the Iron Triangle that the project would continue. He made the promise on radio and in the local media. His friends, colleagues and former ministerial colleagues were involved in it. In the Northern Territory a pamphlet was put out headed 'Give the Territory a voice in the Hawke Labor Government', and this is what it said about the Northern Territory:

Boost Territory development. Build Alice to Darwin railway.

This particular document has a photograph of Mr Hawke in the middle. 'Bringing Australia together' he says. It has photographs of Mr John Reeves and someone for the Senate. But the interesting part of this document is that it was authorised by Bob Collins, 83 Lee Point Road, Sanderson, who is now one of the Federal Ministers dealing with transport. Unfortunately, on coming to Government, they decided to review the project, and they appointed one Mr Hill, who was one of the hatchet men and political backroom boys of Neville Wran from New South Wales. Mr Hill was then promoted to the State Transit Authority administration in New South Wales, and he has since gone to greener fields in the ABC. He was appointed, and blind Freddy knew what he was put there for: to steamroll it, because he was fearful that New South Wales would lose some of the shipping through the port of Sydney. That is what happened, and the project was steamrolled.

The people of South Australia deserve better than that sort of conduct. Recently, the Northern Territory Government released a report in support of this project and indicated that, with the appropriate Government support, it is quite clear that in the long term it would be viable, and the port of Darwin would then become the main port to Asia. If this country is to be successful, we must increase the volume of exports from Australia. To do that we must improve our ports and deliver goods economically and as quickly as possible to the markets. One significant way to do that is to build the railway line from Alice Springs to Darwin and ship the containers directly to Darwin in order to cut down costs and to improve efficiency.

South Australia and the Iron Triangle would benefit greatly from that particular project. The steelworks at Whyalla produces the best rails in the world, and either steel or concrete railway sleepers could be produced in the Iron Triangle. More jobs would be created in the railways, we would improve the efficiency of our transport system, and our exports would be more competitive.

I believe it is a project that should have bipartisan support, because it is in the interests of all South Australians and Australians. My concern is that we seem to be dithering on this project. It has been promised. We have gone part of the way. We have one of the best railway lines in the world constructed from Tarcoola to Alice Springs. It is all there. We have all the infrastructure. Port Augusta has skilled people who are ready, willing and able to make it operate. I believe that Australian National has the will and

the desire. All they need is the nod from the Federal Government. I understand that this particular project would cost in the vicinity of $1.3 billion. In 1979 it was estimated that it would cost about $418 million. The Northern Territory Chief Minister, Mr Perron, has on a regular basis put forward proposals as to why this proposition should go forward. Various studies have been undertaken, and it is quite clear that this is necessary. We must get into those markets in Indonesia and the general Asian area. Instead of members of the ABC and people like that insulting those countries with irrational nonsense, the Government should open up those markets. One way to open them up is to ensure the use of the port of Darwin, which obviously is our front door to those markets.

My concern is that for too long the railways in this State and nation have been allowed to deteriorate and run down. Everyone knows that one of the most efficient ways to handle very large volumes of heavy freight is by rail. There will always be a need for an effective and efficient road transport system. New technologies are being employed in order to put containers on to rail trucks and putting the trucks themselves directly on to the bogies. Freight can then be shipped very quickly to Darwin. Technology will continue to improve.

As a result of my discussions with people from AN, and with people whom I have known a long time, I am aware that new technologies are being introduced all the time. We have computer operated trains and upgraded rail services. All that is needed is the expansion of these services. We all know that politicians have not been very visionary in their outlook in relation to transport. We are really the laughing stock of the world. In my electorate two towns have three different railway gauges coming into them. When one goes overseas and tells people that Peterborough and Gladstone have three different gauges, they think that you have been reading *Alice in Wonderland*. It is time that we progressed from that narrow view that allowed the creation of that situation. We must have some vision for the future.

Too many people are without jobs. The nation has been hogtied by its inability to be able effectively to export. This is one program where export can be assisted. I agree entirely that there is an urgent need to standardise the rail system between Adelaide, Melbourne and Brisbane; it is commonsense. That exercise has already taken too long. I agree with Mr Lesses and others who have advocated the standardisation of the rail system, because that is in the long-term interests of the nation. If this project were to be given the green light, it would create employment in South Australia. The construction of the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway line was undertaken by a South Australian company. That railway line was built in record time and it was a credit to all those involved.

It perturbs me when I visit Alice Springs and am told by AN officials that the first 30 to 40 km has already been surveyed and is ready to go. If the Federal election had been postponed for another three months, that line would have been started and Bob and his colleagues could never have stopped it. So it is the Australian Labor Party that is responsible for stopping that project. If it had not been for the devious tactics of the Labor Party, that line would have been built, completed and operating. The Labor Party is responsible for that line not being built. The documents are here, Mr Speaker. It was an election stunt in order to maintain the seat of Grey at the time. I do not blame the current Federal member for this situation, because I know that he supports this project and he is obviously embarrassed by the current state of affairs. I understand that the Federal member was sitting next to the Leader of the Labor Party when the promise was made.

Mr Holloway: Tell us what Dr Hewson would do.

Mr GUNN: I am telling the honourable member that it was the Liberal Party that approved the project and it was on its way. The survey had been carried out. The Liberal Party has not brought this nation to its knees: the Federal Government has failed in its obligations to assist the exporters. This Government has not had the courage to spend any money on the port system. It takes actions which threaten the operation of the ports in this State. The State Government should have enough courage to lean on its Federal colleagues to take appropriate action in order that this important project may get off the ground. I have here reams of figures and facts which I could read to the House, but the important thing is to get the House to support this project. Hopefully, the Commonwealth Government will take some notice of it, because it is in the interests of all South Australians, particularly those people at Port Augusta and Whyalla—

Mr De Laine: What about Port Adelaide? What would it do to Port Adelaide?

Mr GUNN: Port Adelaide will benefit, because more traffic will pass through South Australia. However, unless we get these goods that we produce on to the world market at a competitive price, Port Adelaide and this nation have no future. Unless we do that, there will be no Port Adelaide in the long term. Look at what is happening to the employment base of this country now. On a daily basis around this nation thousands of people are losing their jobs, and if we do not build some projects of this nature thousands more will lose their jobs. As the member for Stuart should know, this project would have created many jobs at the Port Augusta plant that builds concrete sleepers. Many thousands of sleepers would have been built, giving permanent jobs to people in the railways as more people would be required to maintain the rolling stock and locomotives as well as in the administration area and to drive the trains. There would have been more jobs instead of people being offered redundancy packages and joining the dole queue.

I commend the motion to the House. It is in the interests of all South Australians. These projects must proceed if we are to be competitive and have jobs for our young people, and I remind members that 37 per cent of young people in this State are without employment opportunities. I hate to think what the figures to be released today will show, as it has been said that we have not yet felt the effect of school leavers on the job market. If governments misappropriate moneys to non-essential areas in this way and neglect projects of this nature, the nation does not have a great future. I commend the motion to the House.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support this motion. I will give some background on what has been done with respect to this infrastructure project. Some time ago the Premier did a lot of work in putting forward submissions on this project to the Premiers Conference. Since then he has been solidly promoting the project to the Federal Government. Late last year I also put in a submission to the Federal ALP backbench unemployment committee, chaired by the Hon. Lloyd O'Neil, the Federal member for Grey. In that submission I also supported the development of the Alice Springs-Darwin railway line for very good reasons, some of which have already been enumerated by the member for Eyre.

When I put in that submission I also received support from councils around the area as well as BHP in Whyalla, the Whyalla City Council and the regional development

committee. I also received support from the Port Augusta City Council and the Port Augusta and Flinders Ranges Development Committee, the Port Pirie Development Committee and City Council, engineering firms in Port Pirie and BHAS saying that they thought that the infrastructure project was worthy of support. They were very happy to support it and supported my submission to the backbench committee in Canberra.

The member for Eyre has outlined the benefits to the area. My area would see much benefit in a development of this kind, in particular with respect to concrete sleeper development. The member for Eyre said that Whyalla produces some of the best steel for steel sleepers. Obviously my preference is for concrete sleepers made at Port Augusta which would see a large increase in the number of people employed in that area. It would also have some ramifications for Port Pirie in that it too has large engineering firms that could benefit. Obviously at the next election that may be of relevance to the member for Custance. I am sure that he would support a motion of this kind.

I endorse the comments of the member for Eyre with regard to the transport link with the north of the country and the benefits that would flow for our export potential, because that link is something that we should have had a long time ago. It is a transport link which cuts straight through the country and gets directly to the north; it cuts down the time it takes to get these exports to other countries. This would be a worthwhile project in terms of the benefits for the Iron Triangle alone. However, it also has economic potential through supporting the export of products to other countries around the globe. It would be extremely important as a transport link.

Rail is definitely a preferable alternative to heavy road transport, because heavy road transport causes damage to the Australian road system. That is particularly so in South Australia, because this State is the main route through for all the other States, so a lot of damage is done to our roads. If these road transports could be loaded onto the Alice Springs to Darwin railway facility, that would help the situation. Australian National has been looking at and recently moving to a system of prime movers, which could certainly be of great benefit in that link.

This project is definitely worthy of support from both sides of the House. I agree with the member for Eyre in that regard, especially given that unemployment is so unacceptably high in my area and, I am sure, in other districts. Further, AN has been put at some risk in Port Augusta, because of the additional staff who would be required by AN now that the National Rail Corporation has been set up. This proposal would be a good incentive to employ people in terms of maintenance, as has been pointed out previously, and also administration. Not only that, it will encourage other industries to locate in regional areas, because there will be a transport link to the north. It may well result in the encouragement of further development in the Mid North and the north, and that is extremely important to diversify the economic base of this State. For all those reasons, I have a great deal of pleasure in supporting this motion, and I urge other members to do so as well.

Mr VENNING (Custance): I support my colleague the member for Eyre. I have made speeches about rail facilities previously, and I support this motion. Once again, I enter a debate on a railway issue, which is a critcal subject today, particularly in terms of getting this country on the move again. I have heard various members on the other side ask during this debate, 'What will happen to Port Adelaide?' If we are not careful, Port Adelaide will become a backwater for Melbourne. This State and the Northern Territory will forge ahead if the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link goes ahead. It is the most politicised line in Australia: it was to be built for many years, as my colleague said, but politics got in the way.

I hope that both the State and Federal Governments will adopt a bipartisan approach on this vital issue. Mr Fred Finch from the Northern Territory is in South Australia today, and I will meet with him privately tonight before he talks to a larger meeting on this subject. The Knudson report was delivered to that Government a few days ago on this very subject. For goodness sake, it is about time this Parliament and other Parliaments in Australia did what they need to do. There should be no debate on this issue whatsoever. It is obvious. This country is large and a vital connection will get South Australia and the Northern Territory close to the markets. We all know that the future of this country lies with Asia. This line will give us that vital link. I congratulate my colleague and commend the motion to the House.

Motion carried.

TEA TREE GULLY POLICE STATION

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I move:

That this House condemns the proposed closure of the Tea Tree Gully police station between the hours of 11 p.m. and 7 a.m. and calls on the Government to support its own policy of neighbourhood and community based policing and reject the proposed closure forthwith.

I refer this House to the petitions supporting this motion and to the thousands of signatures contained within those petitions indicating the concern and total disgust at the proposed reduction of police resources in the Tea Tree Gully area. I further advise the House that petitions in relation to this matter are still being sought daily from my office as more and more residents of the region become aware of this reprehensible proposal to close our police station during the most vulnerable hours of darkness.

The annual report of the Children's Court Advisory Committee, which was tabled in this Parliament yesterday, states that juvenile crime in South Australia has increased by more than 26 per cent in the past two years, and the statistics in the report show that 31 juveniles in every 1 000 aged between 10 and 17 appeared before children's aid panels in 1990-91 compared with 24.6 per cent per thousand in 1988-89, an increase of 26 per cent. Regarding children charged with violent crimes, four charges related to murder or attempted murder, 77 to serious assaults, 13 to rape and 66 to robbery with violence.

Those statistics show that this Government is most definitely losing the battle against crime. Of course, the answer that the Government has apparently come up with is to look at reducing resources within an area that just recently has also been affected by those statistics of crimes. Groups of between 10 and 30—which, I guess, you could class as gangs—in the past few weeks have been gathering in some of our local schools. In particular, an incident occurred at the Fairview Park Primary School last Friday, during which police were called to intervene, when two gangs using baseball bats clashed.

This means that the police will be put under greater pressure to patrol those areas. Considering that ours is one of the largest areas in the State, including areas into the hills face zone going as far as Gumeracha, once again it is rather incredible to all the people in that area to consider that the Government's answer is still to look at reducing those resources.

On 25 October 1990 I moved a motion in this House urging the Government immediately to review the current establishment of police personnel in the police subdivision of Tea Tree Gully with a view to updating what are effectively outdated establishment numbers for the purpose of improving police protection of the community within the district of the City of Tea Tree Gully. That motion was supported by the members of the City of Tea Tree Gully council on behalf of the ratepayers of Tea Tree Gully, indicating the high level of concern within our community associated with the staggering increase in the crime rate and the growing awareness among residents that police resources are inappropriate and inadequate.

The Tea Tree Gully council area encompasses the State electorates of Florey, Todd, Briggs and Newland and a portion of Gilles. It has been most disappointing for me to note that the members representing the State seats of Florey, Todd, Briggs and Gilles have chosen to ignore this important local issue, which affects the constituents of those members' electorates.

A short perusal of the petitions presented in this place would verify for those members the concern emanating from their own constituents. My disappointment, therefore, is with the deafening silence from each of those members, a silence that denies support for the call for adequate police resources, and a silence that denies their support to the Tea Tree Gully council, whose members appealed to each local member to recognise that police resources in the Tea Tree Gully region are inadequate and to represent that need to this Government.

It is absolutely inexplicable that requests for increases in police resources should be met with the contemptible reply that resources will be reduced. This Government has failed in many areas to meet its election promises, and one of those promises was to increase police numbers. On 17 October 1990 I asked the Minister for confirmation that his Government had failed to meet its election promise to increase police numbers. The Minister replied:

> I might add that the money provided by the Government in this year's budget will result in an increase in the total strength over the past two financial years of 200 police as well as a number of people who will be working in the Police Department without the status of being sworn officers. Consequently, there has been an enormous boost in the money made available to the Police Force and this has been acknowledged by the police themselves.

That statement was proven to be misleading. The police had in fact made a statement on that issue, but quite contrary to the Minister's assertion. Indeed, the Police Association reported in the October 1990 *Police Journal*:

> The truth is that police numbers have not increased over the past four years, while crime rates have continued to grow. So while the Government and Commissioner mouth platitudes about increases in the Police Department budget, the members at the coalface have increasing workloads and corresponding stress levels.

The truth is that police numbers have not increased over the past five years. The operational strength of the Police Force in 1986 was 3 492; in 1987 it was 3 661; in 1988 it was 3 573; in 1989 it was 3 565; in 1990 it was 3 630 and in March 1991 it was 3 535. If the Minister believes that he has increased police numbers, I can only suggest that he is reading the statistics backwards. The Police Association report very concisely stated the true position of the allocation of resourcing within the police budget, and once again I quote from it:

> Of even more interest is where the salary dollars have been allocated. In crime prevention and general police services there has been a 2 per cent cut in real terms; in crime detection and investigation services a 1.3 per cent cut. So what we are seeing is a reduction in police numbers at the coalface. This is a continuation of the decline in police resources that has been experienced over recent years.

Under-resourced police facilities are pushed to unreasonable limits and have been for the past five years under this Labor Government, which makes the injection of $3.558 million in this year's police budget into the Traffic Infringement Notice Department a contemptuous and blatant act of total disregard for either election promises or the safety and security of the people of this State. Why should the people of Tea Tree Gully accept the night-time closure of their police station? Why should the people of Tea Tree Gully and their property be placed at risk, all for the princely sum of one police salary, when this Government can find $3.558 million to fund 30 extra salaries for a civilian staff to administer traffic infringement notices? The Government obviously expects many millions of dollars return on its investment of 3.558 million revenue raising dollars, which the hapless members of the public will unwittingly fund. What can the members of the public expect in return from this Government? All they can expect is that this Government will reduce their safety and security and have all of that compromised.

This Government has a responsibility to provide for the safety and security of all citizens. Why then are we witnessing this inequitable distribution of resources? The overkill injection of $3.558 million to provide 30 extra civilian police staff in the traffic infringement notice area on the one hand and the removal of one police staff from the Tea Tree Gully police station on the other is an absolute and unmitigated disgrace. If the Government refuses to alter this decision on that proposed move, I can assure the Minister and members of the Government that their credibility on matters of law and order will be irretrievably lost and, if the Government considers relying on the alleged short-term memory of the constituents of Newland, Florey, Todd, Briggs and Gilles, I am happy to offer my services to remind those constituents from time to time that, for all the platitudes, promises and rhetoric expounded by this Labor Government in support of law and order, the bottom line is another penny-pinching bail-out, which is unconscionably at the expense of the citizens of the Tea Tree Gully area. This act of neglect is further compounded by the recent removal and closure of another vital service to the area—the Modbury domiciliary care service.

It is a severe indictment on this Government's irrational mentality to hear reports from Government departments resident in the north-eastern suburbs suggesting that Tea Tree Gully is considered to be one of the more affluent suburbs of the northern region and therefore can be denied Government service provision in order to subsidise the lesser affluent areas of Elizabeth and Salisbury.

I trust that the members for Florey, Todd, Briggs and Gilles will be available to explain that rationale to their constituents and to my constituents and in particular to those whose jobs have disappeared as small business and certain areas of industry go bankrupt, explain to those who have been handed redundancy notices, explain to all of those living in each of our electorates who have become the unemployment statistics of that region, and explain to all the unemployed youth who number as one of the highest percentages in the State that, because the house that they rent or own is in the median market value range, they are classed by this Government as wealthy.

I would also remind this Government that it does not have a mandate to differentiate on the basis of wealth or poverty when providing for the safety and security of its citizens. The only criterion should be the need of citizens based upon crime rate statistics and population growth

rates. On that criterion, I urge the House to support this motion.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION REVIEW UNIT

Mr De LAINE (Price): I move:

That this House acknowledges the work of the Education Review Unit since its establishment in 1989, notes that it has conducted reviews of 231 schools, three operational and support units and five program and policy areas and calls on the Minister of Education to ensure that final ERU reports are made available to the Parliamentary Library.

I am pleased to move this motion. The Education Review Unit represents the fulfilment of the State Government's promise to conduct education audits of our schools and the education system and to involve parents and school communities in those audits.

As members may recall, the origins of the Education Review Unit concept grew out of a report released towards the end of 1987. The report became known as the Cox report, after its author, Associate Professor Ian Cox of what was then the South Australian Institute of Technology, which is now part of the University of South Australia. The report followed his review of the role of school superintendents. The report saw an essential part of the role of those top educators as being the evaluation of our schools and providing public accountability and quality assurance of our education programs. Preliminary work for the Education Review Unit began in 1988 and included developing guidelines for school development plans and assisting and supervising this work.

The school development plan is an absolutely unique concept in Australia. Such plans are developed by the school community, including the school council, principal, teachers and parents. It defines the needs of a school and its goals in educational terms, and determines priorities and strategies for achieving those priorities. The plan is a printed document available to all members of school communities. It is developed within the framework of system-wide guidelines and priorities consistent with the Education Department's three-year plan, which was released some time ago. These plans form an integral part of the school review process undertaken by the Education Review Unit. The ERU assesses a school's success in achieving its planned objectives and suggests how it might further refine the plan.

The work of the ERU began in earnest in 1989 and received a major boost when Dr Peter Cuttance was appointed to head the unit early that year. Dr Cuttance was senior research fellow in the Godfrey Thomson research unit of the University of Edinburgh's Department of Education. He was also a consultant to the Education Department of Scotland. Dr Cuttance has an international reputation as a leader in the field of evaluation of school effectiveness. Under Dr Cuttance's leadership, the Education Review Unit stepped up the work of monitoring schools' achievements and trialling review methods.

As the State Government promised in its election platform for the 1989 election, the first school reviews began in earnest in 1990. They started in term 2, 1990 and gradually built up to the anticipated level of operation. A total of 127 schools were reviewed in 1990, and another 104 were reviewed by the end of term 2, 1991. Three of those schools are in my electorate: Port Adelaide Girls High School, Ridley Grove Primary and the Parks High School. Public reports varying between 25 and 40 pages in length have been prepared for all schools reviewed.

Of the 127 schools reviewed in 1990, the subsequent reports contained some 1 283 recommendations for those schools to implement. Most of these recommendations dealt with the issues of school development planning (including curriculum), decision making processes in schools, school organisation, and regulations and requirements. The important thing to note about the school reports is their positiveness in that they pointed out the things that our schools are doing well. They let the public know about the excellent things that our schools are doing as well as identifying some things that could be improved. I understand that the effects on schools of the 1990 reviews and reports are currently being evaluated and a summary report is being prepared and is expected soon.

As I mentioned earlier, the South Australian approach to quality assurance is unique. The inspectorial system that we used to have years ago, and to some extent the system of Her Majesty's inspectors in the United Kingdom, looked mainly at the performance of individuals in schools, the performance of individual teachers and students. But the ERU has a more holistic approach. It looks more at structures and processes in schools, at the management of a school. It focuses on the outcomes for students from the structures and processes that operate within a school.

This is where the ERU is breaking new ground. For many years now we have been trying to measure the quality of education in terms of inputs—how many teachers we employ, how much money we put in, class sizes, teacher to student ratios, all concrete measures of resources provided up-front. But that approach ignores the real measures of the quality of our schools and of the education they provide. The real measure of the success of a school should be expressed in terms of outputs—in terms of how the school affects students' outcomes. That is the bottom line. Irrespective of what the systems are, it is output and the effect on students when they come out at the other end of the system that counts.

One of the major advances of the work of the ERU has been the way it involves parents, school staff and students in the review process. During the last year the ERU has directly involved more than 3 500 parents, 7 000 students and 3 000 school staff in its reviews. Every school review team had one or more local community members on it. This is where the Education Review Unit is a world leader. In fact, during the Estimates Committees in September last year Dr Cuttance spoke about the work of the ERU. He commented that the ERU built on the work of Her Majesty's inspectorate (HMI) in the United Kingdom. However, he remarked that the ERU had gone a considerable distance beyond the HMI system in the United Kingdom. In fact, he said that representatives of HMI are coming to South Australia early this year to look at the possibility of transplanting the system that we have developed to the British system.

That is a remarkable achievement, and an acknowledgement of the respect with which the work of the ERU is regarded in the international education community. The ERU does not confine its activities only to reviewing schools. Part of its charter is to examine and report on various Education Department policies and program areas. Five such areas—curriculum authority and review in schools, school and industry links, science and technology focus (the Sci-Tec program), school development planning and homework—are in various stages.

I understand that the ERU is also in the process of reviewing three operational and support units—the Lower South-East district office, the English language curriculum unit, and the remote and isolated children's exercise. ERU

is thus helping to fulfil one of the major priorities of the Education Department's current three-year plan to improve public awareness of the State school system and its plans, programs and achievements.

Debate adjourned.

GOLDEN GROVE ARTERIAL ROADS SYSTEM

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.H. Hemmings:

That this House records its admiration for the high standard of design and workmanship carried out by the Department of Road Transport and others associated with the construction of the arterial roads system in the Golden Grove area.

(Continued from 28 November. Page 2491.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): This is a very important motion, and I understand that the member for Napier is very keen for it to go to a vote. I know that the honourable member thought of this motion himself; he would not have read letters in the paper from people who had walked the roads, even though they might have written such letters saying how beautiful the roads were. I have not been on the roads, but I believe that they are an excellent piece of engineering and workmanship. I am sure that with this motion the member for Napier is displaying statesmanship in recognising the good work of the Department of Road Transport and all the people who worked on the roads, from the labourers through to the engineers.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: And paying tribute to the local member.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Sometimes the electorates of Government members get better projects than other electorates, but I will not play politics now. I ask the House to do as I will do, and support the motion. I hope that other electorates, not only electorates on that side of town, get such well constructed roads.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I most humbly thank the member for Davenport for those kind words of support. What I said when I introduced the motion said it all: it was a partnership involving the State Government, the private sector, local government and the local member to ensure that the people who live in that magnificent development known as Golden Grove have the ultimate in highway engineering. I thank the House for its support.

