

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

## HANSARD REPORT

Wednesday 5 November 1986

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

## PETITION: NURSES

A petition signed by 78 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to introduce a career structure for nurses together with a relevant reassessment of salary was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

## PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 26 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose any measures to decriminalise prostitution was presented by the Hon B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

## PETITION: MARIJUANA OFFENCES

A petition signed by 13 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject legislation which proposes an expiation fee for marijuana offences was presented by the Hon B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

## PETITION: SCHUBERT'S FARM

A petition signed by 504 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reopen Schubert's Farm to the public was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

## PETITION: BULK RAW MILK

A petition signed by 1 000 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to allow the sale of bulk raw milk was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

## PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Labour, on behalf of the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. M.K. Mayes):

Department of Fisheries—Report, 1985-86.

## BOTANIC GARDENS CONSERVATORY

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

Botanic Gardens Bicentennial Conservatory.

Ordered that report be printed.

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling on questions, I point out that the galley proof *Hansard* for last Thursday and the subsequent weekly volume contain an unspecified interjection during the debate that followed the naming of the member for Mitcham. That interjection was attributed to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition as a result of standard editing procedures used by the *Hansard* staff. A checking and rechecking of the tape by me indicates that the noise levels in the Chamber at that time (among other factors) prevent that interjection being attributed by *Hansard* to any single member or members with absolute certainty, although the Chair was firmly of the view that the Deputy Leader was one of those who interjected. Accordingly, I will direct *Hansard* that the final bound volume should refer simply to 'Members interjecting', the formula normally adopted by *Hansard* when interjections cannot be definitively attributed and which, in retrospect I believe, after consultation with the *Hansard* Leader, should have been the terminology used in this instance.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: HANSARD REPORT

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not think it is out of order, Mr Speaker, for me to suggest that I had consultation with you on this matter and I do not believe for a moment that your statement this afternoon puts the matter in its correct light. Indeed, an imputation remains as to my behaviour in the House, and I seek to correct the situation.

The facts are that: during the course of my explanation for my behaviour in the House I suggested that the *Hansard* record would show in due course that I had indeed been provoked, and I said that I hoped that no change would be made to the *Hansard* record. I am well aware of the ability for members to go to *Hansard* and seek corrections. Mr Speaker, you then had the galley proof brought into the House, which you then read into the record. I still have a copy of that galley proof, which states quite clearly, preceding my being warned and named:

Mr S.J. BAKER: . . . It is a measure on which I believe we could have spent three or four days.

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order! . . .

Mr Speaker, you then proceeded to chastise me for gross discourtesy in the House. I retained that copy because it put what I believed was a correct complexion on the situation which led to me becoming rather cross and seeking to interject when you sought to remonstrate with me. I then obtained the later *Hansard* galley proofs which are sent to members for correction. However, they were not available to me on Friday when I had my mail collected. Therefore, I had no opportunity of making any alteration until yesterday, when I became aware that '*Mr Gunn interjecting:*' had been changed to '*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*'.

I immediately sought clarification and was told that the alteration had been made. I then asked what evidence there was for making that alteration and I was told that it was on the basis of a recording of events in the House. I then sought your permission, Sir, to hear the master tape which records everything that happens in this House. I heard that tape and I would defy anyone to suggest that an alteration could be made based on that tape recording, because no words are intelligible. On that basis I sought—

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The Chair has stressed on previous occasions that personal explanations are among the most significant matters that can come before the House. I ask for the cooperation of members of the House not to interject on a member making a personal explanation.

The **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY**: I then sought to have a change made, that is, to have the alteration which showed '*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*' changed to the original wording (which you read into the record, Sir, and is there for all to read) of '*Mr Gunn interjecting:*'. After lengthy discussion you did not agree to do that. However, you agreed to make a change similar to the one you indicated in your statement to the House; that is, instead of having '*Mr Gunn interjecting:*' I thought you said that you would have it changed to '*An honourable member interjecting:*' (although in the record it states '*Members interjecting:*'). This concerns me greatly because that change puts you, Sir, in a rather more favourable light and me in a far less favourable light.

To be admonished for interjecting when the original record indicates that I was not interjecting rather explains why I became cross. You may not accept that, Sir, but that is why I was at pains to see what was in the *Hansard* record: because I was admonished very sternly indeed for interjecting when the record indicated that I did not interject. When I sought to remonstrate later, you immediately (and the tape indicates this) jumped on me and warned me. I do not for a moment deny that I was interjecting at that stage. I then sought to have the weekly *Hansard* volume changed because the (what I believed) incorrect change had now gone where all weekly *Hansards* go and people could read, '*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*'.

The conclusion is then drawn that I was rightly admonished, when the original *Hansard* extract did not indicate that for a moment. You, Sir, told me that it was too late to change the weekly *Hansard* because it was already printed and it would be expensive to run another copy, which I accepted. I then approached you with a view to putting in next week's *Hansard* a single sheet which indicated an erratum, quoting the page number, deleting '*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*' and inserting what you agreed to put in. However, Sir, you are not prepared to do that.

I believe that this series of events has been most unfortunate. I believe it is most unfortunate that you, Sir, who went up and heard the master tape on Friday, were prepared to let the change from '*Mr Gunn interjecting:*' to '*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*' remain, knowing perfectly well, I believe, that any reasonable person hearing that tape would not have the faintest hope of identifying who was interjecting.