Motion carried.

COMMUNITY POLICE STATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House calls on the Government to investigate as a matter of priority the establishment of police stations at Hallett Cove and Brighton as part of the commencement of a move back to community police stations.

(Continued from 28 November. Page 2492.)

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): The matter of policing and the re-establishment of community police stations is an important issue in our community. In many communities people live in fear of their homes being broken into or, if they are elderly, that someone will bash them with a baseball bat. If those people are able to get to a telephone or a neighbour hears the commotion and gets to a telephone, there appears to be a long delay in police patrols getting to the scene of the alleged offence. For many people, that long delay is frightening. The member for Bright makes the point that in his district there is a need for police stations at Hallett Cove and Brighton. In my own area the police station is seldom manned. It is not staffed 24 hours a day and I would like to give an example of what can happen. One shop has had its plate glass window broken five times in three weeks. The replacement cost is about $850 each time and now the insurance company will no longer insure that window.

If that damage continues that shopkeeper will have to leave because he will be insolvent as he cannot make his business pay for such costs. I know that the Police Department and the Minister tell constituents, 'Don't worry, even if you have a police station, we couldn't give you better service than we are giving you now.' But people in the community are not prepared to accept that, and I believe they have a right to ask why they cannot have a police station in their area.

In some areas police stations have been there for almost 100 years, while in other areas and new communities such as Hallett Cove, a police station is required in order to be closer to residences and businesses. It is easy for officials to say, 'We have a police patrol and we will get there rapidly.' However, that is not so in practice and that is the truth of it. A jeweller in my area had his shop broken into. The telephone lines that set off the alarm were cut. When he went to the shop the police were a considerable time getting there, although not as long as on other occasions, I can give the police credit for that. This happened during the same week in which another jeweller was bashed at Glenelg, and while the jeweller was at his shop thieves were trying to break into his home where his wife and 10 month old baby were. The thieves knew where he lived and knew that he owned the shop. Now the jeweller and his family have grave fears about even living in that community.

We must rethink the situation. If we have more unemployed people, more people taking drugs and alcohol—if all that is part of the trouble that leads to more criminals—we must have a much larger and more effective Police Force. People claim that Neighbourhood Watch would solve the problem, but it would not. It might help but, as criminals become conditioned to the system, they learn how to play it. I know that when the young man was burnt to death in the park near my area—I have not heard whether that was suicide, sky-larking gone astray or manslaughter or murder, and the likelihood of our finding out now is probably remote—getting someone to the scene was a slow process even though the existing Blackwood police station, which is not fully manned, was only 400 or 500 metres away, and even though prompt attendance would not have saved that person's life, because he was cooked and not just burnt.

When the member for Bright moves a motion asking for a police station in his area, he is simply voicing a request that many other members representing areas throughout the State, particularly metropolitan members, have in their minds. Many members have written to the Minister on this issue. Although the Minister and the Government have written a list showing that this is another request by the Opposition for money to be spent, I highlight that it is the role of the Opposition and indeed every member of Parliament—even Government members—to seek amenities for their constituents.

I support the motion, which suggests that it should be a priority for the establishment of police stations in those areas as part of a commencement towards moving back to community police stations. I rely on that latter part—back to community police stations—for most of my arguments. I do not think it would cost much more but, my word, it does give a great deal of satisfaction, particularly to many elderly people, to know that just down the road is a person

in a checkered hat who might be able to get there a little more quickly. I cannot prove whether or not it would occur more quickly than under the present system, but the present system is no good. If it is no good, we must look at a change. I request the House to support the member for Bright's motion.

Mr QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Holloway:

That this House reaffirms the Government's policy not to accept the transfer of the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park to the State health system unless—

(a) the veteran's community, represented by the RSL is satisfied with the arrangements, particularly those relating to priority of access and quality of health care;

(b) general access to comprehensive health and hospital services for veterans will continue at the level they have always enjoyed;

(c) the Commonwealth provides a guarantee that all funds for operating the hospital will be transferred to the State and indexed for inflation;

(d) the Commonwealth completes the comprehensive upgrading of the facilities at Daw Park; and

(e) the staff of the hospital are satisfied that their interests will be adequately safeguarded.

(Continued from 28 November. Page 2493.)

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I am very pleased to indicate my support for this motion which reaffirms the Government's policy of not accepting the transfer of the Repatriation General Hospital within the State health system unless a series of guarantees is met. My position as shadow spokesperson for the health portfolio and the position of the Liberal Party is that veterans are special people with special needs, and they deserve special consideration. What is quite clear is that the veterans' organisations around Australia are, in fact, in most States dissatisfied with the plans of the Department of Veterans' Affairs to transfer repatriation hospitals to the State health systems. I guess that part of the reason for that is a healthy suspicion of Governments which are appearing to be giving something away.

I know that the veterans, with their views honed by their hard experiences defending our country, perhaps often have views of politicians and of our generosity or otherwise that are not necessarily those which we would like; nevertheless, they have a healthy suspicion of any Government which moves to make fairly radical changes to something which is vital to the veterans themselves, and that is their hospitals. The need for veterans' hospitals in South Australia is perhaps best demonstrated by the fact that, because of Vietnam wars, war widows, and so on, the need for bed days in the Repatriation General Hospital will not in fact reach its maximum until 1995. So, the veterans feel, quite justifiably, that they want to be well assured of their health care between now and at least then, and indeed for probably a number of years thereafter. That will be quite a long lag time from when Vietnam veterans and their widows no longer need the repatriation hospital. I do not want to put a time on that, but I think we would be looking at 20 years at least.

Certainly, the peak of usage is still three years away, so the veterans' community is in fact anxious that major changes are not made without guarantees that their health care will not suffer. The veterans' community at the moment is not satisfied that it is not being offered a poisoned chalice. I am interested to note that the motion indicates that the veterans' community, as represented by the Returned Services League (RSL), is satisfied. I will talk briefly about that, because I am quite angry at emissaries of the Department of Veterans' Affairs federally who have indicated to me that the RSL is not a representative body of returned services people. The reason they do that is that they quote figures and statistics that say that there are only X thousand members who have the right or bother to be a member of the RSL and, when the RSL conducts a survey into whether or not the Repatriation General Hospital should be there, the question it asks is very loaded and the answer it gets back is such and such a percentage, and on and on they go.

I am offended by that, because I have to say that I have had a long, personal affiliation with the RSL through my father who was a very proud member of the Second 7th Field Regiment and who was involved in the RSL all his life. I know that the RSL is a magnificent body that provides an enormous amount of support for returned soldiers, sailors and airmen and, indeed, for their widows. To have an emissary from the Department of Veterans' Affairs attempting to use base statistics to indicate that the RSL is not representative of returned soldiers, sailors and airmen quite frankly disgusts me.

However, as I have said, even if there are members who are eligible to join the RSL but who have not joined or if members have allowed their membership to lapse, I am confident that they feel very much at one with other members of the RSL and would regard themselves as being represented by that organisation. So, again, I am very happy to support that part of the motion.

The motion goes on to talk about priority of access. It indicates that we would not want to remove the Repatriation Hospital from the Federal system until priority of access and quality of health care were guaranteed. Again, I am anxious about what seems to be a misrepresentation of facts by the Federal department in relation to priority of access, because I have been told that under the new system veterans will be guaranteed the specialist of their choice in the hospital of their choice and, if that is not available, the specialist whom they are seeing will be able to say to these veterans, 'Well, you can't go to hospital X, but I have private beds in hospital Y and I will put you in there.'

On the surface, that seems to be quite acceptable. However, like a lot of governmental business, when one actually reads the fine print one sees that the specialist does not have the right to admit the veteran to the hospital of his choice until he gets permission from the department in Canberra. I have enormous anxiety about the fact that the specialist, having seen the patient and determined that an operation is needed and having found that the repat hospital within the State system is too full or unable to take this particular patient, makes the phone call to Canberra and back comes the response 'No, you can't admit the veteran to hospital Y even though there may be beds there.' So, there is absolutely no guarantee of priority of access under the system which the Federal Department of Veterans' Affairs is offering the RSL or, indeed, the State system. As I have said, I fear that we are having a poisoned chalice given to us.

The motion goes on further to talk about comprehensive health and hospital services continuing at the level provided at the moment. As I mentioned before, in my view veterans are very special people and, accordingly, their needs are special. Part of that comprehensive health and hospital service is the camaraderie that exists between the veterans when they go to Daws Road. Again, I am speaking personally, because my father died in that hospital. He felt at home when he went there. Even though in his final illness he did not know many of the people around him, they were

all veterans. They had all gone overseas to serve their country. They knew the privations that they had been through: five years away from their families with very little contact from home, ghastly conditions and so on. In a different age they were fighting for their country, and they share an empathic bond with the other patients in that hospital.

What will happen under this new system is that they may well be put in a bed in a hospital that they do not particularly like, perhaps with people of a completely different age group and with whom they have no bond. So I believe that the comprehensive health and hospital services must take into account those sacrifices that the veterans made and that need they have to feel at one with each other.

The staff of the hospital are also mentioned in this motion and, given the dedicated service they have given to the Repatriation Hospital in the past, I believe it is completely appropriate that their needs are met. When this was first mooted, the staff of the hospital were very dissatisfied with the potential outcome, with the taking over of the Repatriation Hospital by the State system, and I accord with the member moving the motion that the staff of the hospital need to be satisfied as well. Therefore, I signal my complete agreement with the motion as moved by the member for Mitchell.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): May I congratulate my colleague for bringing this matter before the Parliament and, indeed, the bipartisan approach by the member for Adelaide is appreciated, because it is very important. The parents or relatives of many members of this House have used the magnificent facilities at the Repatriation Hospital. As a very young boy I can remember my father, like many others, having to use those magnificent facilities at Daw Park. The returned service men and women are special people who require special services and, indeed, as the previous speaker indicated, the camaraderie that has been built up over many years was reflected only last year when I was at the hospital visiting an uncle of mine from Naracoorte and one from Mount Gambier. There is a special bond between the nursing staff, the doctors and those returned service people.

An interesting article appeared in the *News* of 5 August last year by someone well known to this House, Norm Foster, who was Chairman of the Consultative Council of Ex-Servicemen Organisations. He was somewhat trenchant in his criticism of the Federal Government over this proposed handover and expressed disillusionment at what was proposed by the Federal Government. Quite properly in my opinion, those returned service men and women have every right to seek that all the guarantees and conditions that they are looking at are met. The article in the *News* of Monday 5 August states in part:

> Veterans discharged in 1945-46 are still being treated at the Repat for the war-caused disabilities that were being treated at the time of discharge and many other 'returned soldiers' are being treated for disabilities which are now accepted as war-caused or war-related. Since the first war, Federal Governments have acknowledged their obligations and the rights of veterans by providing a repatriation hospital in each State which has been set aside from the public hospital system. Veterans consider it a continuing entitlement and see no valid reason for it to change, because they are growing older.

In fact, I would say they are entitled to it even more because of their age. The article goes on to say:

> They are disillusioned at the betrayal of a trust by the Government. Since 1945 the Repat Hospital has met the changing needs of the veterans . . . They see no advantage in the transfer.

In fact, they are angry because they are quoted as being in favour of transfer to the State health system. The veterans' opposition to the transfer has been demonstrated by the unanimous vote of the delegates at the recent RSL subbranch conference. The TPI Association plebiscite revealed that, of the votes counted, every member opposed the transfer. If that is not an indication of how these returned men and women feel, I do not know what is. In further support of that, last year, after my colleague had moved this motion in this place, I had the opportunity to discuss the matter with two representatives in the Speaker's gallery. I did not need a great deal of convincing about their views or needs. Those views were further confirmed by the very strong and, at times, trenchant criticism of the proposal.

According to the article, about 20 000 South Australian veterans are not eligible for treatment at Daws Road and a number of veterans find it more convenient to use the public transport system. It seems to me that those people have the right to the best treatment available in South Australia. If it is the intention of the Federal Government to hand over, if you like, or to rid itself of its responsibilities, I do not believe that this State and members of this Parliament would accept such a proposition. Given what these returned servicemen and women were prepared to do for this country, I do not believe that it is too much to ask that they be given the guarantees that they seek.

Whilst I could speak at great length about how I feel on this issue, I just want to record the views expressed by Norm Foster in the article, which states:

> Votes returned by RSL members with their 1991 subscriptions revealed that more than 98 per cent of the 31 000 veterans and war widows opposed transferring the hospital to the State health system.

In my view, that is a clear indication of their feelings to every honourable member of this Parliament. I believe that we have a very strong obligation to honour and listen to what they have said and to recognise the commitment that they have made in the past. I support unreservedly the motion that has been moved by my colleague, and I congratulate all those members who have supported it.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I have great pleasure in congratulating the member for Mitchell on the introduction of this motion to the House. As my colleague the member for Adelaide has indicated, the motion deserves the support of all members. I say that, because it is basically aimed at ensuring that people will feel safe and that they understand what is ahead of them. It will provide an element of guarantee that the support they have been told they will receive will be delivered.

The very fact that the Commonwealth wants to hand this responsibility over to the State is not really a problem. The Commonwealth says that it will fund it to the State but, unfortunately, people have seen the Commonwealth hand over functions in the past and then conveniently, a short time later, withdraw the funds which that particular service relied upon.

We have a real problem. A number of people have served their country well and have received the benefits of the service at the Repatriation Hospital for all those years, but they fear that those services will no longer be available to them or their dependants at critical times. When I refer to 'dependants', I refer to their dependant spouse.

I can remember the foundation of the Daw Park hospital. While it was being built I trampled over the site and moved through all the wards, the windows and the doors. I can share with other members the fact that as youngsters we were always mystified that we had the hospital on the northern side of Daws Road and on the immediate southern side of Daws Road we had the Army camp—a camp to which thousands of South Australian and interstate soldiers returned when they came back from the Middle East and

elsewhere. Immediately above the camp they started to build a cemetery. The belief of young children at that stage was that they train them in one place, they send them across the road to patch them up and then took them up the hill to complete the task. Members can accept with me the sorts of discussions that would have formulated in those times.

It was all open land—an area that I had known from virtually the day of my first reckoning after birth because it was so close to the place where I was born. I take a great deal of interest in the statement that the member for Mitchell read into the debate from the person who was the Director of Nursing, and had been involved in this area for 32 years. She stated:

I have been fortunate to have the privilege of nursing this wonderful group of clients for 32 years and I feel proud when I see my nurses care as much about them as I do. Now as they are growing old, when we should be relieving them of any unnecessary burdens, the process of the integration of the hospital into the South Australian Health Services has been accelerated and this thought is causing them—

and I stress the next two words—

grave concern.

We see the same grave concern occurring in the community presently regarding how safe the aged feel in their own homes. They have a belief that in their own homes they ought to be safe—it is their castle. They should not have to worry about larrikins coming through with baseball bats and people coming in to take from them their various goods and valuables. We know the self same situation that applies with young children being sent out to play with a pair of shoes on their feet, the parent expecting the shoes to come back on the feet rather than the child being knocked over and the shoes taken off because somebody believes that they have a greater right to them.

It is those sorts of fears in the community at the moment (and there are numerous other examples one can give) which are paramount in the concern that veterans feel presently—the fear of the unknown, the promise that was made but may not be delivered. That is not through any fault of the State on this occasion—and I say that quite clearly—but due to the fact that the State has been forced into a position of not being able to fund, along with all other matters that it is required to fund, that which has become a Commonwealth or Australia-wide responsibility for those people who got out there and served their country.

My colleague the member for Adelaide talked of a very famous South Australian, cum Western Australian, regiment—the second seventh field regiment—in which his father served, as did my father, the father of the Hon. Jamie Irwin in another place and a former Minister of this House, the Hon. David Brookman. It is a place, which, for a variety of reasons and because of the service given by those people and the benefits they have derived through the years from the Repatriation Hospital, I totally support. Therefore, I hope that not one of the comments I have made is seen to derogate against the effectiveness of the proposition put by the member for Mitchell. I support, albeit in a slightly different way, why it is that we as a community and a Parliament have to ensure that the Commonwealth fills its commitment from now into eternity.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I rise to support this motion. As an ex member of the Royal Navy, I am privileged to have been invited to join the Australian RSL—and I do regard it as a privilege. I will always look upon the members of the RSL, who were essentially volunteers, not conscripts, as people who unselfishly and courageously were prepared to sacrifice on our behalf by serving in the Australian and Allied forces in fields of combat anywhere on the earth's surface, be it land, sea or even air. They served under a Federal Government on behalf of all the people of Australia in successive wars. Indeed, very few World War I veterans are left alive. I share their concerns at the possibility that Daws Road might have been handed over to the South Australian Health Commission, and I support the honourable member in his proposal that that should not happen.

I believe that the immortal words 'Lest we forget' are certainly relevant in this case. It is not only 'Lest we forget those who died' but also 'Lest we forget the efforts of those who still survive', many of whom have survived in great discomfort from war wounds and other privations they suffered during the war. We should remember—we should not forget—that they endured those privations in order to maintain our rights, even the rights of those who now have the freedom to oppose the RSL and all it stands for. That is true democracy.

I simply reiterate also to the few who may decry the works of the RSL that that organisation is there not to glorify war but simply to guarantee peace, the peace which we all enjoy in Australia as in no other country on the face of this earth. I shall continue in my admiration of RSL members. I believe that they deserve the care and attention of the whole community through the Federal and State health systems. It is a small price for all of us to pay in thanks for the security that we now enjoy. I support the motion.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): I thank the members for Adelaide, Albert Park, Light and Mount Gambier for their indication of support for this motion. All the relevant issues have been canvassed in the debate, and I will not delay the House by going through them again. However, this year is the 50th anniversary of the Repatriation Hospital, which—as has been pointed out by members—is a special hospital. The comments that have been made in this debate indicate that the Commonwealth has some way to go before it will convince veterans—and, indeed, the wider community—that any transfer of the hospital is in their best interests. I hope that, with the unanimous passage of this motion, the Commonwealth will be sent a clear message that it has much more work to do to satisfy the needs of veterans before any transfer of this special hospital can take place.

Motion carried.

THIRD ARTERIAL ROAD

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Matthew:

That this House calls on the Government as a matter of priority to commence construction of phase 2 of the third arterial road in order to alleviate traffic problems on Brighton and South Roads and condemns the Government for attempting to spread the road building project over an unacceptable length of time.

(Continued from 28 November. Page 2494.)

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): When I moved this motion on 28 November, regrettably I did not get time to complete my remarks. On that occasion I outlined the Government debacle that has continued for the past eight years over the building of a southern transport corridor. On that occasion, I outlined the changing schedules, delaying tactics, broken promises and continual redefining of the scope of the project that has occurred. At the end of the day, in 1992 the promise that the Premier gave in 1984 to complete a new southern arterial road still has not been fulfilled. In 1992, construction of that road still has not commenced.

However, at the end of 1991, yet another revised plan for the road was revealed. That plan involved no construction of any new road but simply the widening of existing arterial road bottlenecks. It is true that it will relieve some of the traffic congestion, but it will do little more. Hard on the heels of that announcement, we heard the Government's announcement about reduced public transport services to the southern suburbs. Certainly, we have heard the Minister of Transport say in this place that the cuts that have been made to public transport services have been to facilitate new services in growing southern suburbs. That statement has absolutely no substance to it.

By virtue of the fact that southern train services have been cut, the developing areas have had their services cut. Well may the Minister be intending to introduce services into new areas: I await the announcement of those services into the growing southern area that I represent and the areas further south that are represented by the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Environment and Planning. It is interesting that those two Ministers have been silent in this Parliament in their representation of concerns over transport. It is also interesting to note that my office is constantly inundated with complaints from residents of the districts of Mawson and Baudin who want to complain to someone they believe will listen.

Year after year, their grievances have not been aired in this Parliament. The Ministers who are in a position to influence occurrences in those areas have deserted them. As a result, transport corridor development in the southern suburbs has not occurred, many industries have gone bankrupt because they are unable to guarantee delivery to clients and much industrial land lies vacant in the middle of areas that also are areas of high unemployment.

As a direct result of the failure of those members to represent their electorates properly on issues of transport, and of this Government to respond to the needs appropriately, those areas are becoming stagnant. New areas that should be prospering and growing are offered no opportunity. I stress to the members for Mawson and Baudin and their colleagues, if they are serious about the development of the southern suburbs, if they are serious about generating employment opportunities, if they are serious about attracting enterprise to this State, and if they are serious about building on the vacant industrial allotments, many of them in the southern suburbs being Government owned, that they must first address the basic infrastructure problems.

Nothing could be more basic than a road on which to transfer goods from the place of manufacture to the place of retail and from one place of manufacture of components to another of assembling those component parts. Clearly, something needs to be done, and people in the southern suburbs are fed up with the constant stream of broken promises in relation to this issue. Nothing more needs to be said. The Premier recognised the problem in 1984 and promised to rectify it. He gave a schedule, but that promise has been broken. The action is not there, nor is the infrastructure. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated her assent to the following Bills:

Aboriginal Lands Trust (Parliamentary Committee and Business Advisory Panel) Amendment,

Corporations (South Australia) (Miscellaneous) Amendment,

Correctional Services (Drug Testing) Amendment,

Criminal Law Consolidation (Self-Defence) Amendment,

District Court,

Enforcement of Judgments,

Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) (Coastal Waters and Radioactive Material) Amendment,

Fisheries (Miscellaneous) Amendment,

The Flinders University of South Australia (Joint Awards) Amendment,

Goods Securities (Highways Fund) Amendment,

Housing Co-operatives,

Justices Amendment,

Justices of the Peace,

Magistrates Court,

Motor Vehicles (Historic Vehicles and Disabled Persons' Parking) Amendment,

Pay-roll Tax (Miscellaneous) Amendment,

Petroleum (Miscellaneous) Amendment,

Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances (Miscellaneous) Amendment,

Residential Tenancies Amendment,

Road Traffic (Safety Helmet Exemption) Amendment,

Sheriff's Amendment,

South Australian Health Commission (Private Hospital Beds) Amendment,

Stamp Duties (Assessments and Forms) Amendment,

State Emergency Service (Immunity for Members) Amendment,

Statutes Amendment (Crimes Confiscation and Restitution),

Statutes Amendment (State Heritage Conservation Orders),

Statutes Repeal and Amendment (Courts),

Strata Titles (Resolution of Disputes) Amendment,

Superannuation (Miscellaneous) Amendment,

Wheat Marketing (Trust Fund) Amendment,

Wine Grapes Industry.

PETITION: HILLCREST HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government not to close the Hillcrest Hospital was presented by Dr Armitage.

Petition received.

PETITION: JUVENILE CRIME

A petition signed by 779 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to review the structure of the juvenile justice system and increase the penalties for juvenile crime was presented by Mrs Kotz.

Petition received.

PETITION: COMMONWEALTH SALES TAX EXEMPTIONS

A petition signed by 46 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to seek the restoration of Commonwealth sales tax exemptions for schools was presented by Mr Quirke.

Petition received.

PETITION: ROAD SAFETY

A petition signed by 151 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to improve safety at the Lonsdale Highway and Lander Road junction was presented by Mr Such.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HEALTH WORKERS WITH HIV/AIDS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The recent death of a dentist in South Australia with AIDS has had widespread media coverage of the potential risks to patients from HIV infected health care workers and the rights of patients to be informed of the HIV status of health professionals. There is no legislation in this State specifically excluding HIV/AIDS infected health care workers from practising their professions.

A determination can be made only having regard to, amongst other things, the likely risk to patients and the rights of health care workers to confidentiality and non-discrimination in employment. What is the risk for an individual patient being treated by an HIV infected health care worker? According to world health authorities, the short answer is that no-one knows for sure, primarily because the risk is so small. By contrast, the risk to health workers of contracting HIV from their patients is dramatically higher. With the exception of the much publicised case of a Florida dentist who may have infected five of his patients, there are no known reported instances of HIV transmission from an infected health care worker to his or her patients. This is despite at least 31 'look back' or retrospective investigations and subsequent HIV testing of more than 8 000 patients in the United States who have been treated by infected health care workers.

Furthermore, re-evaluation of the Florida case suggests that cross-infection from one patient to another through contaminated instruments was more likely to be the cause, rather than infection of patients by the health care worker himself. If this is shown to be the case, it merely underlines the need for health care workers to adopt stringent infection control procedures or so-called 'universal precautions' to prevent the spread of HIV or other communicable diseases.

In this regard, the Health Commission and the various professional associations and registration boards are to be congratulated on their efforts in educating health care workers in all aspects of infectious control. The dilemma, however, is that although AIDS and HIV infection are now controlled notifiable diseases in South Australia notification of either disease to the Health Commission does not include details of the sufferer's occupation. Thus, neither the Health Commission nor the registration bodies currently have any means of ensuring compliance with safe clinical practice by health care workers with HIV/AIDS unless they are notified by the treating medical practitioner or by the infected health professional concerned.

This situation requires further examination and the Health Commission has arranged a meeting with medical, dental and nursing professional associations and registration boards, and the AIDS Council, to review existing reporting arrangements. The Health Commission believes that clinical standards are most appropriately governed by professional associations and registration authorities such as the Medical and Dental Boards, and the Chairman has suggested that treating medical practitioners should perhaps be obliged to notify registration bodies of health workers with HIV/AIDS.

Caution is needed to preserve reasonable confidentiality, to avoid driving sufferers underground and to guard against actions which may provide disincentives for health care workers to be tested for HIV if they believe themselves to be at risk of infection. Caution is also required on the vexed question of whether patients have the right to know if they are being treated (or have been treated) by an HIV/AIDS infected health professional, given that the risk of infection is believed to be slight, particularly if 'universal precautions' are followed. If so, whose responsibility is it to inform the patients?

At the same time, we need to decide as a community whether health professionals themselves also have the right to know the HIV status of their patients, given that the risks of health workers contracting HIV from their patients would appear to be so much greater. Answers to these and other questions are likely to be resolved on an individual basis having regard to both statutory and common law, including the principles of informed consent and the duty of care which health professionals have to their patients.

I turn now to the details of the recent South Australian case of a dentist who died with AIDS: the Health Commission was first notified of the case in 1990, but no details were provided on the patient's name or occupation. In December 1991 the Health Commission's Communicable Disease Control Unit was informed by the head of the Department of Microbiology and Infectious Diseases at Flinders Medical Centre of the 'death of a patient with HIV infection who was practising as a dental surgeon for a considerable period of time during his symptomatic illness'. In the letter, the head of the department stated, *inter alia*:

> I do not personally believe that patients of this dentist should be contacted or followed up in any way.

The name of the dentist was not mentioned in the letter. It is believed to be this letter which was obtained by the *Advertiser* and reported on 22 January 1992 under the headline 'Dentist with AIDS virus refused to quit'. Because the Health Commission did not at that stage know the name of the dentist and, because of confidentiality requirements under the South Australian Health Commission Act, the Chairman of the Health Commission refused to release any details. On 24 January, following discussions with the President of the Australian Dental Association, S.A. Branch, the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission authorised Dr A.S. Cameron, Manager of the Commission's Communicable Disease Control Unit:

> . . . to take whatever action you deem necessary and appropriate to ensure that there has been no spread of HIV . . .

The authorisation was made under section 36 of the Public and Environmental Health Act 1987 and other sections of that Act. The name of the dentist was revealed on Adelaide television on the evening of 24 January 1992 and reported in the *Advertiser* the next day. A thorough investigation of the infection control procedures and work practices of the dental surgery was conducted by Dr Cameron of the Health Commission and Dr Ed Gorkic, Director of Restorative Dentistry at the Adelaide Dental Hospital, on 29 and 30 January 1992. The investigation involved an inspection of the physical aspects of the surgeries and associated work areas and interviews with the principal of the practice, other staff and the dental assistant who worked exclusively with the infected dentist. The investigation concluded that infection control and work practices were exemplary.

The interviews involved the use of questionnaires issued by the National Centre for Prevention Services of the Centre

for Disease Control in the United States, which have been specifically designed for the investigation of dental practices in which HIV infected dentists had worked. On the recommendation of the Health Commission, the practice agreed to write to all former patients of the dentist pointing out that the risks of HIV infection are negligible, but offering all patients the opportunity to seek counselling and testing through the Health Commission's Clinic 275 in North Terrace. The findings of the investigation were reported in the *Advertiser* of 1 February 1992.

The circumstances surrounding this incident have highlighted the complex set of issues involved. AIDS is a major public health problem which, to quote the *Advertister* editorial of 28 January 1992, 'cannot be curtailed by compulsion'. The same editorial stated:

> The carefully considered approach to the AIDS dilemma in all Western nations has been to eschew a largely unenforceable legalistic approach, which would be likely to drive sufferers underground, out of contact with health professionals, and into a netherworld in which there was no incentive to modify behaviour that put others at risk.

The Government supports this view and will not be stampeded into making decisions which put the health of South Australians at risk. The balance between public health considerations and considerations of individual rights must be carefully weighed. I welcome the discussions which are occurring between the Health Commission, professional associations, registration boards, and the AIDS Council and sincerely hope that consensus can be reached.

QUESTION TIME

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): What new initiatives does the Premier have to reverse the increasing trend of unemployment and youth unemployment in this State? The Australian Bureau of Statistics seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment for January fell today but the trend rate of unemployment increased from 11.1 per cent to 11.2 per cent and youth unemployment is 37.5 per cent compared with 27.1 per cent 12 months ago.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition has referred to the unemployment figures today. I guess that the important feature of those figures, first, looking at the national level, is that there has been a reduction, much against the expectation of the general market. The suggestion that there is some evidence of a levelling off will certainly be good news for South Australia because, while we were slow into the current recession and while our employment levels and our unemployment rate remained comparatively very good as we went into the recession, it has caught us and caught us hard now.

Part of the means of South Australia's recovery from this situation will be the economic activity in the other States of Australia; in particular, in Victoria and New South Wales. So many of the goods we produce and the activity we generate is directed to those markets, and improvement in those markets, with some lag, will show improvement in South Australia. So that national scene is obviously welcomed. Of course it is less than satisfactory. Of course we need a massive stimulus, a return of confidence which it is hoped will be generated or begun as a process through the 26 February statement of the Prime Minister.

Quite against expectation—and perhaps the Leader of the Opposition had very different questions and strategies in mind today in anticipation of worsening figures—the situation in South Australia has improved by .7 per cent in terms of unemployment; on the figures there were a further 3 800 jobs as between December and January. We no longer have the highest unemployment rate in Australia: we are below Western Australia. All the things I have mentioned are extremely welcome, but we should not put too much reliance on them as long-term trends. I believe it is important always not just to look at the month by month figures which tend to be fairly volatile but at the longer term trend lines. It is still our belief that, because of that timing effect of the recession, unemployment in South Australia could increase, causing employment to be very tight.

There is no great joy in these figures for us, but it is encouraging that the expected blow-out has not occurred. Incidentally, that fairly major reduction in unemployment in the monthly figures occurred despite a static participation rate. So, it is not attributable to an impact of participation either nationally or at the State level, and that is very welcome indeed. We have to do everything we can to ensure that that is translated into confidence in this economy that will see people beginning to invest and spend rather than as occurs at the moment, hanging back hoping the recession will pass.

In that respect, there are some encouraging signs and some major proposals in South Australia. I come back to what I was saying yesterday to members of the Opposition: it is not good enough in this environment for them, on the one hand, to talk broadly about the need for things to improve and on the other hand to denigrate and play down those things where we have hopes of having some major investment or major activity. A classic example is the MFP, which I mentioned yesterday.

Mr Ingerson: What about WorkCover?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: WorkCover is another example where the trends are going in the right direction.

Mr Ingerson: Oh, come on!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member who says, 'Oh, come on' in this extraordinary way—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —is predicting—I think I am right—a $300 million unfunded deficit in WorkCover. That was what he was braying—frightening employers with. The fact is that it is half of that, and it is going down. Does the honourable member deny that, Mr Speaker?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The honourable member was found out trying to make the worst possible case and, as usual, he would like everyone to forget it, but there is certainly no apology and no concession: we are used to that. Let me go back, Mr Speaker. In the submission we made to the Federal Government we drew attention to some great strengths in the South Australian economy and how they could appropriately be reinforced. We have looked at the structure of our manufacturing industry and its particular needs. We have looked at the new industries, particularly defence, aerospace and other areas. We have looked at those projects with great twenty-first century potential like the MFP. We have looked at South Australia as a transport hub, the place where time-sensitive container traffic and other intermodal transport can come so that there will be interconnection between north, south, east and west. We will be the distribution point for the country for that.

There has been very detailed work. I think that the Federal Government was quite surprised that when it said, 'What are the things in South Australia you can do?' it was not just a kind of wish list cobbled up for the occasion: in fact, there were detailed submissions based on analysis,

study and evaluation. I am hoping that that will be taken note of in the economic statement, and I hope we get the support of the Opposition in doing so. So, there are many things going for us. I have not even talked about our training and other initiatives, the Conservation Corps and things of this kind which relate to youth unemployment. Again, let us not spread doom and gloom among our youth.

The way in which the Opposition talks about it suggests two things: one in every three youths aged between 15 and 19 is unemployed. That is what the Opposition is saying. Secondly, it is saying that the aspirations of most of those people are far worse than they might have been. Both those statements are wrong. It is true of those seeking work that one in three cannot find it, and that is an unacceptable situation. But the number of those seeking work, the number of those not engaged in education, training and other skills enhancement of some sort, has been declining. The retention rate at the schools, the number of TAFE courses and all the other opportunities whereby young people are upgrading their skills and abilities mean that in fact the number of youth seeking work has gone down quite considerably over recent years. Of the residue who are left, who are not able to have advanced skill training, education and so on, it is true that one in every three is not able to get a job, but there is hope for those as well. The second point is that they will be schooled, trained—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: They will be able to take advantage of opportunities. If the Opposition walks around telling all the youth of South Australia, 'Forget it, give up; it is hopeless', it is misrepresenting the situation and being very unfair to the young people of our community.

RECYCLING DEVELOPMENT FUND

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the amount allocated to councils from the recycling development fund established to assist councils to promote kerbside recycling programs?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in this whole concept of waste minimisation, kerbside collection and recycling. I can inform the House that approximately $500 000 has been made available and allocated for various projects since the fund came into operation in 1990. Recently I announced grants totalling $20 000 to the councils of Victor Harbor, Onkaparinga and Gumeracha. Last month I had the pleasure of presenting a cheque for $10 000, in the presence of the local member, to the Port Lincoln council to assist with the establishment of a recycling component at its new landfill depot.

Recycling certainly has caught the public's attention. I am most grateful and pleased to note the action being taken by numerous councils now throughout South Australia. The Glenelg council is introducing a monthly recycling kerbside collection scheme, beginning this month. I know that other councils, such as Unley, Marion and others, are well under way with their kerbside collection and recycling programs. Again, I urge all members to lobby their local councils, because this is the way of the future. The quicker we can get these schemes into place, the quicker we can get the development of new industries, new jobs and new technology into South Australia.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): My question is directed to the Premier. What is the Government's estimate of the number of unemployed young South Australians, and does this estimate include school leavers who were still hoping for a tertiary position in January? On Saturday, the North-East Region Director of the Department for Family and Community Services was quoted as saying that youth unemployment is greater than 50 per cent in working class areas of the State. Estimates of the number of young South Australians missing out on an offer of a tertiary place begin at 15 000.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am very happy to answer this question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —because again we are seeing a situation where there is a deliberate misrepresentation of the nature of youth unemployment. As the Premier just said—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —the member for Coles seems to be working on a philosophy of always being sincere, even if she has to fake it. The simple fact is that we are talking about the number of young people who are seeking jobs. What she is constantly calling out in this Parliament about one in three young people being unemployed is simply not true.

It is interesting that the honourable member has been asking questions about unmet demand. She has been making a number of statements about unmet demand, as have other members opposite, in terms of both universities and our TAFE system. Statements have been made in the newspapers about many thousands of young people not receiving university places. As at 14 January SATAC had received 34 317 applications for a place, a rise of 2 681 or 7.9 per cent over last year's total of 31 636. Of the 34 317 applications, 11 218 were from school leavers, a rise of 1 045 or 10.3 per cent over last year's total of 10 173. The exact nature of the unmet demand will not be known for a few months, but the rise in the number of applications, coupled with the probable reduction in intake—

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Sir, I ask that, upon conclusion of his reference to the docket to which he is referring, the Minister table it.

The SPEAKER: Is the Minister reading from a docket?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Absolutely not, Sir. I have notes, I am happy to give the honourable member a briefing on them.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I seek your leave, Sir, to ascertain the position because, if it is not an official docket, is it appropriate to ask the Minister from what source this detail that he is quoting to the House comes?'

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister to resume his seat. If the question was pertinent and specific to the point that the honourable member raised, I am sure that the Minister would be in a position to provide or not provide an answer as he chooses. The question was about statistics and unemployment, and that is the response being received.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Questions have been raised about the true level of unmet demand. The simple fact is that we saw headlines last year about a 50 000 shortfall in unmet demand in the universities. That was a total falsehood. We saw a headline in the *Advertiser* about 15 000 applicants having missed out, and that again was totally misleading.

That was a few days ago. We saw identical headlines last year. The simple fact is that a number of people apply for positions in TAFE and various university courses. Are members opposite suggesting that, if there are 60 places at the Flinders University law school, 1 500 people from around the country should be admitted? What does that do to the legal profession? Are we simply saying that we should have total disorder in terms of the system? The honourable member raises the question of TAFE places.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I know that members opposite are looking for a few lawyers and I am sure that Dean Brown will have some competition. It is guts time for the member for Alexandra. He should put the Leader of the Opposition out of his misery, announce his intentions and pull the plug.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister's answer is far from relevant to the question, and I draw him back to it.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The subject was about jobs in jeopardy, and the Leader's job is certainly in jeopardy. The TAFE records revealed a shortfall in 1991 of some 5 000 course places and about 2 000 subject places. Data for 1992 is being collected during the current enrolment period and will be available shortly. Again, during 1991 newspaper reports claimed unmet demand figures nationally of 150 000 or more, and those exaggerated figures appear to have been prompted by partisan sources in a dispute over control of TAFE funding and policy.

The concept of unmet demand is so elastic and future projections so dependent on assumptions that a wide range of estimates and forecasts can be justified. This State has maintained its expenditure on TAFE and redirected resources towards the creation of student places, so that resources for the college system have been increased in real terms by 7 per cent over the past three years. We have also recently won a new increase in TAFE places, about which I will be informing the House very shortly.

MEDICARE CO-PAYMENT

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): My question is directed to the Deputy Premier in his responsibility as Minister of Health. What are the implications for the health system of the abolition of the so-called co-payment?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I guess it means that there is some hope for Medicare, and that is very important. Medicare is important for two reasons: it introduces an element of compassion into our health system that is absent from health systems overseas that do not have this element of redistribution in health care delivery; but at the same time, it is also important because, as has been demonstrated on a number of occasions, it has also helped to keep a lid on health expenditure, as illustrated by the percentage of GDP that is devoted to health.

In this country it is around 8 per cent, and it has been around 8 per cent for some considerable time. You do not get that reasonably happy picture in the United States, for example, and I draw members' attention to a number of articles that have recently been written about the Bush proposals as part of President George Bush's attempt to get himself re-elected, and the effect that will have on health costs in the United States, as well as the fact that it is a package very much directed towards distributing the health dollar from the poor to the relatively well-off parts of that society.

Perhaps I should explain why it is that, largely, the Medicare system has been able to keep some sort of cap on this expenditure, why it is only 8 per cent. It is, of course, because a large number of doctors have been bulk billing, and bulk billing gives the Commonwealth some indirect control over GPs' salaries. As soon as bulk billing goes, you lose that control. I invite members to consider the gap between the rebate and not the scheduled fee but the AMA recommended fee.

Dr Armitage: So it's about control of income.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It is about control of costs.

Dr Armitage interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will deal with the honourable member in a minute. Let him say whether he ever supported this co-payment. Let him say, because he staggered around in much the same way as a body to which I now want to refer which should have acted far more responsibly in this matter and which has not, and I refer to the national AMA. When the co-payment was imposed by the Commonwealth Government, loud was the cry in opposition to it by the AMA. I exempt the South Australian body of the AMA from this criticism: it has been utterly consistent all the way through and, although I am not always comfortable with some of its philosophical positions, it is under moderate leadership and generally takes a constructive approach to these things.

However, the national body said that it wanted nothing of the co-payment—until Mr Keating showed some prospect of becoming Prime Minister and indicated that he may well do away with the co-payment. Suddenly, the co-payment was the greatest thing that had ever been implemented. One could be tempted to think that, whatever the Commonwealth Labor Government advocates, the AMA will be agin it. Further, and this gets back to something in which I was quizzed by way of an interjection from the member for Adelaide a few minutes ago, not only has the national AMA now gone from outright support for the co-payment and opposition to its removal, but I heard this morning that one of its leaders is now saying that the removal of the co-payment is the first step towards the nationalisation of GPs in this country.

So, here is a proposition which initially it opposed but which it now sees as having been so important that, without it, all the GPs will be salaried to the Federal Government, apparently, within a few years. That, of course, is arrant nonsense. The tragedy in all of this is that, during the period in which the co-payment has operated, a large number of practices have moved away from bulk billing, and it may be very difficult to get them back into it. It is important that we get them back into it. The figure was that something like 56 per cent of all practices were bulk billing. It might be difficult to move them back. Without it, we can kiss goodbye to the 8 per cent of GDP.

KNEE REPLACEMENT

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Will the Minister of Health tell the House when Mrs Yvonne Parker of Happy Valley will get a complete knee replacement? The Minister will be familiar with this case, because he was asked to discuss it on the *7.30 Report* last night but declined to do so. I wrote to him about it a fortnight ago. Mrs Parker is a young 64 and has a husband with a heart condition. She has been waiting since last October for a complete knee replacement required by her arthritis—a condition which makes it impossible for her to stand up for any longer than a few mintues. At this

stage, she has been given no prospect of surgery for at least another three months.

Mrs Parker is particularly incensed by a public statement from the Chairman of the Health Commission, Dr Blaikie, that people on public hospital waiting lists are not suffering unnecessarily. Her anger would have been shared by all *7.30 Report* viewers, especially the many South Australians waiting for surgery in our public hospitals, when she demonstrated her incapacity and explained how she is confined to her living room all day.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I will get the details of this individual case for the honourable member.

CONVEYANCING TRANSACTIONS

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I ask the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs: what is the current intention of the Minister regarding legislative proposals to limit dual representation in conveyancing transactions? The 1990 Auditor-General's Report stated that eight landbrokers cost the Agents Indemnity Fund some $3.7 million, with total claims amounting to $9 million. In the 1991 Auditor-General's Report it was noted that there were outstanding claims of $4.5 million, with $5.3 million being paid as a result of default by six brokers.

In August 1987 a report to the Attorney-General recommended that consideration be given to the abolition of dual representation except in very limited circumstances in relation to landbrokers. The figures illustrate the danger of one conveyancer controlling both parties to a conveyancing transaction and, following settlement, also having control over the investment of proceeds. My question is prompted not only by those facts but because some time ago a constituent of mine lost a house as a consequence of fraud and one broker representing all parties to the transaction.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I will be pleased to obtain a detailed report from my colleague in another place on the important matters he raises. Last year we passed legislation in this place to tighten up some of the weaknesses in the existing legislation with respect to those practices of landbrokers, very much bordering on being practices other than those of a landbroker, which have brought about this most unfortunate situation of people being defrauded of very large sums of money in South Australia over recent years. There can now be a great deal more confidence in the landbroking profession, in the law surrounding that profession, and in the conduct of that profession's own internal disciplines to ensure that these undesirable and illegal practices are minimised in the future.

MEMBER FOR ELIZABETH

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Has the Premier or anyone acting on his behalf or on behalf of his Government made any recent offer to the member for Elizabeth of a place in the Ministry? If so, what was the offer, what was the response, and is it intended to make any such offers in the future?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I presume the question is now framed in order. I have the highest regard for the abilities of the member for Elizabeth, who could well with distinction fill ministerial office in this State, as indeed could all those sitting on this side of the Chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am somewhat puzzled about the thinking behind this question from the honourable member, but I do understand that he has some difficulties in relation to preselection and the appropriate seat that he might take, and perhaps this is a sort of fishing expedition to see whether some sort of offer might be extended to him across the Chamber. I must admit that there are one or two competitors for that. With due respect to the honourable member, I would say that the claims of the member for Goyder and the member for Murray-Mallee as Ministers would be somewhat higher, rejected as they have been. That is not withstanding my agreement with the Leader of the Opposition who, apparently, has promised the Ministry of Agriculture, should those opposite take Government, to the member for Chaffey—very appropriately—from water resources. It is great that he is able, as a prospectus for his preselection bid, to tell members of the electoral college of Chaffey that they should select him again for a record further term because, if the Liberals gained Government, he would be a Minister in that Government.

Perhaps the motive for the question is to suggest that I might make further offers, because the Leader is obviously fully extended in terms of his offer. I see he is welcoming the Hon. Dean Brown into this Chamber, so he must be supporting moves posited by the member for Alexandra, who said as a Tonkin Government Minister that he would make a great contribution as a Minister in our Government. So, there is yet another candidate for such a role.

So, the list is somewhat long, and I would certainly give the fullest consideration to the underlying reason or basis for the honourable member's question. I also believe that his complaint is with his own Leader, who has made many promises. He already has a shadow Cabinet that is two or three members over the appropriate level. There are three or four other promises out and about and people outside waiting to get in. I understand that the Lord Mayor, who is to be the Minister of Local Government should a Liberal Government be formed, is amongst them. So, it looks to me as if—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, the member for Hanson is the first honest member amongst them. I can understand why in despair the member for Hanson has announced his retirement; he is the only one who has not had any sort of offer from the Leader of the Opposition. That is to be regretted, but that certainly indicates the level of his judgment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Peake.

TAFE STUDENT NUMBERS

Mr HERON (Peake): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise the House of the results of his negotiations with the Federal Government for the funding of extra TAFE places?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am delighted to be able to inform the House that, shortly prior to Christmas, I flew to Canberra for a meeting with the former Minister for Employment, Education and Training, John Dawkins, to negotiate a funding package worth some $9.07 million to South Australia for TAFE. This extra funding will create another 3 300 TAFE places and more than a million extra student hours for South Australian students in 1992.

Every college covering all regions across the State will be provided with some of these funds to boost student places and, in determining the types and locations of courses,

priority has been given to regional levels of unemployment, to help alleviate pressures on student places in TAFE courses and create employment opportunities.

In addition, preference has been given to courses designed for school leavers and courses for young people under the age of 25. The DETAFE programs receiving major funding are the community services programs with 525 additional student places, of which 95 will be in the area of child-care training; business and commercial studies programs, with 570 additional student places; and Aboriginal education programs, with 692 additional places. We have to recognise that the first Australians are still the last Australians when it comes to employment with massive sustained levels of unemployment across the country. Also, in the preparatory education program there are 355 additional student places.

There is some other positive news. South Australia has been awarded its full per capita share of the Commonwealth's incentive payment of $0.42 million, which will be used to provide for extra TAFE teacher education training programs and generate approximately 300 additional student places. There is also a series of other initiatives, such as matched capital funding for work at three TAFE colleges. The member for Whyalla will be pleased to know that Whyalla, Croydon and Elizabeth have been chosen in this area. I guess the point that we have to keep making, and the point that the Opposition keeps mistaking, is that we cannot let the Federal Government off the hook when it comes to the 26 February statement. That is what you want to do. By pretending that this is a South Australian problem, by pretending—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will not refer to the Opposition as 'you'. He will address his remarks through the Chair.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. The Opposition wants to mislead the State because it has predicated its future on a continuation of recession. That is the whole basis of its strategy of opposition—a continuation of recession. It has no commitment at all towards recovery and not one care about jobs. The Opposition knows that is true. I want to know from the Leader of the Opposition today whether he shares the views of his Employment and Further Education shadow spokesperson in being opposed to the MFP, to Wilpena, to every development that comes along and to every job. You are either inside the tent or outside.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is debating the question, which is well outside Standing Orders. I warn him of his action.

ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Planning.

Mr S.J. BAKER: On a point of order, Sir, it was over here.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Deputy Leader has some doubts about the fairness of the Chair, he should speak to the Chair about it. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister say whether the economic downturn has slowed the progress of environmental enhancement in South Australia?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question, because there has been a deal of debate and discussion in recent times on the balance between economic development proposals and environmental imperatives. However, I believe that South Australia has continued to get that balance right in accordance with Government policies. Indeed, in the past two years alone the Government has been able to announce a series of milestones which have ensured a cleaner and less polluted environment not only for this generation but for the next.

I think it is important to pick up the concept of ecologically sustainable development and translate that into some of the environmental enhancements that we have undertaken. It is not my intention to go through each of the environmental enhancements that have been undertaken, because I will be sending members an updated version of what has happened in the past two years in my portfolio areas. However, I should like to share with the House the fact that this program has included enhanced environmental quality, improved land management, wilderness conservation, about which we shall hear in the near future, animal welfare, urban environment and resource recycling.

Not only have we begun to remedy some of the mistakes of the past but we have established a new attitude to the exploitation of South Australia's natural resources which will ensure the sustainable use of our air, water and soil not only in the immediate future but for generations to come. I think that South Australia has got this balance correct. It is important to recognise that we must continue to move forward, enhancing our environment, and not be immobilised or bogged down as has happened in other parts of the world and, indeed, in some other parts of this country.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES FACILITIES

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): Why are security and communications facilities available to prison officers demonstrably inadequate when transporting dangerous prisoners in prison vans; and why were these facilities not immediately upgraded when it was known that an escape was planned for a dangerous criminal who was to be transported from Yatala Labour Prison to the courts last Tuesday?

I refer to the armed escape of Marcel Spiero (who has been described as very dangerous) which could have been carried out only through prior knowledge of the transport arrangements. Media reports suggest that the police had been warned of an imminent escape, although no mention was made of this information being passed on to the Department of Correctional Services. One newspaper reported that prison guards were forced at gun point out of their van and another suggested that these guards had to report the escape to authorities from a nearby shop.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: First of all, I welcome the member for Newland to the shadow portfolio; I think it is quite an achievement. The House might be interested to know that, since I have been the Minister, the shadow Ministers have been the member for Hanson, the member for Heysen, the member for Mount Gambier, the Hon. Trevor Griffin, the Hon. John Burdett and the Hon. Jamie Irwin. I apologise if I have missed anybody. The member for Newland joins a long list of failures in this area, with the exception of the member for Mount Gambier who, I admit, did have some idea of what was required.

The incident was a very unfortunate one. It has been declared a major crime, and the police are investigating it. I also have seen the TV and newspaper reports. A full report is being prepared by the Major Crime Squad and the Department of Correctional Services as to whether it is desirable to have prison officers armed or perhaps to have the Star Force transport people of such notoriety. All those matters will be assessed by the people who know far more than I do about security and, of course, we will take into account their views.

It is quite clear that the vehicle itself has to be looked at. It is a very high security vehicle for the prisoners, but whether it affords sufficient protection for the officers is something that has to be looked at. As an observation, I point out that the call for prison officers to be armed in these circumstances is one that I think requires very careful thought. We are talking about Regency Road and armed criminals outside a school at peak hour. I do not like escapes, but it seems to me that these people, if they are hijacking a prison van with guns, are prepared to use them.

I do not know that I want shoot-outs with either Correctional Services officers or armed offenders at that time and in those circumstances. If there is to be a shoot-out, my view is that I would rather the police were in charge of that operation. I think the simplistic notion that prison officers ought to be armed, so that they can take on armed hijackers, is exactly that—simplistic and possibly dangerous. I have every confidence in the South Australian Police Force to analyse the incident and to make recommendations to us after that analysis. As I said, the South Australian Government obviously will take into account very much the recommendations of the Major Crime Squad.

SAFA DEALS

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): When will the Treasurer provide the answer he promised on 27 November 1991 concerning details of all SAFA structured financing and lease-back deals? The original question was asked in relation to SAFA's part in the use of State assets, such as the Noarlunga hospital, in a funding deal involving Tricontinental Corporation and Babcock and Brown.

I have now been advised that the new Hallett Cove East Primary School has been sold by the Education Department to SAFA, with the Education Department agreeing to pay SAFA $315 000 per annum in rent over 15 years. A number of constituents have expressed their concern to me that what they regard as secret use of Government assets, such as schools, hospitals, power stations and public transport is nothing more than a way to increase borrowings not approved by the Loans Council and without having them added to our official State debt, which is already $6.6 billion.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The financial arrangements that SAFA enters into, and the money management it operates on behalf of the State, quite contrary to what the honourable member says, is aimed at minimising and reducing the State's debt and minimising the cost of our borrowings, and giving the best deal possible to departments that under the previous system found great difficulty in financing a number of the projects that they have now been able to accomplish. In addition to doing that, SAFA returns very large multimillion dollar amounts of profit to the budget each financial year. So, I just believe that the honourable member is totally misconceiving the situation and clearly does not understand the structure of our finances, the way in which property is held, and the way in which we ensure that the best possible deal is delivered for the taxpayers of South Australia.

Every dollar that SAFA can save the Education Department is a dollar that can be put into providing new services and assisting, for instance, the constituents of the honourable member. He should welcome that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The same applies, yes, like hospitals, the Health Commission as well. When we came into office, the outgoing Government, in which some members opposite were Ministers, had allocated $10 million for the total Health Commission capital works program. The reason we have been able to provide substantially more than that year by year—more than $40 million this year—is that we have been able to organise SAFA as a central borrowing authority and money manager. The success of that model could not be more eloquently demonstrated than by the fact that nearly every other State is seeking to do exactly the same.

SOUTH-EAST COASTAL LAKES STRATEGY

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Lands advise the House of the response to the management plan for the South-East coastal lakes system released in November last year for public comment?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The South-East coastal lakes strategy was released to the public on 28 November last year. The strategy covers a series of large coastal lakes from Port MacDonnell in the south to Kingston South-East in the north. These lakes are the Paranki Lagoon and Lakes Hawdon (north and south), Eliza, St Clair, George, Frome and Bonney. The lakes are subject to varying degrees of competing uses that require resolution. The strategy has been prepared with the aim of identifying management issues, determining the environmental status of the lakes and developing a plan for the future management of each site.

The consultation period closed on 31 January this year and 24 submissions were made with respect to this draft that I had released last year. The department is currently working to assess those submissions and a summary will be available shortly, and reports on each of the sites will follow. I will be very pleased to make those available, particularly to the members in the South-East and to the shadow Minister, because this does give us the opportunity to look at the ongoing management of this very important area of our State and to manage some of the conflicting uses and interests to which the lakes have been subjected in the past.

WORKCOVER

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister of Labour advise why WorkCover delayed reviews on the exempt status of some of South Australia's leading employers? Although 21 exempt employers were due to have their status reviewed at the January meeting of the WorkCover Board, I understand that a decision to renew these exemptions was deferred and, subsequently, some of the employers affected were asked to provide information in additon to that already supplied in accordance with the onerous performance standards of WorkCover. Much of this was a duplication of information previously provided.

The board at its February meeting has again deferred a decision, and I am advised that this has occurred because WorkCover Staff have been frustrated by the desire of the board's union representatives to bring personal animosities into overall decision making. I understand that the result is that a number of South Australia's largest employers are unable to make sensible, long-term business decisions because of uncertainty about their ongoing workers compensation costs.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I will seek from the board of WorkCover the details requested by the honourable member.

NAVIGATIONAL AIDS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Marine tell the House what stage the negotiations have reached regarding the retention of the navigational aids in Spencer Gulf? Last year the Federal Government announced the decommissioning of several navigational aids, namely, the Middle Bank, Eastern Shoal, North and South Beacons and Point Lowly lighthouse. This is causing great concern on safety and other grounds in my electorate.

The Hon. R.J. GREORY: This matter has caused considerable controversy in the northern area of Spencer Gulf. The navigational beacons in that area have been maintained by the Australian Maritime Safety Authority, which has decided that it will no longer maintain those lights because it believes that they are no longer necessary. It took that decision in October 1990 and conveyed it to us in July 1991. Whilst the waters are under the control of the Minister of Marine in South Australia, the Commonwealth has collected the funds for the maintenance of those beacons from ships that use Australian ports. Having inspected two of those beacons in the latter part of last year, I advise this House that one is in a precarious state and will probably fall over if not soon dismantled. The other has been set alight by people who I regard as vandals.

The advice that I have is that both Santos and officers of the Merchant Service Guild in South Australia are of the view that those lights are a required navigational aid in the area. I am advised that, while ships may have all modern navigational equipment on them, these lights are there and are a reassurance that the navigational equipment is working, and if it fails there are still those mechanical aids to ensure safe navigation in fairly shallow waters. I have taken up the matter with the Commonwealth authorities, and officers of my department have spent considerable time discussing it with them. However, we have come to a halt in that they refuse to reconsider their decision. I wrote to the Minister, Senator Collins, seeking an urgent meeting with him to discuss this and other matters of concern to me and the Government of this State.

Mr LES WRIGHT

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister of Labour advise whether his personal assistant Mr Les Wright resigned to establish himself as an independent consultant in industrial relations and occupational health and, if so, how will conflicts of interest be avoided with Mr Wright's position as Chairman of WorkCover?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Mr Wright has resigned as my personal assistant. I am sure that everybody in this House agrees that Mr Wright has a high personal integrity and will ensure that there is no conflict of interest.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ROCK CONCERTS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Will the Minister of Education, on behalf of the Minister of Consumer Affairs, advise the House what action has been taken by the Government to clarify the situation of members of the public attending rock concerts which they assume to be live performances but which may involve miming? On 7 and 21 November 1990 I raised the matter because of public concerns expressed about miming during so-called live performances.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and note that he has sought information on this matter on previous occasions and brought his concerns to the attention of the House and, in that way, to the broader community in this State. I have some information from my colleague in another place and I can advise the honourable member that fans attending live performances have a right to know whether the entertainers will be miming. Concert organisers must let fans know if the entertainers will be miming at performances when they advertise the event on tickets that they sell for performances. Of course, there is not anything inherently wrong with miming. Indeed, it could be described as an art form in itself and can enhance the sound and quality of the performance.

The point, though, is that patrons of this form of entertainment are entitled to know what they are getting for their entertainment dollar. South Australia's Consumer Affairs Department plans to write to concert promoters throughout Australia and to South Australian operators of licensed premises who offer live entertainment reminding them of their obligations under the Trade Practices Act and the State's 1987 Fair Trading Act. Promoters could be prosecuted for misleading advertising or deceptive conduct if they do not advise fans that performers will be miming during those performances.

Some promoters, unfortunately, may not be aware of the law in this regard. Certain situations—for example, where a singer sings to pre-recorded music or where part of a performance or part of a musical backing is pre-recorded—may not be clear. However, the general provisions of the Fair Trading Act operate to cover a wide variety of situations. The Office of Fair Trading has received few complaints in relation to misleading or deceptive advertising for entertainment, but the local performers raised the issue because the practice is growing interstate and overseas and is a matter of some public note at the moment. It is important to warn promoters now of their obligations under the law so that South Australian consumers may be protected now and in the future.

ELECTORATE SECRETARY

Mr VENNING (Custance): Did the member for Playford refer to the Minister of Labour's department, the Department of Labour, in determining the future employment of his former electorate secretary? What involvement did the Minister have in discussions about the matter? It has been claimed in the press that there was a payout of $80 000 to the member's former electorate secretary. How can this be justified, given that it is the equivalent of almost three years pay as well as being in excess of the normal in both public and private sectors?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The member for Playford's secretary received a payment in accordance with the Workers' Rehabilitation and Compensation Act in this State. She was treated like any other employee of the Government in respect of that separation.

CONCESSION HOME LOAN INTEREST RATES

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Housing and Construction tell the House the current state of play in regard to concessional home loan interest rates? It is widely known that major banks and building societies have dropped

their rates dramatically in the past few months. Have concessional borrowers received the same reductions?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is important in regard to some 23 000 South Australians who enjoy the concessional interest rates through the Home Ownership Made Easy scheme offered by this Government. I am very pleased to announce that from 1 March there will be a further reduction in the interest rate of 1.5 per cent. As members would recall, we have previously dropped the rate from 13.5 per cent, and will now bring that down to 11 per cent.

So, that will bring some 13 600 home owners in our State a further reduction in the interest rates they pay. I am delighted to be able to announce that, because some 23 000 people have enjoyed the benefits of this scheme, and considerable concessions have been offered, bearing in mind that during the period when interest rates were around 17.5 per cent to 18 per cent these very same South Australians enjoyed a capped rate of 13.5 per cent. Of course, in addition, many of them were not paying that 13.5 per cent, because further concessions were built into the scheme from when it was first introduced. I am sure that 13 600 South Australians will be overjoyed at the announcement today that, from 1 March, the new rate will be 11 per cent.

STRATHMONT LAND SALE

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): Will the Minister of Health inform the House whether he is going to address the crisis accommodation situation for 26 severely and multiply handicapped adults in the State through the proceeds from the sale of land from Strathmont to the Urband Land Trust? There are currently 130 out of 600 severely and multiply handicapped people in this State seeking crisis accommodation. Of these 26 require urgent high support care. The Premier has signed a Commonwealth/State agreement that will see the Commonwealth start to hand over responsibility for accommodation for these people to the State. With the closure of Ru Rua and with Strathmont Centre overcrowded and in urgent need of upgrading to cater for adults, there is an urgent need for funding for these people. The sale of 10.2 hectares of land from Strathmont to the Urban Land Trust is expected to yield approximately $1.5 million.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The only context in which Strathmont and the possible sale of land have been mentioned was in the early stages of negotiations concerning the Better Cities project. I acted specifically to exempt Strathmont from that stage of the process. It is true that Hillcrest has been mentioned in the possible transfer of land to the Urban Land Trust, with some of that money going to this area, and that money is confused in some people's mind with the money that will go to disability as a result of the devolution of the Hillcrest beds.

However, it is wrong to make that assumption, because they are two quite separate buckets of money. The figures that have been bruited about are the savings from the devolution and nothing to do with the additional money that will come from the sale of a good deal of that property. As the honourable member knows, some of the Hillcrest property must remain, but no decision has been made in relation to the other facility to which the honourable member refers. My feeling is that we will need that sort of institutional accommodation for many years to come, and I believe that it would be quite irresponsible for me right now to be setting any hares running whatsoever about the possibility of the deinstitutionalisation of those facilities.

I will spend a little time talking about deinstitutionalisation. I hold no particular ideological brief for a particular position in this area. I know that there are those who feel that deinstitutionalisation has gone far enough and those who feel that it could go very much further. I believe that we have to look at individual cases as compassionately as we can. It may well be that there are still people in institutions whose quality of life would benefit from some degree of removal to what might be regarded as a more normal type of housing environment, but I think we must proceed fairly carefully in that area.

The other thing that is implied by the honourable member's question is the whole question of cost, because it is by no means clear that every instance of deinstitutionalisation saves money. One can think of examples in the past where deinstitutionalisation has led to greater rather than less cost to the community. So, the arguments are not all one way. We are conscious of the need to continue to make more resources available in this very important disability area. We are conscious of the fact that, despite the protests of some, we should divert some of the savings from the Hillcrest devolution into that very important matter, but I would not want to give any credence to the other matter to which the honourable member has referred. There has been no decision, and very little consideration.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: I pose the question that the House note grievances.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I am pleased that I have the first opportunity in this grievance debate to rise and rally support, not only in this House but also in the wider community, for an old friend, a colleague, and one who I am proud to say is my mentor. Those in the Liberal Party desperate to get Dean Brown into Parliament in order to dump the Leader of the Opposition have summarily decided that the member for Alexandra should be the reluctant sacrificial lamb in order that they may achieve their treacherous ends. It is typical of the member for Alexandra's integrity and loyalty to the Party he loves so much that he has put on this brave, stoic front and accepted the inevitable, despite the fact that he is bleeding inwardly and feeling terribly betrayed. I and my colleagues on this side of the House believe that anyone who is prepared to make such a large financial and moral sacrifice should not be thrown to the wolves and is worthy of our wholehearted support to keep him here. I pledge to the member for Alexandra that I will not only make speeches in this House; I will go out to rally support for him.

It is the unanimous view of those on this side of the House that anyone who is prepared to make the supreme sacrifice with the humility for which he is renowned, deserves to remain in this Parliament as long as blood flows through his veins. This moral integrity that the member for Alexandra is exhibiting is exactly the same kind as shown by the early settlers when they forged a new, vital and democratic life in Kangaroo Island. Is there anyone in this House who has not at one time gone to Ted and asked his advice on some matter? Is there anyone who has been refused that wise counsel for which the member for Alexandra is so well known, and not been able to go back and further satisfy their constituents or their Party in this House? Not one has ever been refused. I do not mind confessing that my career in this House has been modelled on the member for Alexandra, and I am proud of it.

I have witnessed the member for Alexandra being dumped from the front bench, being dumped from the Public Works Standing Committee and dumped from all those other jobs, and I have cried for him. I have cried for him over his humiliation but marvelled at the way he has taken it on the chin and still acted on behalf of his Party and his constituents on Kangaroo Island. Not only on behalf of members on this side of the House, but I am sure on behalf of thousands of South Australians who were shocked last night to see the member for Alexandra being put up as a sacrificial lamb, I implore those subversive characters in the Liberal Party who are intent on destroying our Ted, to lay off. It is our fervent wish that the member for Alexandra remain for that period in this Parliament for which those simple country folk on Kangaroo Island elected him.

The people of Kangaroo Island did not want Ted to serve only half a term; they wanted him to serve the full four years. They expect him to serve the full four years. They are not worried about whether the Leader of the Opposition is no good; they are not worried about the conniving that is going on to get Dean Brown into Parliament; and they are not worried about all the machinations that are taking place in the Party room. They want the member for Alexandra, their member (whom they have elected year in, year out, to represent their interests in this Parliament), to be here until late 1993 or 1994.

I put to those plotters that, if it is so important to get Dean Brown into Parliament to get the Liberal Party out of its mess, let one of them stand down from this Parliament and leave our Ted alone. They will not do that, because they do not have the guts. The member for Alexandara is the victim—the sacrificial lamb. However, I have news for those plotters to which they will not take kindly. The groundswell is growing, and it will grow even more after this speech. The people of Kangaroo Island and the member for Alexandra will triumph in the end. I think the member for Alexandra will appreciate that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind all members to refer to other members by the name of their electorate, not by their christian name.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): One of the large industries that people seem to forget about in this State is the recreational boating industry. There are literally tens of thousands of trailer boats in backyards and in sheds scattered around the metropolitan area which at some time or another are taken to the coast and put into the water, and their owners go fishing, boating, sailing or whatever, getting pleasure out of these boats. The Tonkin Liberal Government in the early 1980s saw the need and built the O'Sullivan Beach boat ramp, but since then there has been very little activity by this Government in the metropolitan area.

Last year the Government gave the green light to a project which has the potential to redevelop the Patawalonga outlet. That project will involve many phases, one being the redevelopment of the inner Patawalonga—the dredging of it and improvement of the water. Outside there is a marina and there will be a housing development and a new sailing club. Incorporated in that new sailing club will be a small boat ramp for the use of the club. However, there is no provision whatsoever for trailered boats, fishing boats, sailing boats or yachts to come in and use the new facility.

As an alternative, the Government suggested that it would create a new public launching facility at West Beach, but that seems to have fallen into a hole. If the Government does not create a public launching facility somewhere in the centre of the metropolitan coastline before it closes the estuary and starts reconstruction at Glenelg, it will have grave difficulties in getting this project up and running.

The recreational boating industry is very large. Tens of thousands of people use these boats. At a public meeting I asked the Government representative on the steering committee about the proposal for a launching facility at West Beach, and we had a very vague answer. There was some question as to whether there was even a plan at all. The representative said, 'Yes, we are planning some sort of ramp, but we cannot tell you whether it will be an all-weather ramp.' I asked, 'Is there any chance of a facility something like the one at O'Sullivan Beach where people can launch and retrieve a boat with some safety?' I was told by the Government representative, 'We might build a small facility at West Beach, but nothing is determined yet. If any boats of any size come in'—and we are talking about a 20ft launch that will require the use a four-wheel trailer—'let them go down to O'Sullivan Beach.'

What he was really saying was that the Government is going to close the whole metropolitan coastline from O'Sullivans Beach to North Haven to boats of any size. That is ridiculous. It shows a complete lack of understanding of the needs of the recreational boating industry. It shows that the Government is not thinking through the new project at Glenelg and if it does not start to think through this project and its implications for the boating industry, it will have grave difficulty in getting it off the ground. The boating industry must be considered in this development.

We must have a launching facility somewhere along the central metropolitan coastline, and it must be available to the public. At the moment the project does not include a ramp that would be available to the public, and in those circumstances many people would have trouble supporting what has the potential to be a very good project for the central metropolitan coastline. It is something many people want to support, but the Government has to get it right. This Government is not heading down that track; a lot more work needs to be done and there has to be more public consultation which, at present, is not happening.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I place on record my very firm support for the concept of the Youth Conservation Corps. The Minister of Employment and Further Education this week alleged that the Opposition is not interested in this project. That is contrary to the truth. We are fully supportive of it and any other responsible, imaginative and constructive project that not only trains young people who would otherwise not be in training but also, in creating short-term employment, achieves the additional goal of ensuring that work that is in the public interest, of lasting value and highly desirable is undertaken. Thus it not only benefits the community but gives those young people who are participating a very great sense of purpose and value.

Yesterday in reply to a question from the member for Stuart the Minister outlined some of the projects that are currently being undertaken or soon will be undertaken by the Youth Conservation Corps. I take this opportunity to put in a word for projects that I think are worthy of the Youth Conservation Corps. Each project happens to be in my electorate and happens to involve a national park or conservation park in the hills face zone.

At the top of my list I would put the Horsnell Gully Conservation Park. I visited that park a fortnight ago, and I have never in my visits to conservation and national parks across the State seen a park so neglected and degraded and so much in need of attention. It is a small park which is in a half-forgotten valley. I would say that it is rarely visited,

except perhaps occasionally by locals. It certainly rarely, if ever, is visited by National Parks and Wildlife staff.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It's an enormous bushfire hazard.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: It is a bushfire hazard. It is absolutely choked with exotic vegetation—broom, blackberry, elm and olives—as well as a range of weeds—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Pest plants.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Pest plants, including boneseed. Horsnell Gully Conservation Park is typical of a number of small valleys throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges that have fallen prey to exotic vegetation, which is growing unchecked. In doing so, that vegetation is destroying irrevocably a lot of the native vegetation. The feral animals in those little valleys are either endangering or putting at risk of extinction small native mammals.

It would be a worthwhile exercise for any member of this House to take a little trip up the Old Norton Summit Road, detour to the right and look at the truly shocking state of the Horsnell Gully Conservation Park. The evidence of foxes in that conservation park is abundantly clear on the narrow tracks. It is clear from the evidence of the fox faeces that the olive and other exotic seeds are being spread into the lower levels of the valley where the water, open ground and sunlight will ensure that there is a revegetation of these exotic species. That is a project that is more than worthy. It would mean that metropolitan young people had easy access.

It is equally appropriate for young women as well as young men to be involved in the TAFE courses associated with horticulture and botany. It would be a superb project. If it is not undertaken, I fear that that valley and many others in the ranges will be destroyed to all intents and purposes as part of the watershed area.

Mr HERON (Peake): I rise to speak on an issue which I know is of concern to all members in this House. I refer to land contamination. For many years now, industrialists, agriculturalists, local councils and Governments have been very naive of the problem in relation to contaminated land. Minerals, sludge, rubbish, insecticides, chemicals and oils were dumped at leisure and with no thought of the damage that today we see it has done to our soil and waterways. That dumping poses a serious threat to human health, animals, bird life and the environment. The general public is now becoming very much aware of these problems and is demanding that Governments take immediate action to safeguard our future.

Old industrial areas and land used for agricultural purposes are now being identified as land contaminated by hazardous substances, and these findings are becoming more and more frequent each day. Last April, some 70 sites were found to be contaminated and, not surprisingly, most of these sites were revealed in the western suburbs of Adelaide. Those sites listed are only the tip of the iceberg. As there is no register to record what the land was previously used for, it is extremely important that we take action to safeguard the well-being of our future generations.

With this problem hanging over our heads, it was very pleasing to learn that the Minister for Environment and Planning has released a green paper entitled 'Contaminated land—a legislative approach' on this very serious issue. The green paper invites the community to comment and give their views so the Government can legislate to manage properly the problem of contaminated land. The legislation will not be easy because the Planning Act, the Public and Environmental Health Act, the Waste Management Act, the Water Resources Act and the Land Agents, Brokers and Valuers Act do not directly tackle the contaminated land issue. Also, the Commonwealth Government takes no responsibility for contaminated land, so it is essential that that legislation is supported.

The green paper outlines the strategy for options which could assist in connection with legislation dealing with this very complex problem. This is indeed a complex problem, and many issues have to be examined. First, the contaminated land has to be identified; a register of all sites contaminated must be set up, and those sites must be assessed. How those sites can be cleaned must also be determined, as well as ascertaining where the contaminated soil will go, not forgetting the clearing of the contaminated areas and, most importantly, who pays for it. Also to be considered is the health and safety of the workers involved as well as of the general public. Then another register will have to be set up to record sites that have been cleared and where they were cleared.

This register is also important so that the public and prospective commercial buyers know whether the land is clean or contaminated and, if contaminated, to what extent. I understand that other States of Australia are also looking at legislation relating to contaminated land and I will be interested to find out how far they have progressed. I thank the Minister for Environment and Planning for the green paper and I hope that all sections of the community who have concerns about contaminated land will put submissions to the Government so that suitable legislation can be introduced in this House.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): There is no question about the fact that the sooner the Education Department has removed from it the prerogative to determine who gets employed where and in which schools and that prerogative is handed over to the schools and their communities, especially in the country of South Australia, the better off the children of South Australia will be. We have seen a constant parade of changes in policy, in administrative structure and in consequential effects in that department over the past decade, the hairy armpit brigade being the mafia responsible for it.

In one instance, they destroyed the notion of regions, introduced the concept of areas, and re-created all the positions, opening them up to appointment and thereby enabling members of their group to find their way rapidly into senior management positions. Having done that, they demanded that all such positions become contract, the position not having previously been affected by that shake-up, so that even more of their ilk could be appointed to higher and higher management positions. Now they are on the track of returning to central control in Adelaide, where personnel are being removed from the area offices, particularly in the country, and the positions re-created in Adelaide.

The Minister comes out with this wimpish answer, which only a twit like him could give, to the question asked of him as to whether those people should remain in the locations in which they live in the country: 'they can continue to live there if they wish.' And commute to their jobs in Adelaide? Some chance! There would be very little likelihood of that. Not only will these people appointed to positions of responsibility be utterly removed from the locations over which they exercise responsibility and from the communities over which their decisions will have an impact but they never will have had any experience whatever of life outside suburban Adelaide. It is a formula for disaster. It does not provide any consideration whatever for the needs

of the people living in those communities as perceived by those communities. They want to see the State's economy decentralised, and they want to see job opportunities created in the communities in which they live through diversification of their economic base, but they constantly find themselves paying taxes to meet the salaries and charges of departments that have their personnel increasingly located in the city. It strips away the income they derive from their efforts in primary industry, and removes their prerogatives as to how they can re-invest it in the development of their communities and of the children who are coming up as adults in those communities. It is a formula for disaster and destruction.

There are three instances in the circumstances to which I am referring that I wish to put on record this afternoon. At Coomandook, after having everything settled in the area school regarding course subject matter and the teachers teaching those subjects, suddenly, at less than 24 hours notice, they were told that they had to relocate one secondary teacher out. That meant that they had to destroy the class structure, thus affecting the subjects that would be taught by the remaining secondary teachers, and that students had to reconsider at the beginning of their matriculation year, having already done year 11, what subjects they could undertake.

The same sort of thing has happened at Swan Reach with equally insensitive attitudes being adopted by the 'bunch', as I will call them, in head office in the way in which established teachers there were taken out and relocated in one instance in Orroroo, at very short notice, without any cause whatever. The position that that person could have occupied at Swan Reach could have become permanent. He was entitled to permanent employment and had the necessary qualifications, but was simply shifted out and another inexperienced teacher moved in, which destroyed the confidence of the students and parents of those students in what was being done there. It threw into disarray the subject offerings and teachers that would be able to provide those subject offerings. Furthermore, the same thing has happened at Murray Bridge High School. This is all a direct consequence of the ineptitude and arrogance of the newly appointed managers in the Education Department who are more concerned about their own political agenda than they are about the welfare of the students in the schools that they are supposed to be looking after.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): In the few minutes that I have this afternoon I would like to express my concern at the disturbing comments made in last night's *News* of Wednesday 12 February under the byline of Rick Holden who is the new staff writer. I am sure that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, will be interested because it does concern us as we were both on a select committee that looked at this area. The comments are attributed to the Grey Power President, Mrs Betty Preston, who states:

> If someone breaks into my home, I may defend myself provided I do not draw blood. If I have to retaliate and unfortunately break an intruder's skin, then I can be charged with assault. It's ludicrous.

This matter has arisen because of the distressing bashings of elderly people in our community, which concerns me as much as anybody here. I am very concerned that these comments are being made, given that this House set up a select committee to look at the issue of self defence by people in their own home. That committee was set up early last year and has reported. From the recommendations made by that committee the Government codified the law in around May last year. Unfortunately, the legislation was held up in the Upper House for six months because the Liberal Opposition was reluctant to support it, which was also of great concern. Eventually it passed both Houses of Parliament and is now law.

A real need exists for us to look at that situation and have some contact with the media to ensure that the sort of statements that we read are correct. I refer to another comment attributed to a Mr Roy Amer who criticised the law which he said allows intruders to charge victims with assault if they retaliate. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, would be aware as I am that those statements are quite erroneous and that we strengthed and codified the law to allow people to protect themselves in their own home. Many submissions and recommendations were given to the committee. As a result of that and the research done in other States on what is occurring, the committee came down with some very good recommendations to assist people, particularly the elderly, to protect themselves in their own home. It would appear that there is a real lack in communicating such to the community, including Mrs Betty Preston, the head of Grey Power. If somebody like that does not know that the law has been changed and that people can protect themselves in their own home without fear of repercussions, there is something wrong with our communications system.

I strongly urge the media to assist us to be able to set at rest the minds of the elderly and others in our community so that they will know that they do have power to protect themselves. The legislation states that a person does not commit an offence by using force against another if that person has a genuine belief that the force is reasonably necessary to defend himself or herself. That was one of the main reasons why the legislation was written in that form, so that it could be easily understood by people in the community that they were not committing an offence if they wanted to protect themselves in their own home.

It was the perception of those persons themselves as to whether they were at risk that was so important in regard to that legislation. If the member for Chaffey, for example, felt that he or his family were at risk in his home, he would have every right to protect himself and his family and to do so in the best manner in which he could. For that, he would not be committing an offence. I would not be committing an offence if I were doing that and protecting myself.

ACTS INTERPRETATION (CROWN PREROGATIVE) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the continuation of the State Government Insurance Commission; to define the functions and powers of the commission; to repeal the State Government Insurance Commission Act 1970; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

On 8 August 1991 I made a ministerial statement to the House on the release of the findings of the Government Management Board review of the State Government Insur-

ance Commission. This report, while stressing the fundamental viability and strength of SGIC, identified a number of shortcomings of the commission's operations. In response I announced that the Government would take action to correct any deficiencies and that the SGIC Act would be amended and the amending legislation would be referred to a select committee of the House of Assembly.

I made a further statement on 28 November 1991 informing the House that there would be significant changes to the manner in which SGIC operates. While many of the clauses in this Bill duplicate provisions within the current Act, the extent of other changes required substantial amendments which have made it necessary to redraft the Act. The Bill which I am now introducing provides for the repeal of the State Government Insurance Commission Act 1970 and proposes a new framework for regulating the activities of the commission. The proposed new framework places much greater stress on the notion that statutory authorities should be accountable to Parliament through their responsible Ministers and much less stress on the freedom of such authorities to act independently.

Legislative changes have also been necessary to take account of the many developments within the insurance and financial markets since SGIC was established in 1972. Since that time SGIC has enjoyed considerable growth, and in so doing has provided substantial benefits to the people of South Australia. Recent attention to a number of SGIC's poorer performing investments has tended to overshadow the positive contribution that SGIC has made to South Australia. One of the original objectives when establishing SGIC was to provide an adequate insurance service to the public and to keep premiums at reasonable levels. SGIC's current status as the State's largest household and commercial insurer and one of the State's largest motor insurers highlights its success in achieving this goal and underscores its importance to South Australia and the significance of the Bill.

Another objective of SGIC was to ensure that insurance funds raised in South Australia were to a much greater extent reinvested in the State. When SGIC was established, only a small proportion of the investment of private insurers was channelled back into South Australia. As members would be aware, SGIC has played a leading role in investing in South Australian companies, property and projects. In addition, SGIC provides substantial sponsorship within South Australia and since 1985 has committed more than $5 million to road safety and medical research into road accident trauma. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The Bill proposes that the administration of the commission's functions will be undertaken by a board of up to seven directors, each appointed for a term of up to three years. In carrying out these functions the commission is to have all the powers of a natural person. A notable change is the inclusion of the power to dismiss a director for failure to carry out satisfactorily the duties of office. The Bill will maintain the broad functions of the commission and empower it to undertake all forms of insurance both within and outside the State. The commission's functions and powers must, however, be exercised within the framework of a charter drawn up by the board in consultation with the Minister and the Minister may limit the broad functions and powers of the commission at any time through the agency of this charter.

The charter must deal with the objectives of the commission and the nature and scope of its activities including in particular its investment activities, activities conducted outside the State and activities undertaken through subsidiaries. The charter must also deal with the reporting obligations of the commission, the form and content of its accounts and financial statements and the accounting practices to be observed by the commission. The charter must be laid before both Houses at the same time as the annual report for each financial year and amendments to the charter must be laid before both Houses within 12 sitting days.

An important area to be covered by the charter will be the actitivies which SGIC should undertake outside of South Australia. The onus would be on SGIC to demonstrate the necessity to conduct any domestic and commercial insurance interstate. There can be no question, however, about the need for the commission to reinsure its exposure to risks such as bushfire and earthquake outside of the State and in return to accept some exposure to events which may occur elsewhere in the world.

SGIC was first established with a loan from the State Government of $60 000 which ws subsequently repaid with interest within two months. In the 20 years since SGIC was established it has grown to become the largest general insurer in South Australia with total assets of $1.5 billion. This has been achieved without any capital support from the State Government. The Government Management Board report recommended that the Government should review capitalising SGIC for an adequate amount consistent with the existence of the Government guarantee for SGIC's insurance obligations.

Without capital the commission will find it very hard to produce operating results comparable with those of its competitors. The appropriate level of capitalisation for SGIC is however related to the overall shape of the commission's balance sheet and the Government is awaiting further information from SGIC about likely operating results before reaching a final decision on this important question. The amount of capital will of course, be at least as much as is necessary to compensate those areas of the commission's activities which have been disadvantaged by interfund transactions.

The Government is conscious of the desirability of SGIC having some capital. The Bill therefore empowers the Government to provide capital to SGIC and grants appropriation authority for such capital. The extent to which the commission accumulates additional capital from any future profits will also be a matter for consultation with the Treasurer. The Government Management Board review recommended that SGIC comply with the disclosure requirements specified in legislation covering private insurers. It is appropriate that SGIC policy holders have this protection and the Bill provides accordingly. As is the case under the existing legislation SGIC will be required to maintain a separate Life Fund for its life insurance business. Furthermore while it is the sole compulsory third party insurer the commission will be required to maintain a separate Compulsory Third Party Fund.

SGIC has been the sole third party insurer since 1976 following the voluntary withdrawal of the 60 private competitors for SGIC. Since that time SGIC has undertaken significant reform of the system implementing effective fraud control measures and efficient claims handling procedures. This reform has helped SGIC eliminate the third party deficit and return the fund to surplus. In addition any increase in CTP premiums in this State have been contained and as a consequence the average premium in South Australia of $186 is $91 less than the average standard premium in New South Wales despite substantial competition in that State.

The Bill prohibits interfund lending. In order to ensure that this prohibition does not inadvertently prevent SGIC from engaging in sensible banking practices which maximise its returns from overnight investment the Bill explicitly authorises such practices. Moreover, the commission is explicitly authorised to conduct its investment activities through a series of common pools. Thus to take equities as an example, the commission will be able to operate one large pool of equity investments of which each Fund will 'own' a proportion. The alternative is to allocate particular equities to particular Funds. For the smaller Funds especially this carries with it the risks that there will not be sufficient moneys within the Fund to enable the commission to put together a balanced portfolio with a prudent spread of risks.

The pooling approach also minimises transaction costs. As the relative sizes of the funds change or the desired mixes of equities change it will be possible to adjust the proportions of the common pool rather than being obliged always to buy or sell equities to reflect these changes. It should be emphasised that this does not authorise the transfer of particular shares or other investments from one fund to another.

The present Act contains no provision requiring SGIC to present a annual report to the Minister for tabling in Parliament and the commission is specifically exempted from the provisions of the Government Management and Employment Act which include an obligation to report. The Bill rectifies this anomaly by requiring the commission to report by 30 September each year. In response to concerns expressed by the Auditor-General about his difficul-

ties in certifying the accounts of SGIC for 1990-91 whilst uncertainty existed over the legality of interfund transactions I gave an undertaking to introduce legislation to validate all such transactions. The transitional provisions of the Bill contain a clause giving effect to this undertaking.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the measure to be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3 contains definitions of terms used in the Bill. 'Insurance business' is defined as including:

(a) assurance, additional insurance, coinsurance or reinsurance;

(b) the granting, issuing or entering into of guarantees, sureties or contracts of indemnity;

and

(c) any other activity or transaction:

(i) of a kind generally regarded by the insurance industry as constituting or forming part of insurance or insurance business;

or

(ii) of a kind prescribed by regulation:

This definition varies from the corresponding definition and related provisions of the current Act by referring expressly to coinsurance and indemnities and by allowing regulations to be made if necessary to make it clear that certain activities or transactions fall within the concept of insurance business.

Part 4 (comprising clause 4) provides for the continuation of the State Government Insurance Commission as the same body corporate. The clause declares that the commission is an instrumentality of the Crown and holds its property on behalf of the Crown.

Part 3 (comprising clauses 5 to 12 inclusive) provides for the establishment of a board of directors of the commission.

Clause 5 provides that the commission is to have a board of directors which is to be governing body of the commission. Anything done by the board in the administration of the commission's affairs is to be binding on the commission.

The clause provides that the board is to be subject to direction by the Minister in the same way as the commission is subject to ministerial direction under the current Act.

Clause 6 provides for the composition of the board. Under the clause, the board is to consist of not more than seven persons appointed by the Governor, one of whom is to be appointed by the Governor to chair the board.

The chief executive officer of the commission is made eligible for appointment to the board.

Directors are to be appointed for terms not exceeding three years.

The clause provides for a director to be appointed by the Governor as a standing deputy of the chairperson of the board and for other deputies of directors.

Provision is made for the Governor to remove a director from offce for misconduct or incapacity or failure to carry out satisfactorily duties of office. The office of a director is to become vacant if the member dies; completes a term of office and is not reappointed; resigns by written notice to the Minister; is convicted of an indictable offence; becomes bankrupt or applies to take the benefit of a law for the relief of insolvent debtors; or is removed from office by the Governor.

Clause 7 provides for the procedures of the board. The clause contains the usual provisions for a quorum, the chairing of meetings and the making of decisions.

Provision is made for meetings by telephone or audio-visual means and for round-robin resolutions. The board is required to have accurate minutes kept of its proceedings.

Clause 8 is the usual provision ensuring the validity of acts of the board despite a vacancy in its membership or a defect in the appointment of a director.

Clause 9 provides that a director will incur no liability for an honest act done in the performance or purported performance of official functions or duties. Any liability that would attach to a director is to attach instead to the Crown.

Clause 10 provides that a director is entitled to such remuneration, allowances and expenses as may be determined by the Governor, including remuneration, allowances and expenses for membership of the governing body of a subsidiary of the commission.

Clause 11 deals with disclosure of interests by directors. Under the clause, a director who has a direct or indirect private interest in a matter decided or under consideration by the board must disclose the nature of the interest to the board and not take part in any deliberations or decisions of the board on the matter.

A maximum penalty of a Division 5 fine ($8 000) or division 5 imprisonment (2 years) is fixed for such an offence.

Subclause (2) provides that it is a defence to a charge of such an offence to prove that the defendant was not, at the time of the alleged offence, aware of his or her interest in the matter. A disclosure must be recorded in the minutes of the board. If a director makes a disclosure of interest in respect of a contract or proposed contract:

(a) the contract is not liable to be avoided by the commission on the ground of the fiduciary relationship between the director and the commission;

and

(b) the director is not liable to account to the commission for the profits derived from the contract.

Clause 12 provides for delegation by the board. The clause creates an offence of a delegate acting in a matter in which he or she has a direct or indirect private interest.

Part 4 (comprising clauses 13 to 28 inclusive) deals with the operations of the commission.

Clause 13 sets out the functions of the commission. These are:

(a) to carry on insurance business of any kind;

(b) to invest, re-invest or otherwise use or employ the funds of the commission;

(c) to perform any functions conferred on or delegated to the commission by or under the measure or any other Act;

(d) to perform any functions of a kind prescribed by regulation;

(e) to perform any functions that are necessary or convenient for or incidental to the performance of functions referred to above.

Subclause (2) provides that the commission may perform its functions within or outside the State.

Clause 14 provides that, subject to any limitations imposed by or under the measure, the commission has all the powers of a natural person.

Clause 15 provides for the affixing of the commission's common seal and the execution of documents on behalf of the commission.

Clause 16 is designed to protect persons dealing with the commission from the consequences of a deficiency of power on the part of the commission or a procedural irregularity and from the need to make exhaustive inquiries to ensure the validity of transactions with the commission. Under the clause, a transaction to which the commission is a party or apparently a party (whether made or apparently made under the commission's common seal or by a person with authority to bind the commission) is not to be invalid because of:

(a) any deficiency of power on the part of the commission;

(b) any procedural irregularity on the part of the board or any director, employee or agent of the commission;

(c) any procedural irregularity affecting the appointment of a director, employee or agent of the commission.

Subclause (2) however provides that this is not to validate a transaction in favour of a party who enters into the transaction with actual knowledge of the deficiency or irregularity who has a connection or relationship with the commission such that the person ought to know of the deficiency or irregularity.

Clause 17 requires that the board prepare a charter for the commission in consultation with the Minister. The charter is to deal with the following matters:

(a) the commission's objectives;

(b) the nature and scope of the activities to be undertaken, including:

(i) the nature and scope of the investment activities to be undertaken in respect of money of the Life Fund, money of the Compulsory Third Party Fund and other money held by the commission;

(ii) the nature and scope of any activities or transactions outside the State;

(iii) the nature and scope of the activities or transactions that may be undertaken by subsidiaries of the commission, by other companies or entities related to the commission or by the commission in partnership or under any arrangement for sharing of profits, cooperation or joint venture with another person;

and

(c) all requirements of the Minister or the Treasurer as to:

(i) the commission's obligations to report on its operations;

(ii) the form and contents of the commission's accounts and financial statements;

(iii) any financial, accounting or internal auditing practices or procedures to be observed by the commission.

Under the clause, the charter may—

(a) limit the functions or powers of the commission otherwise provided by the measure;

(b) deal with any other matter not specifically referred to above.

The board must, in consultation with the Minister, review the charter at the end of each financial year. It may amend the charter at any time with the approval of the Minister, and must do so as required by the Minister after consultation with the board.

The charter or any amendment to the charter is to come into force and is binding on the commission when prepared by the board and approved by the Minister.

The Minister is required by the clause to cause the charter as for the time being in force to be laid before both Houses of Parliament together with the commission's annual report for each financial year. If more than 12 sitting days would elapse from the time when the charter or an amendment to the charter comes into force until an annual report of the commission is next laid before Parliament, the Minister must cause the charter or amendment to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within those 12 sitting days.

Clause 18 empowers the Treasurer to advance money to the commission by way of a grant or loan and provides for the automatic appropriation from the Consolidated Account of an amount required for that purpose.

Clause 19 requires in the same way as the current Act that the commission must only borrow money or give security for a loan as approved by the Treasurer.

Clause 20 provides that the liabilities of the commission are guaranteed by the Treasurer. The Treasurer is empowered under the clause to make charges in respect of the guarantee.

Clause 21 deals with compliance with insurance laws of the Commonwealth. The clause provides that, subject to the regulations, the commission must:

(a) supply to the Minister such annual accounts and statements as it would be required to supply under section 44 of the Insurance Act 1973 of the Commonwealth, as in force from time to time or under Divisions 4, 5 and 6 of Part III of the Life Insurance Act 1945 of the Commonwealth, as in force from time to time.

and

(b) comply with all requirements imposed on insurers carrying on business in the State by or under an Act of the Commonwealth for the disclosure of information to existing, prospective or former policy holders.

Clause 22 provides that the commission is liable for all taxes, rates and imposts and has all other libilities and duties under State laws, as if it were not an instrumentality of the Crown. The clause also requires the commission to pay to the Treasurer amounts equivalent to the income tax and other taxes and imposts for which it would be liable under Commonwealth law if it were a private insurer.

Clause 23 corresponds to section 12a of the current Act and imposes requirements designed to be equivalent to restrictive trade practice requirements applying to private insurers.

Clause 24 requires the commission to establish and maintain separate funds for its life insurance business and compulsory third party insurance business.

Subclause (3) provides that the commission is not required to maintain the Compulsory Third Party Fund if the commission ceases to be the sole insurer providing policies of insurance under Part IV of the Motor Vehicles Act 1959.

Under the clause, each fund is to consist of:

(a) all income of the commission derived from the insurance business for which the fund is established;

(b) all income of the commission derived from or attributable to investment of money of the fund;

(c) all amounts paid to the commission by the Treasurer for payment into the fund;

(d) any other amount that the commission pays to the fund.

Each fund is to be applied only:

(a) in payments made in pursuance of the insurance business for which the fund is established;

(b) in investment as authorised under the measure in respect of money of the fund;

(c) in payment of the proportion of the commission's costs (including borrowing costs) determined by the commission to be properly attributable to the costs of administering the business for which the fund is established;

(d) in making such payments as the Treasurer requires in accordance with the measure to be made from the fund.

Subclause (6) specifically prohibits money of a fund from being transferred or lent to another fund or account of the commission subject to any requirement of the Treasurer under clause 25.

Subject (7) provides that nothing prevents the commission:

(a) from managing the investment of a fund by combining the money or investments of the fund with other money or investments of the commission;

(b) from keeping money of a fund in a single bank account together with other money of the commission and, in course of operation of such an account—

(i) from allowing the fund to be in temporary deficit;

or

(ii) from allowing the fund to be temporarily debited to meet payments required to be made for business of the commission other than the business for which the fund is established.

Clause 25 empowers the Treasurer to make requirements for payment from a general surplus or from a surplus in the Life Fund or Compulsory Third Party Fund. The clause provides that where it appears from the audited accounts of the commission that a surplus has been achieved by the commission in respect of a financial year, the commission must, if the Treasurer so requires, pay to the Treasurer or, as the Treasurer directs, otherwise deal with such part of the surplus as the Treasurer determines in consultation with the board. In addition, the clause provides that where it appears from the audited accounts of the commission that a surplus exists in the Life Fund or the Compulsory Third Party Fund, the commission must, if the Treasurer so requires, pay to the Treasurer or, as the Treasurer directs, otherwise deal with such part of the surplus as the Treasurer determines in consultation with the board.

Clause 26 corresponds to section 20a (2) of the current Act and requires that the board cause an actuarial investigation to be made of the state and sufficiency of the Life Fund as at 30 June in each year.

Subclause (2) requires the board, on receipt of a report on the results of such an actuarial investigation, to forward a copy of the report to the Treasurer.

Clause 27 deals with accounts and audit. Under the clause, the board must cause proper accounts to be kept of the commission's financial affairs and financial statements to be prepared in respect of each financial year. The accounts and financial statements must comply with the requirements of the Treasurer contained in the commission's charter. The clause provides that the Auditor-General may at any time, and must in respect of each financial year, audit the accounts and financial statements of the commission.

Clause 28 provides for an annual report to be provided to the Minister on the commission's operations and for the tabling of the report in Parliament.

Part 5 (comprising clauses 29 and 30) deals with miscellaneous matters.

Clause 29 provides that offences under the measure are to be summary offences.

Clause 30 provides a regulation making power.

The schedule provides for the repeal of the current Act, the State Government Insurance Commission Act 1970, and contains transitional and validating provisions. The current members and the current Chairman are continued in office. Under subclause (4), all transfers of money or investments made by the commission before the commencement of the measure between separate funds kept by the commission for different classes of insurance are declared to have been made lawfully.

Subclause (5) provides that the assets and liabilities of the commission in respect of its compulsory third party insurance business and its life insurance business as recorded in the commission's accounting records immediately before the commencement of the measure are to be treated as assets and liabilities of the Compulsory Third Party Fund and Life Fund respectively for the purposes of the establishment of those funds under the measure.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): 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

I move the second reading of a Bill to make sundry amendments to the Local Government Act. The Bill seeks to finalise a number of matters relating to the Act which have been developed in response to council requests over a number of years, and to rectify a range of anomalies and discrepancies which have arisen in recent years in order to facilitate the smooth operation of council affairs.

Members will be aware of the current negotiation process between the State and local government. In October 1990 a memorandum of understanding was signed by the Premier and the President of the Local Government Association. This agreement committed both levels of government to negotiate a new and cooperative relationship in relation to the legislative, financial and administrative roles and functions of each. In this process of negotiations, the State has agreed that the Local Government Association will speak on behalf of councils, and the association has agreed to consult with councils and to ensure full representation of their views. The association has undertaken extensive work in providing information to, and consulting with councils in the past year in order to fully participate in negotiations, and the Government appreciates the effort made by the association's President and Secretary-General, and the officers whose efforts have enabled councils to participate in these reforms.

The negotiations are progressing well, with a number of significant agreements reached, including the role and resourcing of the Local Government Grants Commission, the provision of information and advice on local government matters to councils and to the community, and the self-management by local government of fees and charges within the sector. A comprehensive review of the legislative relationship between the State and local government, which is being undertaken jointly by State officers and officers of the association, is underway.

The first stage of that review focuses on reform of the role of the State in regulating a range of activities undertaken by councils. It is anticipated that legislation relating to these aspects will be introduced to Parliament this session, following negotiations on those matters by the negotiation task force representing both State and local government interests.

The Bill to which I speak today does not seek to make major reforms in the legislative relationship between State and local government. As I mentioned earlier, it seeks to finalise a number of matters raised by councils with the then Department of Local Government and to rectify a number of difficulties with the Act which have been raised by councils. The provisions of the Bill have been developed in consultation with local government, some over a number of years. Prior to drafting the Bill, the matters were formally discussed with the association, which has requested that they be dealt with now, as a matter of urgency, rather than delayed and included in amendments arising from the legislative review under the memorandum of understanding. The association was also provided with the opportunity to include any additional legislative issues it felt should be dealt with at this time, and matters arising from negotiations on the reform of the administration of the septic tank effluent disposal scheme have been included in the Bill. The association has been very cooperative in assisting in the development of the Bill, and in meeting the timelines for response to the draft Bill to enable its immediate introduction.

The Bill also includes one provision, relating to the occasional slaughter of large animals for meat for household use, which is the result of issues raised by a member of Parliament through a private member's Bill, and I acknowledge his efforts in this matter.

I will briefly outline the various provisions of the Bill.

COUNCIL LIABILITY INSURANCE

In this State the Local Government Association Mutual Liability Scheme provides unlimited cover to member councils for civil liabilities which include both public liability and professional indemnity. All but one of the 119 local councils in this State are members of the scheme at the present time.

The provision to require minimum levels of civil liability cover is included in response to a decision by local government Ministers in all States and Territories to enact nation-wide requirements for adequate levels of insurance cover.

In this State the provision will be relevant to those councils which choose to seek civil liabilities cover outside the association's mutual liability scheme. Minimum levels of insurance cover will be determined in consultation with the Local Government Association.

RATING

The Bill seeks to rectify a number of anomalies in the rating provisions of the Act. These difficulties have been brought to my attention by individual councils and through the Local Government Association in its work with councils. I will not detail the provisions here, but they aim to remove the confusion experienced by some councils in administering their rating systems.

CONTROLLING AUTHORITIES

A provision has been included to give certainty to the position of members of regional controlling authorities in relation to liability incurred for honest acts or omissions arising in the discharge of duties by such members. Such statutory protection is included for members for local controlling authorities, but has been absent from provisions relating to regional authorities. Local government officers have sought to rectify this situation.

Other minor matters of definitions relating to the capacity of controlling authorities to carry out activities for the benefit of their constituent councils are also rectified.

MOVEABLE BUSINESS SIGNS OR SANDWICH BOARDS

A number of councils have for some time sought the power to license the placement of moveable business signs, known as sandwich boards, in public places. Such signs can obstruct the public use of footpaths and the other public areas, and can create nuisance and potential damage and injury.

Since late 1988 there has been a working group on planning controls over outdoor advertisements in the Department of Environment and Planning developing a comprehensive approach to such controls as are necessary. This amendment to the Local Government Act forms part of an overall strategy for refining planning control for outdoor advertising, and is brought forward now in order that the definition of 'moveable sign' coincides with the intended changes to the development control regulations. The amendment enables moveable signs to be exempt from the development control regulations.

The power to make by-laws allows councils to regulate the placement of signs within its area, to develop standards, and to set such conditions as are necessary to prevent public nuisance and obstruction, and to limit the potential for damage.

Simply providing councils with a power to remove moveable business signs which cause nuisance and are a hazard would create a situation in which the council would need to stringently police the placement of signs as they could be replaced, and continue to obstruct public access or create hazards.

PARKING

Councils have raised a number of issues in the administration of the parking control provisions of the Act, and in the penalties available for various offences. The provisions in this Bill seek to ensure consistency in powers and penalties available to councils to regulate parking.

OCCASIONAL MEAT SLAUGHTERING FOR NON-COMMERCIAL USE

This provision restores to councils, through by-law powers, the capacity to ensure that the occasional slaughtering of large animals such as pigs, goats, sheep and calves for household purposes does not interfere with the amenity of urban or suburban areas. This matter was raised by the member for Light as an amendment to the Act. As the honourable member noted in introducing the legislation, it is not a widespread practice for households in cities and towns to kill their own meat but it does still happen, particularly in country towns and among people with farming or village traditions.

Such slaughtering is not subject to the provisions of the meat Hygiene Act 1980. As it is 'once-off' slaughtering which cannot be construed as 'operating a slaughtering works' under section 20 of that Act. If such slaughtering gives rise to insanitary conditions, if the condition of the premises puts health at risk, or offensive material or odours are emitted, such slaughtering can be prevented and penalised under the Public and Environmental Health Act 1987. However. It is not usually the case that occasional slaughtering of an animal creates an insanitary condition. It is better described as a practice which may cause offence to neighbours. It is appropriate for local councils to have the power to regulate this activity in order to balance the interests of people within the community and allow the occasional animal to be slaughtered on properties which are suitable and in ways which do not cause undue concern to neighbours. The member for Light has agreed that this can be achieved by by-law rather than a general power within this Bill. The Government acknowledges his work on this issue.

CONTROL OF CATS

Problems caused by the proliferation of cats in local council areas and the consequent nuisance caused by stray and feral cats have been the subject of extensive debate in recent years, and the Government has established a process of consultation with the Local Government Association and other interest groups to develop a wide ranging strategy in this area. One aspect of such a strategy is the provision to local councils of powers to limit the numbers of cats which can be kept on premises. A number of councils has

requested that a specific provision be made to this effect, and following consultation with the Local Government Association, this Bill includes a new by-law making power for those councils wishing to place limits on cat numbers within their areas.

CONCLUSION

Once again the assistance of the Local Government Association in assisting in the development of the provisions of this Bill is acknowledged, and like the association, the Government looks forward to legislation soon to effect significant matters arising from the current negotiations on the relationship between State and local government. I commend the Bill to the Chamber.

I commend the Bill to Honourable members.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure.

Clause 3 inserts into the Act a definition of 'business day'. The amendment is proposed in conjunction with new subsection (4c) of section 183.

Clause 4 will require a council to effect insurance cover against civil liabilities to the extent prescribed by the regulations. A regulation under the section will only be made after consultation with the Local Government Association.

Clause 5 proposes an amendment to section 176 of the principal Act to make it clear that where there are two or more townships in an area, there may be rating differentiation between the towns, and between the towns and other land. A related amendment is made in relation to differentiation according to zones, and according to whether the land is within or outside a township, to ensure consistency of approach within the relevant provision.

Clause 6 recasts subsection (2) of section 183 to provide that the occupier of land held from a council under a lease or licence will be taken to be the principal ratepayer for the purposes of the Act. New subsection (4a) will empower a council to impose a charge if it serves a notice on a lessee or licensee of land to pay rent or other consideration to the council in satisfaction of a liability for rates. New subsection (4c) will require an owner who receives an amount in contravention of a notice under subsection (4) to pay the amount to the council within one clear business day.

Clause 7 provides that interest on any amount paid in excess of a liability for rates runs from the date of the payment to the council. The interest will accrue monthly and be compounded.

Clause 8 recasts subsection (1) of section 192 so that rates are not payable for the relevant financial year in respect of land that becomes rateable after the rates for a particular financial year have been declared.

Clause 9 provides for a definition of 'contiguous' for the purposes of Part X of the Act.

Clause 10 replaces a heading that might otherwise suggest a limitation on the ability of a council to carry out projects under the Act.

Clause 11 will ensure that councils must always give public notice and invite submissions on prescribed classes of projects before they are submitted to the Minister for approval.

Clause 12 will require a controlling authority to prepare an annual report on its operations. The report will be incorporated into the annual report of the council.

Clause 13 relates to controlling authorities established by two or more councils under section 200 of the Act. A new provision will ensure that a controlling authority can (subject to the Act) carry out any project on behalf of the constituent councils. A provision relating to the personal liability of members of a controlling authority is also proposed. Finally, the controlling authorities will be required to prepare annual reports.

Clause 14 makes the penalty under section 358 (2) of the Act consistent with other relevant provisions of the Act.

Clause 15 will empower councils to regulate moveable signs through the introduction of by-laws.

Clause 16 makes a consequential amendment to section 475e, in conjunction with a proposed amendment to section 743 relating to the facilitation of proof.

Clause 17 relates to schemes for the disposal of septic tank effluent. It is intended to apply new arrangements that do not require the involvement of the South Australian Health Commission. Instead, regulations will be prepared to act as guidelines to councils that undertake septic tank effluent disposal schemes.

Clause 18 will empower councils to make by-laws relating to the slaughtering of certain animals within municipalities and townships, and to the keeping of cats.

Clause 19 repeals a provision that is inconsistent with the rating provisions of the Act.

Clause 20 clarifies a council's power to facilitate the proof of certain matters.

Clause 21 recasts section 789b of the Act. The new provision will ensure that the owner of a vehicle is guilty of an offence against the Act in prescribed circumstances where there is no evidence as to the identity of the driver.

Clause 22 amends section 789d of the Act to provide that in proceedings for an offence against the Act relating to the use of a motor vehicle, an allegation in a complaint that a specified notice has been sent in accordance with section 789d will be accepted, in the absence of proof to the contrary, as proof of the matters so certified.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SURVEY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 February. Page 2720.)

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN (Minister of Lands): I sought leave last night to continue my remarks. However, because it has been quite clearly indicated by the two speakers so far on this Bill that they will need to look at this legislation in some detail during the Committee stage, I will leave some of my remarks with respect to their speeches until the Committee stage. I urge the House to support this Bill. It has been many years in the consultative period, and I urge support for it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Interpretation.'

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

Page 3, after line 7—Insert definitions as follows: 'Surveyor-General' means the person for the time being appointed or acting as the Surveyor-General:

As I pointed out last night, the consultation I have had with a large number of people from the profession has shown considerable concern about the matter of delegation. The request was made that it be spelled out that, rather than the Surveyor-General's having the opportunity to delegate to any person, the Surveyor-General should be in a position to delegate only to an acting Surveyor-General. When I sought to do something about this, Parliamentary Counsel suggested that the only way in which we could go about it was to introduce into clause 4 a definition of 'Surveyor-General' that would clarify the position once and for all.

That is what I am seeking to do with this amendment. It makes a lot of sense to me. I might seek information from the Minister, because I am not quite sure what the situation is at the present time and whether there is a Deputy Surveyor-General or an official acting Surveyor-General. I presume that that is not the case. I could see some benefit in that occurring so that, if the Surveyor-General was out of the State or not available to carry out that business, there should be some officially designated person to take his place. My advice is that this is not the case and that there is no such person. So, I think this amendment is important. It means that, if the Surveyor-General is away from that position, somebody can formally carry out those responsibilities. That would seem to achieve the goal that has been put to me by those with whom I have consulted and who are concerned about this matter. I would seek the support of the House for this amendment.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am happy to accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Delegation.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: This amendment is consequential on the first amendment, so I do not intend to

proceed with it. I would have thought, and the advice I have received would suggest, that it was, because, if that definition has now been introduced, it would not be necessary to include the delegation powers in the Bill. The delegation powers provide that the Surveyor-General may delegate to any person any of the Surveyor-General's functions or powers under this or any other Act. That was the very concern expressed by those who made representations to me, and I would have thought that the introduction of the amendment that the Minister has just agreed to would mean that those delegatory powers were not necessary now.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: That is not the way I interpret this aspect. In fact, this is completely consistent with what is in the existing Act under section 46a, which clearly states that the Surveyor-General may delegate any of his powers, discretions or functions under this Act or any other Act or law to a person holding or acting in an office or position under the supervision of the Surveyor-General, and it goes on. I believe it is important to retain the actual powers. We are not talking about the position: we are talking about the various powers and responsibilities, and I see no reason to delete this. I think it is important that the Surveyor-General does have the ability to delegate any of the roles or functions to another person, and this provision clearly spells that out. It also provides that this can be revoked, and certainly does not in any way derogate from the power of the Surveyor-General to act in any matter. I do not accept that.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I can only reiterate what I said previously. The concern has been expressed to me that the Surveyor-General may delegate to any person. I presume that this could mean that the surveyor could hand down those responsibilities to any person under the Surveyor-General, and I do not believe that to be appropriate. I am quite happy, if the Minister is happy, for further consideration to be given to this matter between now and its being debated in another place. I am quite happy to accept that, but I can only say again that the whole purpose of the amendment to which the Minister has just agreed is to overcome this situation, so that the Surveyor-General, rather than just delegating to any person, would delegate to the person who is acting in that position at the time. That just makes sense.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I would like to point out that this has been operational under the present Act since 1975. In that time, no Surveyor-General has in any way delegated powers that were not appropriate or to people who are not appropriate. It may well be that the Surveyor-General wants to delegate a particular type of power to someone else within his or her department and not necessarily to the acting Surveyor-General. The amendment that has been moved by the honourable member was accepted, but not in the context of then determining that there is no provision in the Act for some delegation.

That happens all the time within various Government departments and agencies where there are a whole range of powers vested either in the Surveyor-General or the Directors-General of other departments where they delegate those powers to officers for whom they are responsible, and it has operated successfully. If the honourable member could give some examples where there has been some dereliction of duty on the part of the Surveyor-General, where that delegation has not been carried out in accordance with what we would think appropriate in this Parliament, that might be another matter, but we are talking about the time since 1975 and, certainly, the matter has not been raised with me before today.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I do not want to do any disservice to the Surveyor-General, but it has been put to me that an amendment similar to the amendment I have on file was agreed to by the Surveyor-General but, for some reason, it was not acted upon. As I say, I do not intend to bring about any disservice to that gentleman, but that is certainly as I understand it. Once again, I point out that the only concern of those from the profession who have talked to me is that, if the Surveyor-General is out of the State or not able to carry out the responsibilities allocated to that position, the Surveyor-General may pass them on to any person, rather than to somebody whom the profession would consider appropriate or properly qualified to carry out that position. I find it strange that there is no opportunity for the appointment of some person to carry out the duties of the Surveyor-General, recognising the importance of that post, if the Surveyor-General is not able to carry on those responsibilities for one reason or another. If the Surveyor-General were to take ill and not be able to carry out his or her responsibilities at that time, what would happen then? The Surveyor-General could appoint any person to carry on those responsibilities, and I would see that as being most unsatisfactory.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Committee.'

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

Page 4, line 15—Leave out 'four' and insert 'five'.

I understand that there has been some discussion on this matter. This provision would equal up the numbers as far as representation is concerned. That was being sought by the profession and it was originally intended that an amendment be made to paragraph *(c)*, but, with further negotiations, it was determined that the most appropriate way was to increase the number of people appointed by the Minister on the nomination of the Institution of Surveyors to five, and I seek the support of the Committee.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I know that this is a very sensitive issue, particularly with the Minister. I do not want the Minister in any way whatsoever to suggest that I do not support the appointment of women because I support that position very strongly. The clause states, 'At least one member of the Committee must be a woman and one a man.' I am told that this year there will be about six women surveyors in a total of 200. I understand that women have always been well received in the profession and that there is no likelihood of discrimination against them. However, if there are 200 gentlemen and only six ladies, I have some concern about that. I re-emphasise what I said earlier about my belief in the appointment of women to boards generally and to positions of responsibility. As I have some concern, I seek an opinion from the Minister in regard to that matter.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: As you would imagine, Mr Chairman, I am delighted to give the honourable member an opinion. I refer him to subclause (2) *(c)* which provides:

three persons appointed by the Minister of whom two must be persons nominated by the Surveyor-General and one must be a person who is not a surveyor.

At the last statistical figures release, I believe about 51 per cent of the population were female. That means that a woman could be chosen with respect to that part of the requirement for the advisory committee. Apart from surveyors, there is the opportunity to have someone who is not a surveyor. I believe that it is within the realms not only of possibility but of reality to ensure that a woman can be a member. We have had similar clauses in other

pieces of legislation in the past couple of years providing that we have at least one man and one woman.

I think that gives some clear signals to the community generally that, whilst surveying has been a traditionally and historically male pursuit, women are now entering the profession. Indeed it may send a signal from this Parliament that it is appropriate for more young women to aspire to become surveyors and to join this very worthy and professional group of people who go right back to the beginning of our State and who were so necessary in ensuring that we have some of the finest land information systems not only in this State but throughout the whole country. I think it is important that we keep the clause. We should not go overboard. We do not say that we should have three or four women.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am not suggesting that you did. However, it is appropriate that the clause is there. It is also appropriate that we ensure that we have at least one woman on this advisory committee. I am very comfortable with that. I would point out finally that at the Institution of Surveyors meeting on 26 July 1991 a detailed discussion was held on the proposed amendments to the draft Act and a motion was put on the Survey Advisory Committee. It was moved by B. Burford and seconded by D. Phillips that the Survey Advisory Committee, as constituted in the draft, remain, and that was carried. The Institution of Surveyors, at a properly constituted meeting, has supported the composition of the Survey Advisory Committee. I see no reason to depart from what has become the tradition in this place, obviously supported by the institution itself.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 9 to 14 passed.

Clause 15—'Obligation to be licensed to carry out cadastral survey for fee or reward.'

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

Page 6, line 17—Leave out 'for fee or reward'.

The amendment deals with the obligation to be licensed to carry out cadastral survey for fee or reward. This covers the whole function of cadastral surveying. The words 'for fee or reward' appear not to be understood. The reason for my moving the amendment to delete those words is the confusion that has arisen and the strong feeling that has been put to me by those in the profession whom I have consulted. It has been a sore point on the part of those who have spoken to me about this piece of legislation. I am suggesting that 'for fee or reward' should be removed so that a person must not carry out a cadastral survey unless he or she is a licensed surveyor or is acting under the supervision of a licensed surveyor. I seek the support of the Committee for this amendment.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have taken advice on this matter, and I should like to share it with the Committee. First, I would like to highlight the fact that the basic premise on which the clause is built is that the carrying out of land boundary surveys should be controlled to protect consumers and, most importantly, the integrity of the State cadastre. The difficulty is that land boundary surveys are often quite properly carried out from time to time by ordinary people, such as the member for Heysen and, indeed, myself. For example, when neighbours determine where to put a fence—I have done that in the past six months—or when a person measures boundaries for the purpose of deciding where to put a garden or a gazebo, surely such activity should not be restricted.

It is impossible to define 'cadastral survey' in sufficiently precise terms to catch the types of surveys that one would expect only a licensed surveyor to perform and to exclude those that anyone can perform. In fact, there is no distinction in many cases in the nature of the work that is carried out. The essential control is that survey marks should not be placed by anyone other than a licensed surveyor. If incorrect survey marks are placed, the next survey will or may in some cases be inaccurate. Clause 14 provides this essential control.

The next level of protection that can best be achieved is to require any person who conducts a cadastral survey for money or the like to be licensed. We cannot require somebody who in a sense does not conduct it for money or the like to be licensed. It is much harder to do that. Therefore, the next level of protection is to insist that, if one carries out survey work for money or the like, that person should be licensed. This is what clause 15 achieves. This approach is common in other areas where again it is difficult to define the activities that are to be controlled. I refer the honourable member to the provision of medical treatment and physiotherapy as an example. Therefore, I believe it is important to retain 'for fee or reward' within this clause.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I appreciate the advice that the Minister has provided. I am not too sure whence it has come, but I know that people in the profession will be interested to read it. I am afraid that it does not allay my fears and it does not interfere with the strength of the argument that has been put by the profession in this regard. I will take into account the advice that the Minister has received and provided to the Committee and will consider the matter further between now and its being debated in another place. My information in writing from the Association of Consulting Surveyors is that, when considering that clause, it was agreed that the amendment that I moved should proceed so long as it did not create any legal problems. From what the Minister has indicated, it does not appear to be a legal problem, but I will take that into account and consider that advice further and determine whether or not we should proceed in another place.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 16—'Illegal holding out as being licensed.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: A considerable time has been spent on consideration of this clause. As the Minister may be aware, there is a deal of opinion on this subject. The existing Act protects the word 'surveyor'. This provides for the proclamation of the use of the word 'survey' in association with other terms such as 'health surveyor' and 'mining surveyor'. A considerable number of people in the profession believe that the provision in the existing Act should remain. The Bill provides for a licensed surveyor to place survey marks and perform cadastral surveys, but certainly does not protect the use of the word 'survey' from use by other people and organisations. Both the Institution of Surveyors and the Association of Consulting Surveyors have made strong representations on this matter, but the association, particularly, feels very strongly about this matter.

I have been contacted by other sections of the profession, who are delighted that the Bill has been changed, as we recognise it in clause 16, so I did not proceed with an amendment regarding this clause, but I wanted to make the Minister aware of the strong representation I have received, and I ask the Minister whether she has received similar representation and whether she wishes to comment on this.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for giving me the opportunity to comment on this. Indeed, I have had representation in the opposite direction—a lot of representation, going back to my first months as Minister of Lands, which is now over 3½ years ago. I have had very strong representation, both as a local member, in my electorate office, and as the Minister, for not

protecting the term 'surveyor', but allowing people who are mining surveyors and other surveyors to use the term 'surveyor'.

I remind the honourable member that the Institution of Surveyors, in a letter to the Premier dated 4 September last year, stated:

> Our institution has discussed the final draft of the proposed Survey Act at a recent general meeting of all our members. This Act has been considered by our institution through all stages of its preparation. We are fully in support of the thrust of the Act and look forward to its introduction to Parliament, its approval and its early implementation.

Indeed, I understand that some people, generally speaking people who have been in the survey profession for a very long time, feel strongly about this, and I respect their views. However, the research that my officers have done indicates that the overwhelming majority of surveyors in this State believe that the thrust of clauses 16, 17 and 18 is necessary to ensure that people can indicate exactly what they do: if they are mining surveyors they should be able to indicate that, etc. Certainly, that is the overwhelming representation I have had.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I just make the point that we seem—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I know. I read that letter into my second reading speech last night—both the letter to the Premier and two more recent letters. That only helps to emphasise the confusion that there has been and the difficulty that I have had in consulting with the profession. Until yesterday I was receiving representation from various sections of the profession, and the Minister should be aware of that. The Minister should be aware that the day before yesterday her officers were meeting these people to try to sort out some of these problems.

I said in my second reading speech that I realised the length of time that had been provided for consultation, but I also indicated my concern that the day before the legislation was to be debated sections of the profession were still determining their attitudes to various parts of the legislation. Certainly, representation has been made on this clause, recognising, as I did in my second reading contribution last night, that both the association and the institution have written indicating their support for the legislation.

I wanted to raise the fact that we seem to have gone around in a complete circle. I referred last night to the debate on the Bill in 1975, when exactly the opposite situation was being portrayed by the then Minister, Mr Corcoran, who indicated that the legislation was being introduced to protect the surveyor. In fact, he went into considerable detail. I quote:

> The principal provisions of the Bill are intended to ensure that a person who holds himself out to the public as a 'surveyor', qualified to perform the wide range of activities sought from 'surveyors' by the public, is so qualified.

The then member, Mr Millhouse, said:

> The object of this Bill is to protect the use of the word 'surveyor' and to restrict it to people who are, in the opinion of the Government and the board, properly qualified to be called surveyors.

It is no good the Minister carrying on and saying that this is not necessary. We have been around in a complete circle. It is interesting that we had a Labor Government introducing the Bill in 1975 and that that is the case now. Very different opinions are being expressed by the Ministers responsible for the legislation. I have drawn this matter to the attention of the Minister. There will be further representation, I am sure, because I understand that there is some strength of conviction on the part of some of the people who have made representation to me about that clause. I will determine what happens—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: The honourable member is prepared to take a minority view. It is very interesting.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Minister says that I am prepared to take a minority view. I find it rather difficult from the representation that I have received to find out who the majority is and who the minority is: it seems to vary considerably. That is no reflection on the profession, which seems to feel very strongly about a number of these issues. I am not averse to taking up a position of a minority group, and I certainly would not be in this case. As I indicated to the Committee, I have not moved an amendment on this clause and I am happy to accept that, but it may be that we will need to reconsider that when the legislation reaches another place.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: If I can share some statistics with the honourable member he may more easily appreciate that we are talking about 200 resident licensed and registered surveyors in South Australia. During the period that this Bill has been in the consultative phase, I think my officers have probably consulted with every single one of the 200 members. However, I would not want to exaggerate, so I have to say that am not absolutely sure of that.

I remind the honourable member that the Institution of Surveyors is the professional body representing the State's licensed and registered surveyors, of whom there are approximately 200 resident in South Australia. The vast majority of these, over 90 per cent, are members of the Institution of Surveyors, which has a total membership of 263. There is a second body, the Association of Consulting Surveyors, and these are the employer representatives. It is an industry body consisting of 24 of the 33 firms that carry out cadastral surveying activities in South Australia. Most, if not all, are members of the Association of Consulting Surveyors and are also members of the Institution of Surveyors.

Also, we have the Institution of Engineering and Mining Surveyors. This body represents those who work as paraprofessionals in surveying and who carry out survey tasks other than those excluded by statute as being the responsibility of registered or licensed surveyors. I am informed that there are about 210 members in this group. The information that I have is that all members of the Institution of Engineering and Mining Surveyors support the proposals in the legislation, and that the overwhelming majority of members of the Institution of Surveyors support them as well.

We are left with the Association of Consulting Surveyors which represents the firms that carry out survey work. I think, therefore, it puts this thing into some sort of context—that we really have consulted and listened to the industry. If someone is working in the area doing survey duties quite legally, not purporting to be licensed or registered and is merely indicating their title (which is an engineering surveyor or a mining surveyor) the community will know the exact type of work they are doing. It makes sense to me; I believe it will make sense to the vast majority of people in the community and certainly to the vast majority of the profession.

Clause passed.

Clauses 17 to 25 passed.

Clause 26—'Continuing education.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand that there have been some changes to this clause since the Bill was first drafted. It still seems to me that this provision is a little draconian. I agree that the institution should encourage an improvement in academic qualifications, but I wonder about the necessity of having to prescribe it. I would like the Minister to comment on that.

Also, after further reading the debate on the 1975 legislation, I noticed that the matter of appropriate qualifications took a fair bit of time. Will the Minister outline the appropriate qualifications at this stage, because that has been a matter of contention over some period. I realise that there needs to be an incentive to encourage people in the profession to upgrade their academic qualifications, and that that is something that is required across the board, but I am interested in the Minister's comments regarding this profession.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The basic qualification for a surveyor is a degree, I presume that that is a Bachelor of Surveying, from the University of South Australia or its equivalent.

Clause passed.

Clauses 27 to 30 passed.

Clause 31—'Employment of licensed or registered persons by company.'

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I oppose the clause. It has been put to me that some existing surveying companies will not fit this clause, and it would seem appropriate for it to be considered further and, if possible, deleted. This matter was raised with me by a number of people, and I seek the support of the Committee.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: Although I did not get these amendments until today, I have had an opportunity to seek advice on this matter, and I will share that with the Committee. I believe that this clause is essential for the following reasons. It provides that a company must not employ more surveyors than twice the number of practising surveyors who are directors of the company. It allows the Institution of Surveyors—and this is where it allows companies that may not at present conform to this clause some degree of flexibility—to approve the employment of a greater number of surveyors in a particular case. The clause recognises that practice by professionals through a company is a privilege and not a right, a privilege granted basically to take account of taxation advantages that may apply to a company. The privilege is granted subject to there being adequate safeguards for clients.

One of these safeguards is to ensure that directors of the company take responsibility for the professional practice of that company. If there are too few directors compared with the number of employed professionals, the lines of responsibility are indirect and, in some cases, may well be inadequate. I remind the honourable member that similar provisions are contained in all modern pieces of legislation and provide for registration of professional practice companies. I am informed that this is in line with all modern pieces of legislation, and that it is in the Bill for consistency and to maintain the fact that directors must take responsibility for the professional practice that occurs within their company.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I understand and appreciate what the Minister is saying. Has the Minister or her officers received representation from any firm or from the profession in regard to this matter?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I have sought that advice, and I am informed that they have not received representation in this way. I guess we could search through all the correspondence over the past five or so years, but it is not something that my officers have had raised with them recently.

Clause passed.

Clauses 32 to 42 passed.

Clause 43—'Survey instructions.'

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

Page 16, line 42—Leave out 'after consulting with' and insert 'with the concurrence of'.

This is a contentious part of the legislation. As I pointed out last night during my second reading contribution, under the existing legislation there is a Surveyors Board of South Australia. The current board has considerable powers to examine and license surveyors, cancel licences, discipline, keep a register, and so on. In keeping with what we presume is Government policy, the Bill proposes to abolish that statutory authority and restore powers to the Surveyor-General.

That has caused some considerable concern within the profession in that the Bill provides that the Surveyor-General only need consult with the Survey Advisory Committee. I have received strong representation that an amendment be introduced to ensure that the Surveyor-General be able to issue survey instructions only with the concurrence of the committee. I support the concern expressed to me about this. It is a major step to move from responsibilities of the board to the same responsibilities being vested in one person. Again, I am not particularly referring to the abilities of the present Surveyor-General. I believe it is quite appropriate that the situation be spelled out in the legislation that instructions from the Surveyor-General can only occur with the concurrence of the committee, rather than just seeking the advice of the committee.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I must say I am continually astounded by some of the positions which the member for Heysen adopts in some of these cases. I cannot believe that the honourable member, who believes in the system of parliamentary democracy, would suggest that an advisory committee, not a statutory committee, should dictate to the Surveyor-General, who is directly responsible to the Minister, and who in turn is directly responsible to the Parliament and therefore to the people of this State. The honourable member is saying that the Surveyor-General should take his or her instructions, if you like, from an advisory committee. That is really one of the more bizarre propositions that he has put before this Chamber. I will very carefully go through exactly what is proposed in this legislation with respect to the licensing registration discipline for the honourable member's edification, because obviously he is unaware of it.

The main powers of the board at the moment under the present Act relate to licensing and registration of surveyors and to disciplining of licensed or registered surveyors. Under this piece of legislation—which the honourable member obviously has not read—these powers are now transferred to the Institution of Surveyors, not to the Surveyor-General, in recognition of the role that the profession has to play in self-regulation. We on this side of the House believe in self-regulation of the profession, as we have done with a number of other professions. Just in case the honourable member thinks that the Institution of Surveyors does not have the ability to perform this function totally, the Commercial Tribunal is brought in as an independent body of experts when required. So, when outside expertise is required, the Commercial Tribunal will consider disciplinary proceedings against surveyors brought by the institution, and against the Surveyor-General or any other person.

The Surveyor-General is given secondary powers to take disciplinary proceedings against a surveyor to ensure that matters of a technical rather than a professional nature are brought before the tribunal where appropriate. Where else in this country or in the world does an advisory committee have power over an officer who has direct responsibility through the Minister and back to the Parliament? I ask the honourable member to consider seriously what he is proposing in this amendment. This happens in no other juris-

diction for which I have responsibility in any of my portfolios.

I have made inquiries and I know of no other professional public servant who is properly trained and qualified and who has to take orders in terms of their total duties from an advisory committee. I do not believe that it should be the surveying profession—indeed, it is the Government—that is responsible for setting the survey standards, as the Government must take community needs and expectations into account.

It seems to me quite inappropriate to suggest that an advisory committee that is not elected, that has no direct accountability to anyone, should have some authority over the cadastral system of this State. It is an advisory committee. I believe that the Surveyor-General will certainly listen to the advice of that committee, but to suggest that the Surveyor-General should be bound by this legislation to follow the direction of this advisory committee I believe is a nonsense.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I was interested to hear the Minister describe the provisions of this Bill as self-regulation. When it first started off, we were talking about deregulation. It has moved from deregulation to self-regulation. I have explained the concern that there is in regard to this matter. I have explained that there has been considerable—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: Who has raised the concern?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The concern has certainly been raised by both the association and the—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: They have.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: The Association of Consulting Surveyors, in a letter of 11 February—

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am talking about the association. The association has written to me. I understand that the institution is also of the same opinion.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: That is quite in contradiction—

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I cannot help that. The Minister has her own problems. It might be sensible when the Minister leaves this Chamber after this debate for her to contact the President of the association and the President of the institution. It might be very sensible for that to happen because certainly, as I understand it, it was one of the matters raised at the meeting.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I find this very interesting. I hope that the Minister will take the time to contact both organisations, because it certainly is something that has been put forward as a very important issue. I can refer particularly to a letter I received from the association in which it states:

> We believe that this is a very important issue and strongly urge you to strive for the adoption of the amendment.

The Hon. S.M. Lenehan: This is the association?

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes. As I understand it, the representation is similar with regard to the institution, but the Minister can make her own inquiries about that. Certainly, I am very conscious of the time and we have another important Bill to deal with this afternoon. I strongly urge the Committee to support the amendment.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will not take the time of the Committee. The honourable member did actually say that the Institution of Surveyors supported this amendment. In fact, that is not my information. It has written quite clearly to the Premier. Neither I, the Premier nor the department have received a letter in any way stating that. The letter reads:

> The Act has been considered by our institution through all stages of its preparation. We are fully in support of the thrust of the Act and look forward to its introduction, its approval and its early implementation.

Let me remind the Committee about who the honourable member is representing. He is now representing the views of some members of the Association of Consulting Surveyors. Who is this body? Is it the body that represents the practising, licensed and registered surveyors? No, it is an industry body that represents 24 of the 33 firms—employer organisations—that carry out cadastral surveying activities in South Australia. If the honourable member stands up once more and says that he has had overwhelming representation, he needs to be a little more honest. I clearly highlight that he has not had overwhelming support from the 200-odd licensed and registered surveyors. I have sat here most patiently, but for the fifteenth time the honourable member has said that he has had overwhelming representation. It is merely a nonsense.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I have also been very patient in this debate. I can only repeat that I hope the Minister leaves this Chamber at the appropriate time and makes contact with those two organisations because certainly I have met with and discussed this Bill with the presidents of both organisations together, and that is the opinion being expressed. The Minister stands in this place and suggests that I have made it all up and not sought any advice on the Bill. It is totally inappropriate and improper for the Minister to suggest that. I suggest that the Minister seeks that information for herself.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 44 passed.

Clause 45—'Rectification.'

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

Page 18—

Lines 28 and 29—Leave out ', or a surveyor of whom such a requirement would have been made has died'.

Lines 31 and 32—Leave out 'or by the surveyor's estate (as the case may require)'.

After line 32—Insert subclause as follows:

(5) If a surveyor of whom a requirement under subsection (1) would have been made has died, the Surveyor-General may carry out such work as is necessary to rectify the defect.

I understand that this issue was raised with the Minister's officers during a recent meeting, and I seek her support and that of the Committee in this regard.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will accept it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 46 to 49 passed.

Clause 50—'Confused Boundary Areas.'

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

Page 20, after line 10—Insert new subclause as follows:

(4) The Surveyor-General must consult with the Survey Advisory Committee before publishing any notice under this section.

It is appropriate that that should be the case. The Minister has been talking all afternoon about the need for appropriate consultation, so I hope that she supports the amendment.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will, indeed. I am delighted that the honourable member has taken notice of what I have said. It has always been the intention of the Surveyor-General to consult with the advisory committee; indeed, that is what it is for. I will not delineate for the honourable member what is an advisory committee. That is quite appropriate and certainly is in line with my view of the proper relationship of the role and function of an advisory committee, in this case to the Surveyor-General, and I am quite happy to accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (51 to 63), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 23 October. Page 1358.)

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): This Bill amends an Act that has been on the statute books for 15 years. The amendments proposed are largely technical ones but, because of the importance of technical and further education, it is appropriate in debating the Bill to canvass some of the wider issues that confront that education sector in Australia today. As I see them and as I believe many others also see them, they embody five principal issues and no doubt many more, but I will address the five key issues. The first issue confronting technical and further education is the Federal Government's proposal to take over the funding of that area. It is well known that policy dominance inevitably accompanies total funding and, therefore, there are implications for the States, particularly for South Australia.

Members would be aware that in many other areas where South Australia has had a leading edge—and I have identified two that come readily to mind, namely, early childhood education and domicillary and nursing home care—when the Commonwealth has become involved the inevitable outcome has been that, whilst South Australian standards have been higher than the rest of Australia, instead of the rest of the country coming up to our standards it has been a requirement that South Australian standards be brought down to match those of the rest of the country. That is entirely unacceptable to every member of this House and something that every one of us will be watching closely as the Commonwealth moves towards that goal. We want our standards in technical and further education to become even better than they are, and we will not countenance a reduction in those standards to meet some kind of national goal of uniformity. That is my first point.

My second point, which is equally important, is that the abolition of Colleges of Advanced Education and Institutes of Technology in Australia as a result of the Dawkins plan has left a middle level vacuum in tertiary education, which will be filled by Technical and Further Education colleges. This places an enormous responsibility on those colleges. It places them in a relationship with universities which, unfortunately, they have never previously had, and the proposed articulation of courses (a strange jargonistic phrase which simply means that credit will be given for qualifications gained in TAFE for students who wish to proceed to university) means that universities could well exert an influence on Technical and Further Education which may not be in the best interests of that sector. Universities, being not only institutions of learning but also of research, have an entirely different focus from the essentially practical and vocational focus of TAFE, and that TAFE focus should be enhanced rather than diminished. Anything that puts at risk that focus should be carefully watched and avoided at all costs.

On the other hand, that abolition of CAEs and Institutes of Technology gives TAFE the potential to do what the Finn report has urged it to do, that is, to raise the esteem in which vocational qualifications are held. I quote briefly from the executive summary of the Finn report, the Report of the Australian Education Council Review Committee into Young People's Participation in Post-Compulsory Education & Training, which states:

> If implemented, several of the strategies proposed by the committee will contribute to improved community understanding of and esteem for TAFE courses, for example, the renewed emphasis on vocational education, revised and expanded entry-level training, and improved credit transfer and articulation between sectors... This, in turn, will increase the value of vocational qualifications and the esteem in which they are held.

That is a goal that I support wholeheartedly. Australians have in recent years lost the respect that they once had for the dignity of work no matter where it is performed, by whom and in what capacity. The maxim that I was always taught in childhood, that the work done by a street cleaner is as worthy in its own right as that undertaken by a doctor or a teacher, seems to have disappeared. With that disappearance, I believe, has gone much of the respect Australians once held for each other as individuals. I should like to see that respect restored, and I believe that TAFE has the potential to play an enormously important part in that process. I see the Minister nodding his agreement, and I am sure that he will be working towards that goal.

A third important issue is the capacity of industry, which one might describe as a client of TAFE, to influence the nature and quality of training courses and accreditation procedures. I note that the 1990 Corporate Review and Annual Report of TAFE states that the department began to establish 'labour market data bases for each of our teaching programs as a means of further strengthening the relevance of courses. The department also took the opportunity to commission a survey of clients on their satisfaction with TAFE college programs, and provided greater support for Industry Training Committees'.

That is another critical issue which, if grasped by the Government and by the department as well as by industry and by trade unions, should ensure that TAFE courses are finely tuned to the needs of industry and to the needs of the State and national economy. So, TAFE is critical in economic reform and in industry restructuring, and that is the fourth point I want to make. TAFE has a responsibility to respond to industry restructuring and to deliver competency based rather than time based training. It has an obligation to implement the national training reform agenda and the recommendations of the Finn report, and that is an enormous responsibility.

In addition to those four issues, I would identify a fifth and, in doing so, pick up remarks made by the Minister in his second reading explanation. That point relates to the impact and the potential of technology itself to transform technical and further education in Australia. I refer to distance learning and to the satellite delivery of teaching programs to factories, offices and work places.

You, Madam Acting Speaker, would be well aware, because of the remote nature of parts of your electorate, of the benefits of this technology in delivering teaching, if not training, programs, and this issue of technology based learning and distance learning is one in which TAFE has an opportunity probably unparalleled, I venture to say, since the invention of the printing press some 500 years ago.

Mr Quirke: William Caxton, 1485.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Or the Guttenberg Press.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I thank the member for Playford and all other members: their memories are better than mine. I think we could say in terms of education that that is one of the most profoundly important developments and, probably, the single most important one since the invention of printing. That is the broad picture. The specific picture of this Bill is that it is essentially a technical Bill that seeks to make a number of amendments to the Act to enable TAFE to fulfil its obligations in the 1990s.

I will not enumerate them all, as the Minister did in his second reading explanation, but one that is of particular interest to the Liberal Party and to anyone undertaking any

kind of enterprise in this State is the provision to enable TAFE to establish commercial enterprises and to provide consultancies for fees, and to develop intellectual property.

That is a very interesting and potentially rewarding capacity for TAFE, but one which I believe needs to be extremely carefully monitored and upon which restraints must be placed to ensure that TAFE does not compete in an unfair manner with any private sector operation. The process of deregulation of private training providers is continued, and in Committee I should like to question the Minister about the way in which the registration of teachers in that sector will be handled.

I know that the Independent Schools Board has difficulties with the prospect that teachers in private training institutions may be left in registration limbo because of the deregulation, in other words, the end of licensing of private training institutions. The Minister is empowered to provide assistance to community bodies and, in return, to obtain rights to enable colleges to share in the use of the facilities of such community bodies.

That proposal enjoys overwhelming support. The other provisions, which I will not elaborate upon because of the time constraints on the House, are essentially technical, relating to staffing, salary, part-time appointments and the ability to terminate appointments, and, in addition to that, the provision for college councils to hold property, to borrow and to make annual reports, and things of that nature. So, the protection for TAFE teachers to ensure that they are covered by the TAFE Act and not the Government Management and Employment Act is an important part of this Bill. The clarification embodied in those clauses is one which will also warrant questioning in Committee to ensure that the goals will be met by the proposed changes.

In order to give my colleagues the opportunity to speak on a matter which is important to all of us, I will not go further beyond saying that I believe that this decade will see technical and further education restored once again to the community esteem which it enjoyed in a totally different but equally important climate in the 1940s and 1950s, when the word 'tradesman' (and it was invariably 'tradesman' in those days) was an honourable word, one that carried with it reward and margins for skill and one that was regarded with pride by the families and householders of the tradesmen. There were some tradeswomen, but not many. Things have now changed. We want to be sure that the potential and the national responsibilities that TAFE now has can be implemented effectively. I believe that this Bill will go some way towards ensuring that that occurs, and I am pleased to support it.

Mrs KOTZ (Newland): I want to make only a few comments, particularly in the area of TAFE as it affects clients and constituents who have contacted my office in recent months, mainly with concerns related to many aspects of TAFE in South Australia today. One of the problems that was related to me was the difficulty that people are experiencing in attempting to get into a college of TAFE at the present time. It would appear that the Government has indeed cut back many of the courses within the TAFE area. I will refer in particular to one course as related to me by one of my constituents. It raises a matter that I believe the Minister must consider looking at in attending to the educational needs and requirements of our young people in the State. I would like to document this letter in *Hansard*, and it is from the parent of a student who had negotiated a course at TAFE at the beginning of the year.

At the beginning of this year the parent was asked to attend an interview at one of our local high schools to have discussions and to give approval for her daughter to participate in a joint course that was run by the high school, a second high school in the area and the TAFE college at Kensington. Apparently, this course had a very strong emphasis on work skills, which of course was very pleasing to both the parent and student alike. They were guaranteed, both verbally and in writing, that the course was four accredited subjects and would run for two years, covering that student for years 11 and 12. As the parent understood it, the teacher who was appointed to this position to coordinate the project was also given a guarantee that, when transferring from a teaching position, he would have a positive position in that field for the two-year course.

Apparently, the teacher also understood that, as this was a guaranteed position for two years, there was no other position that he would either return to or go to after the conclusion of that contract. The parent gave permission, and the teacher-coordinator at the high school and the teacher at the TAFE college worked very hard at getting the course off the ground, and the students involved gained quite considerably from the course. However, approximately at the beginning of November 1991, the parent was informed by the student that TAFE at Kensington was closing down and that they had to find alternative schooling for 1992.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs KOTZ: This came directly from a parent and student involved. They apparently had no understanding that the course that they had agreed to be taken into would be cut halfway through. This is their story, and I am saying it from their point of view, which is quite obviously the truth. Why would a TAFE college enrol someone in a two-year course if it did not intend to continue on for the two years of that course? I think that is the point of this complaint. The parent stated:

> Understandably, I was furious that the Government had withdrawn the funding on the course when they were halfway through, that we hadn't been told sooner and that no alternative was offered to them.

Apparently, there were repeated phone calls to the Northern Education Area Office, TAFE and the CES to try to ascertain what alternatives these young adults could be offered instead of being thrown on the scrap heap and probably the dole queue. The letter further stated:

> The students were very angry that they had wasted the year and had to return to square one again.

Eventually, a meeting was set up between the principals of the high schools and other parents, but apparently still no-one wanted to offer an alternative. So, not only do we have very angry parents but also we have very angry students who should have been offered counselling sooner and some priority into another TAFE course if it was their choice not to return to year 11, which apparently was the only alternative offered to them.

The students could not pick up a new subject in year 12 to replace the subjects that they had lost when they had to return to year 11 because of the new SACE system being introduced. The only other alternative was to try to get into another TAFE course. This also proved apparently to be a near impossible task because of the numbers applying for the very few places being offered in the different courses.

The CES could not offer anything in the way of courses until they had been on Job Search for six months. The woman's daughter has now managed to get into a cosmetology course for two full days at TAFE, which was the only course out of seven that she could get into. By the efforts of one of the principals of the high school, she managed to get two additional subjects at one of the high schools on three remaining days. The parent states, rightly, that this

should never have happened. However, how many other students across the State have had this experience?

I have heard rumblings that this is not the first time that funding has been withdrawn on courses when the enrolled students have been halfway through. The Government should have to meet its obligations, and if it starts a course at least allow those already started to complete it before it is withdrawn altogether. The effect on the student was dramatic and traumatic, as members can imagine having lost confidence and self-esteem, particularly since the only alternative seemed to be to repeat a year that she had already done successfully.

One of the other aspects that was brought to our attention within the electorate office from other concerned constituents attempting to gain further education and take themselves off dole queues and unemployment lines was the fact that funding cut-backs in further education are a reality. In Marleston College of TAFE we had several elective subjects offered in courses being scrapped while class sizes in other courses were reduced. At the same time, students were also faced with a huge hike in course fees resulting from self-paying students pulling out of the certificate course.

One student on a supporting pension who had contacted the office was greatly concerned by these moves as he had been studying the cabinet-making craft for five years and still had another three years to go. The student supports an invalid spouse and saw obtaining a certificate as a way of widening employment opportunities besides increasing his family's financial independence. He was initially told that he could not study wood carving because class sizes were being reduced in 1991 due to Government funding cut-backs. He eventually got into the course because of a cancellation, but then found that his college fees had risen from $75 in 1990 to $163 in 1991. The college has cut out its furniture polishing and upholstery electives simply because it has not the money to pay hourly staff.

At a time when the State's unemployment numbers are the highest in the nation, the Bannon Government should do everything possible to ensure that students can maximise their employment prospects. Cutting funding to TAFE colleges and forcing students to pay drastically increased fees will do little other than drive more people away from further education. I am aware that this Bill, as the member for Coles has already stated, is a technical Bill which enforces TAFE to fulfil its obligations in the 1990s. I also agree with the member for Coles when she states that we should also take a very hard look at the lines that are being utilised for the financial status of TAFE colleges in an attempt to promote the user-pays system to compete with private enterprise where it can do so.

I am rather concerned by some of the moves that the TAFE college at Tea Tree Gully appears to be adopting at this stage because some of its courses that have recently been initiated will, quite obviously, compete with local private enterprise to the point where individuals who have been trained and skilled by private enterprise individuals at their cost are now being encouraged to move into the TAFE area as teachers and then to hold courses that will compete against local people. In this climate of very high unemployment in our particular area, that is quite unacceptable. I support the Bill.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): I support my colleague the member for Coles, who is leading the Opposition in this debate, and my colleague the member for Newland who has just spoken. While I realise that this is a technical Bill, as the member for Coles has pointed out to the House, I think there are a number of important points that need to be made in relation to TAFE. The first is the absolutely paramount importance of TAFE to the education structure of this State and to future employment prospects for young South Australians. As its name implies—technical and further education—it is a teaching provision of this Government. It is the primary trainer of people who are going into industry and professions other than those who are trained in courses set down by universities. So, it is an absolutely important and vital sector of the South Australian community.

It is also a sector of our community that has a very proud and distinguished history. It has a very fine group of institutions and has offered and continues to offer some very fine courses. It has trained many fine tradespeople and people who have been experts in their field. I believe that no value at all should be put on the work of TAFE compared with the work of universities. They do different work, but one is not more valuable than the other. Indeed, some of the people who have come out of TAFE institutions have taken their place alongside the finest graduates that any of our universities have produced. They are experts in their field and they deserve praise as, I repeat, do the TAFE colleges that have trained them.

However, I believe it is important for this House to realise that it is not the function of TAFE to train people in a liberal education. The idea of TAFE training colleges is that they are vocationally oriented. We have 12 to 13 years of schooling in primary and secondary schools to give a liberal education and we then have the TAFE system that is vocationally oriented.

I question the Minister on various provisions of this Bill because, while I accept the leadership of the member for Coles, it concerns me a little that one of the provisions of the Act, as it will be amended, is that teaching positions in TAFE will not be restricted to officers of the teaching service. I understand that the Minister will tell us that if you are going to train a plumber a teacher is not necessarily the best person to do it—and I accept that. However, I say to the Minister that I believe there should be some provision for people who will come into the colleges because of special expertise in an area to develop also expertise in teaching. While they might be the best plumbers in the world, as TAFE instructors they must be able to communicate or teach the skills that they are so good at.

I can accept that some of the officers who should be chosen for TAFE positions should not come from a teaching background, but I believe that they should be able to prove that they have some teaching skills. It is essential for TAFE courses not to be filled simply on an enrolment basis. I believe that the courses, if they are to be vocationally oriented, should be needs based and industry driven. I have seen this happen time and again. I do not attribute any blame to this Government; rather the system of funding which is handed down from the Commonwealth Government. I understand that the Commonwealth Government demands places on courses rather than structured courses. I would rather see us train 10 pastry chefs, because we need 10 in South Australia, and 50 people in another capacity because we need them than fill a course with people for whom no jobs will be available finally. The analogy that I would draw—I realise that this is not the TAFE sector, but it is a pertinent analogy—is the teaching service where for too long our universities took in and trained hundreds more people than could be offered jobs in all the schools of South Australia. I do not think that the Minister would want any State money wasted on training people merely for the sake of training if there is not the prospect of a job at the end of it.

I ask the Minister to consider carefully the vocationally based nature of TAFE and to consider that the courses should be driven by industry and by needs. I also ask the Minister to consider the problem, which I do not think is addressed in the Bill, of selection by merit. A number of my constituents have missed out on a TAFE place because they did not get to the college early enough on the day that enrolments were being taken. Some were people who would have been ideally suited to a course. I do not care what method of selection is used. I do not believe that scores in tests are necessarily a good idea. The selection should be on any basis at all so long as we select on merit those people who will best fulfil the courses.

I pay special tribute to the Regency Park College of TAFE, to the School of Food and Catering and to the School of Tourism, which I believe are among the best courses on offer anywhere in Australia. They are world class courses and they show the standard which TAFE has the possibility of achieving. I believe that if this Opposition could know that every course in every TAFE college was of the standard that those two courses have achieved, there would be no carping, no criticism, and nothing but praise for the Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I particularly commend the new shadow Minister of Employment and Further Education on her contribution this afternoon and the member for Hayward on his very constructive remarks. I want to take up a number of the points mentioned by the member for Coles. One relates to the fight between the Federal Government and the States over the future of TAFE.

I firmly believe that our TAFE system has to be industry driven, not bureaucrat driven—and not bureaucrat driven from Canberra in particular. I believe that sort of control at a distance will have the effect of watering down the excellence that we have in our TAFE system. That is not to say that I do not believe in national standards or in working towards a national curriculum in key areas. It is not to say also that I do not believe in a real partnership between the State Government and the Federal Government in terms of TAFE. What I do not want to see is all the moves that we have made in terms of a tripartite industry-driven TAFE system with strong local roots founder. If one goes anywhere around the State—at Port Augusta, for example, the member for Stuart was the President of the TAFE there—one finds that a number of members of Parliament, including the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Speaker, are on TAFE councils and make outstanding contributions. Those councils have representatives from local industry—industry on which the TAFE college has a specific focus.

I believe it would be a very sad day if we lost that local relevance, that local flexibility and the local links with industry, because basically that is what TAFE is all about in terms of providing further education and training for local industry needs. As I said, I have been criticised in Federal Parliament for saying that I reject an East German model for TAFE: I intend to maintain that position. I believe that on this matter we can have a constructive partnership with Kim Beazley. I think that he is looking at a partnership between the Federal Government and the States and I look forward to having extensive discussions with the new Federal Minister in this area. Hopefully, those discussions will be more productive than was the case with the former Minister in that area.

The honourable member mentioned the printing press and the new generation of technology in further education. I am very proud as Minister, not because I am in any way responsible, as the system in this State is outstanding, that we have the best TAFE system in Australia. Everyone in Australia acknowledges that fact. In addition to the comments made about Regency, there is another example of our excellence. I refer to our moves in technology with the new TAFE channel where we are bringing TAFE to the country areas and providing an interactive two-way process. That system is by far the most advanced not just in Australia but in the world and we intend to maintain that leadership. I certainly make a pledge to this House today that, as long as I am the Minister responsible for TAFE, we will continue that leadership internationally.

That concept is something that we hope the university system will take up, because I would like to see university education also being delivered to country areas by using that same kind of interactive process. As an example of the excellent way in which TAFE is regarded internationally, I mention the fact that a few months ago I was in Sydney and talked to the heads of Qantas. The fact that Qantas, which spends $100 million a year on training, has chosen TAFE South Australia, and particularly TAFE Regency, to supervise its training on everything other than pilots, and that includes flight attendants and chefs (of which there are about 1 300 in the amazing 24-hour a day kitchen operation) is an example of the high regard in which we are held. It has chosen our TAFE system because we are simply the best. It has shopped around the world and shopped around Australia. It ignored the New South Wales system and the local private employers. Instead, it chose South Australia. I hope that, in the next few weeks, some further announcements will be made that show that we have an international reputation. I certainly will be involved in further talks very shortly.

I strongly agree with the comment that we must maintain industry relevance. The member for Newland raised some questions about the Kensington College. Quite frankly, I am happy to take up some of her remarks, but I am baffled when I think of the massive publicity and criticism that I received, as did the Government, when in August 1990 we announced the closure of Kensington College at the end of 1991, and yet people somehow believed that it would still remain open. However, I am prepared to give her the benefit of the doubt and to look at the case if she is prepared to provide more information, because I think that she raised some interesting points.

I also want some clarification on another comment made by her. She said that she was concerned about the new Tea Tree Gully TAFE. I would have thought that at the opening she would be throwing petals on the ground leading up to the drive to the Tea Tree Gully TAFE. This college will be one of the most outstanding vocational and technical colleges in the world. I look forward to her applause at the opening. The honourable member also said she believes that that college intends to set up courses that will compete with private industry and that this situation should not occur.

If she can write to me and tell me which courses she wants closed down in the Tea Tree Gully TAFE, I would be very happy to read that out in this House and to publicise it in the Golden Grove area. However, I want to respond particularly to the very constructive contributions of honourable members, so I will return to this Bill which, essentially, is a rats and mice Bill in one respect, but is historic in another. It talks about bringing our TAFE system into the 1990s. Basically, it goes through the old legislation and tries to achieve relevance, accountability and responsiveness, and that includes our business enterprises to make

sure that the business enterprises that currently exist in TAFE are made more accountable and as successful as they can be.

Many people ask why South Australia's TAFE system is involved in business enterprises. I can tell the House that we are involved now in international contracts worth $82 million, and there is a whole series of TAFE training in Indonesia at Sulawesi and Bandung. I visited the operations in Bandung and it is a bit like a South Australian headquarters.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Bandung is in Indonesia. It is up the hill from Jakarta. There are also operations in the Maldives, and members will be pleased to know that I resisted all the offers to me to visit the Maldives. But, if the shadow Minister cares to suggest that I go to the Maldives—and perhaps she could accompany me—we could look at the excellent TAFE operations there. So, South Australian TAFE is involved in a series of very useful, productive and constructive enterprises in several countries, including the Philippines.

The Qantas project is another example of a business enterprise. In terms of fee for service, there was about $8.5 million worth of business a year or so ago in terms of our business enterprises, and we must make sure that we keep an eye on them. We are trying to make sure that they are accountable. There have been spectacular successes and a few failures along the way, which happens in any business enterprise. Rather than looking at business enterprises as an off-shoot that is something on the side of TAFE, we want to make it central to TAFE's operations, because South Australian industry constantly says, 'We want to run an internal course. Can you be our consultant? Can you write the curriculum?' We want to do this in a commercial contract and, obviously, that is part of the new relevance of TAFE.

There is a range of other requirements in the legislation. As I said, most of it is, by nature, fairly technical. In terms of the process, it has taken a long time, because we wanted to consult widely about these sorts of provisions to make our TAFE system even better. We are cleaning up the Act to bring it into line with other legislation, and we are making sure that we have a TAFE system in which we recognise the vital importance of college councils, which I mentioned before. The college councils that we have are vital to the future of TAFE, and we want to make sure that they are both relevant and accountable.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Delegation by Minister.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: This clause relates to delegations by the Minister. Can the Minister indicate to the Committee what kinds of powers he envisages will be delegated? I note that it includes all his powers under the Act except the power to dismiss a person from office. That is a pretty wide range of powers. I think we should know exactly what is the nature of those powers.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Essentially, we are just covering ourselves in terms of possible eventualities. For instance, if a ministerial advisory committee were set up to look at the hospitality industry, a very high profile committee might give that committee the power to hire a research assistant or some specialist to assist it in that way. I can give no particular examples at the moment of where that is applicable because those types of committees currently do not operate. We wanted to ensure that such a committee, if it were set up, would have power to seek and hire advice if necessary.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—'General powers of the Minister.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: This clause is long and detailed and extends the general powers of the Minister. It makes provision for the Minister to make available land, buildings and equipment, and to provide assistance to community bodies, possibly through loans. It also enables the Minister to provide students with practical training by establishing or carrying on enterprises for commercial, community or other purposes; to provide consultancies; and to undertake the development of intellectual property.

I turn to the ability to establish or carry on enterprises, which is encompassed in new subsection (9) *(a)* and distinguish that from new subsection (9) *(c)*, which provides for undertaking the development of intellectual property (which I will deal with separately). The issues I see inherent in new subsection (9) *(a)* are as follows. What will be the criteria for the charges that will be levied by those commercial enterprises? Will they be based, as any private enterprise would base such charges, on criteria such as the repayment of interest on capital (which any private provider would have to do, bearing in mind that TAFE will be in competition with private providers in this area) or the salaries of those who are developing the services? Will they undercut private providers of equivalent services (and I am now thinking about consultancies)? Further, to what use will the revenue be put? Will it accrue to the college that provides the service or to the department? If the answer is not clear, who will determine that? Will TAFE charge other tertiary institutions, namely universities, for the provision of its services?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We basically look at cost recovery as being the minimum. I will outline the whole range of business enterprises in terms of where we are going. Currently the TAFE Act allows me to engage in functions that are related to the provision 'of technical and further education', and that is defined in section 4 (1) of the Act as instruction or training in any academic, vocational or practical discipline other than certain instruction or training excluded from the Act such as that provided by the Education Department, school, university or theological college. I know that some of my quotations verge on the theological, but I am prevented by the Act from getting too involved in that area.

A few years ago, as a temporary measure, the Minister of Employment and Further Education was established as an agent of the Crown, or a Crown agent. I think there are only two or three Crown agents left in the British Commonwealth. That is a fairly archaic but legal entity which was empowered to create and operate through business enterprises on an interim basis in order to perform other functions allied to the provision of TAFE such as skills audits, training needs analysis, contract course design for particular industries and so on where it has been commissioned.

What we are doing is basically cleaning up that provision, which was a technical way of ensuring that business enterprises could continue. First, every college, or virtually every college, had its own business enterprise with its own separate board. When I first became Minister, I was concerned that these business enterprises had to have much greater accountability to the whole system, that they were not seen as someone's great idea for collegiates to go off and peruse this, without having the sting in the tail of being accountable in terms of the money spent.

We brought in a Victorian consultant, whose name I think was Tom Malcolm, who had a look at the whole system. As a result of that, we basically centralised it more. We closed down a number of those business enterprises. We still had three or four in places such as Regency Park and Adelaide which had been doing particularly well—and we have already referred to that—and which were still maintained independently. But the rest were under SATECH, which is the overall body for TAFE in terms of commercialisation of TAFE's program.

We now want to ensure that all these sorts of things—those consultancies, those being contracted by industry to do certain tasks, and so on—are not seen as somehow different for TAFE to do or something extraordinary, but in fact as an important part of that very relevance to industry that we all agree is necessary. TAFE is not just about teaching in a classroom: it is about being on-site and working within industry in terms of developing their own training needs.

Principally, we have looked at cost recovery. In terms of universities, obviously we looked at differential costs, and those matters would be negotiated. As for who has the ultimate right to say how the money is organised and so on, it is the Minister of Employment and Further Education. That is what we want to do: to ensure that there is accountability, that people are not running off and doing different things in different ways. In saying that, I do not want to in any way criticise the business enterprises, because many of them have been spectacularly successful and innovative. We are trying to lay down some groundwork in terms of accountability and responsibility.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Two things that the Minister has said require further explanation. First, in relation to minimum cost recovery, which, of course, gives TAFE a competitive advantage, I offer one example. Let us say, for argument's sake, that film making courses conducted by TAFE result in the production of films—I am talking not about feature films but about documentaries, films of that nature—that are competing with any one of the number of film makers in South Australia. Those film makers are entitled to feel that, as they had to pay for all their equipment, their rent, and the interest on their capital, they are being undercut by TAFE. I want to know what protection there is for those people. I use that as just one example. Secondly, will the Minister, when he replies, clarify for the Committee the standard procedure for dealing with income? Is the Minister aware at all times of the level of income and to what purpose that income is being applied? Are there standard guidelines or is there a big pot into which the income is put with it then divided up at the discretion of the Minister?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We are doing this in terms of business enterprise to ensure relevance. If someone has been a TAFE lecturer for 20 years, the technology that they worked on in the 1970s will be rapidly overtaken. I want to encourage TAFE lecturers to go back out to industry, to work with industry—perhaps to go 'offshore' for a couple of years ('offshore' meaning going to a factory and working with people) and then to bring back that expertise in to the system. We do not have any intention of crippling the industry: we want to be out there as partners with the industry. In the vast majority of cases, that has been the case; people have asked what minimum cost recovery means.

It would certainly include salaries and salary on-costs; for example, workers compensation and leave. It is true that we do at times compete with private training providers. The money we generate—we talked about $8.5 million in terms of contracts a couple of years ago—is simply being driven back into TAFE to ensure the courses that all members want to see available to people. The Finn review and the Deveson review both looked at this issue. The Deveson review said that TAFE should be funded through greater commercialisation and industry involvement, that is, the training levy and in other ways.

We receive a substantial contribution from industry in South Australia in terms of equipment. One only has to go down to the Croydon TAFE, the printing headquarters, to see a fortune's worth of equipment donated by the printing industry, or to go to Elizabeth where General Motors-Holden's is making a major contribution in terms of car engines and so forth. That is the way they are making that kind of contribution.

The Deveson review highlighted fees—and this is part of Liberal Party policy. Whilst being massively subsidised, students also make a contribution along with industry and Government. What we are trying to do with our commercialisation is to be industry relevant and to plough the money back in to ensure courses for school leavers and others.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I am pleased to have the Minister's assurances on that. I would also like his assurance that subsections (9) *(a)* (i) and (ii) make provision for joint ventures with private enterprise. Is that the case?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There are no problems with joint ventures, hence the Qantas deal.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I was about to commend the Minister on the Qantas arrangements. About six years ago I was a guest of Qantas and was shown over the training campus in Sydney. Even then it was an incredible operation. At that stage South Australian TAFE was not involved, and I am glad to learn of the income that has been earned, having regard to subclause (9) *(c)* (referring to intellectual property) and the export income that that is earning for South Australia. Can the Minister indicate whether the intellectual property currently being developed and sold is restricted to distance education for which there is a huge potential in South-East Asia, just to name one area, or does it involve other areas of TAFE effort and, if so, which areas?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It involves a massive amount of areas—the whole of our curriculum. We write curriculum, we have intellectual property over curriculum. I recently signed an agreement to allow both interstate and overseas TAFE systems to use particular parts of our intellectual property. I am not supposed to reveal it, I suppose, but because I am an open, honest and fair person I can say that there is a major new development at Croydon TAFE involving a new kind of engine, and we have entered into a partnership with the CSIRO in terms of our intellectual property.

Mr Ferguson: The steam engine?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No, it is not the steam engine; it is a kind of circular engine.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the member for Henley Beach wants a private briefing, I am sure that can be arranged.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is an example where our intellectual property has been taken up. The same applies to distance education. I take the honourable member's point: we have enormous chances. This is why TAFE has to be a key part of the MFP, and hence the new Port Adelaide TAFE, in terms of ensuring that South Australia is a leader in the export of education.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Hayward.

Mr BRINDAL: Clause 7, new subsection 6, provides:

The Minister may employ such persons (in addition to officers appointed under this Act and employees in the department) . . .

Who does the Minister envisage employing who would not qualify either as an officer appointed under the Act or an employee of the department? It seems to me a rather strange provision, as I would think the Act would allow him to employ virtually anyone.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is an existing provision, which has been in the Act for many years. I assume it refers to part-time instructors. Whilst there are thousands of TAFE lecturers in South Australia, there are also thousands of part-time instructors. We very much depend on people who might work as an electrician during the day and a part-time instructor during the evening. It also refers to special contract people, lecturers assistants and so on.

Mr BRINDAL: I am a little concerned about the Minister's power under new subsection (5), which provides that the Minister may:

(b) provide assistance to community bodies . . . on conditions that secure for colleges rights to make use of land, buildings, equipment or facilities of the bodies.

Will the Minister expand briefly on that?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I guess that in terms of assistance to community bodies, we want to make our TAFE system relevant not just to industry but also to communities. There are times when communities use TAFE buildings for a whole range of things, particularly in the country areas where there is a great feeling of ownership in terms of the TAFE system. For example, it could mean a grant or loan could be provided to an Aboriginal community to partially fund the building within their homeland of a community centre or workshop on the condition that at times the building would be available to DETAFE to use as a site to provide courses for the community. Of course, there are a number of examples which are not exactly relevant but which I think help the explanation. The Noarlunga TAFE college has a brilliant library that is shared with the local city council. The same applies to Tea Tree Gully TAFE. Each makes a financial contribution to ensure excellence and local relevance.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—'Advisory committees.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Can the Minister advise the Committee, in respect of clause 8 (3) *(b)*, what other functions assigned to the committee by the Minister does he have in mind in respect of advisory committees? At least one employer body—the engineering employers body—has expressed concern that there could be a duplication between the TAFE advisory committees established by the Minister and the national advisory committees. Employers everywhere are concerned that there should not be conflicting and duplicated sources of advice on technical and further education matters.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In terms of State and Federal bodies, I want to hear from local liaison people, from local industry groups, as much as I want to hear from the Federal groups. A number of the Federal groups supported the Dawkins takeover of TAFE, although their local subsidiaries did not. We had a lot of support from them. I am not quite sure where we are getting to on this point. I mentioned previously the advisory committee. We are moving to allow an advisory committee to perform functions assigned to it by the Minister in addition to having the existing powers to report on matters related to the provision of technical and further education and administration of the Act.

The committee could be required to develop strategies or provide input to oversighting of functions, utilising relevant outside expertise contained on the committee under this provision. It is not expected that extensive use will be made of the ability to assign functions to an advisory committee, but SATECH, for example, could be reconstituted as an advisory committee and given the role of providing advice on marketing, on monitoring the effectiveness of the department's marketing or setting marketing priorities, or it could be given a greater role in terms of our overseas activities. That is the sort of thing that we are looking at.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 27 passed.

Clause 28—'Repeal of Part V.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: This clause repeals Part V of the principal Act which provides for the registration of private training bodies. The Opposition has heard concerns expressed by the Independent Schools Board about the status of teachers when these private training bodies are no longer licensed. For example, the removal of the licensing function, according to the board, puts these institutions in what it describes as 'no person's land'. If they teach subjects, sometimes at the request of schools, for example, dance or drama at years 11 or 12, do teachers now need to be registered? How are the institutions to be regarded? How do they regard themselves? In light of the time constraints and as we have only five minutes left in which I have to move an amendment and raise other questions, will the Minister take this question on notice and possibly provide an answer in another place?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have an answer here, but I am happy to do that. I am strongly committed to deregulation, because it makes no sense that at one stage I was the accrediting authority of teachers training people who were bikini waxers, for instance.

Clause passed.

Clauses 29 to 31 passed.

New clause 32—'Insertion of schedule.'

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I move:

Page 13, after line 31—Insert new clause as follows:

Insertion of schedule

32. The following schedule is inserted at the end of the principal Act:

SCHEDULE

Interpretation of other Acts and instruments

References to officer of the teaching service

1. A reference in an Act or in any other insrument (whether the instrument is of a legislative character or not) to an officer of the teaching services under this Act will be construed as a reference to an officer.

The amendment is designed to ensure that the concerns of the South Australian Institute of Teachers about the proposed amendment are set to rest and that the powers granted to the CEO under this Act cannot be exercised under the Government Management and Employment Act. In view of the time, I ask the Minister to consider the amendment and possibly deal with it in another place.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is a good idea. My gut response when I first saw the amendment was that it seemed fairly innocuous and probably unnecessary, but I want to have it looked at more closely. The principal reason for this provision is to remove the impression that these employees merely teach and to avoid confusion with Education Department teachers. A large number of staff undertake curriculum development work, development of learning resources, educational administration and management. This is merely a change of nomenclature. The amendment is unnecessary but probably does not hurt. The schedule to the GME Act excludes officers of the teaching service from the Public Service, so we can look at it. I suggest it be dealt with in another place.

New clause negatived.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (RAPE) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS COMMISSION BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.1 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 18 February at 2 p.m.