Furthermore, it was put to me that it is standard practice, when it is not clear, to put '*Members interjecting:*'. I heard the tape further on where it had '*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*' and no-one hearing that tape would for a moment suggest that you could identify me as interjecting. I sought not to make the change, as I know perfectly well that I was interjecting at that stage, because you had warned me and I sought to protest. As far as I am concerned, this has been a most unsatisfactory series of events. I deplore the fact that you—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I caution the Deputy Leader about straying from a personal explanation and debating the matter.

The **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY**: I just wind up my comments by saying that I deplore the fact that a change was made, which was distinctly to your advantage and to my disadvantage, from what was in the original *Hansard*

record, and which you knew had taken place but by hearing the tape had chosen not to have altered back to the original transcript as was taken down by the *Hansard* reporter in this place.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre)**: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr GUNN**: I rise to make this brief personal explanation to express my concern that an interjection which I had made in the House would be deleted from the record without consultation with me. I read the proof to which the Deputy Leader has referred and was quite happy to accept that I was the member who interjected. I make no apology for saying that at times I am provoked into occasionally interjecting.

I read that on Thursday afternoon and left this place early on Friday, not to return until after the weekend, and I am, to put it mildly, surprised that an interjection which was clearly indicated in the proof would be taken off the record without consultation with or reference to me, and I rise on this personal explanation to request that it be corrected and placed in the original manner in which it was recorded.

## QUESTION TIME

### AUSTRALIAN BUREAU OF CRIMINAL INTELLIGENCE

**Mr OLSEN**: I address my question to the Premier. Is the future of the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence being threatened by a decision by the Federal Government to renege on funding commitments and, if so, will he make urgent and immediate representations to Canberra to ensure the bureau is able to function as originally intended? The bureau was established as part of an agreement by the Commonwealth and the States to ensure a uniform approach to fighting drug trafficking and organised crime. Indeed, here in South Australia we have a unit of the BCI within the South Australian Police Force.

However, a report in today's *Melbourne Age* says its future is threatened by a wrangling over funding in which the Commonwealth has reneged on an agreement to meet the cost of administrative support staff of the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence. The report reveals that, recently, the New South Wales Police Commissioner wrote to the Federal Government warning that the ongoing viability of the bureau and its drug data base is in jeopardy over the provision of a small number of staff.

The 1983 Royal Commission Report on Drug Trafficking, by Mr Justice Stewart, stated that the bureau's achievements had been considerable and that it deserved further assistance from Australian Governments. In view of the concerns raised by this morning's report, is the Premier in a position to confirm that the bureau's future is under a cloud and, if so, will he make urgent representations to Canberra to ensure that its important role in investigating drug trafficking and organised crime is not placed in jeopardy?

The **Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD**: The South Australian Government and South Australian Police Force have been very active and willing participants in what has been a very happy arrangement thus far between the Commonwealth and the States. We would want that to continue. I certainly have been given no advice from our Commissioner as to any concern about the future of funds, apart from the normal concerns people always have about any elements of public funding. We as a Government would vigorously

oppose any move which would mean that any burden in this respect would be shifted from the Commonwealth to the State.

I hope that additional resources from both State and Commonwealth sources can eventually be made available for this very important task. We would not be stampeded by a newspaper article into moving this way. We would not want to be accused of being the 'little boy who cried wolf,' so I will get an urgent report from the Commissioner and, if necessary, we will certainly follow it up.

**The SPEAKER:** Before calling on the member for Bright I advise that questions that would normally be directed to the Minister of Agriculture will be taken by the Minister of Labour.

#### HALLETT COVE RESERVE

**Mr ROBERTSON:** Can the Minister of Transport outline to the House any steps which the State Transport Authority intends to take to prevent further flooding of the Barndoo Street reserve at Hallett Cove Estate, and to prevent further undercutting of the railway embankment at the northern end of Hallett Cove railway station? Local residents of Hallett Cove Estate and Karrara have informed me that the problem of flooding at the western end of the Barndoo Street reserve has been recurrent for a number of years. During the last winter, however, it appears that so much water banked up against the embankment at the northern end of the station that the Noarlunga line was in severe danger of being undercut. I therefore ask the Minister what steps the State Transport Authority proposes to take to remedy the situation, and when any such actions will be undertaken.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I can advise the honourable member, and the House, that the STA will very shortly be dealing with this problem which has caused so much concern to the honourable member's constituents. The real problem, this year was created by some council roadworks in the area which caused a diversion of stormwater into STA culverts. That is not to say that there was not a pre-existing problem, because we acknowledge that there was. However, it was accentuated this year by these roadworks that diverted stormwater during the winter months. During a fairly wet period the STA was unable to rectify that problem.

Design work to resolve the flooding has now been completed and if work goes to schedule—and I see no reason why it should not—the STA advises me that new pipes will be installed before the end of March 1987 and will eliminate the problem about which the honourable member has had representations made to him by his constituents. I imagine that by the end of March 1987 the problem, which has existed for some years, will have been fixed.

#### PITJANTJATJARA COUNCIL

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs consult with the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs over the financial position of the Pitjantjatjara Council? I ask this question following representations made to the Opposition on the basis that senior officers in the Department of Aboriginal Affairs in Canberra are concerned about the way in which the Pitjantjatjara Council has been managing funds provided by the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments.

This financial year, the South Australian Government has budgeted to provide a grant of \$502 000 to the council. Last financial year \$452 000 was actually granted, although the original budget allocation was only \$102 000. The representations made to the Opposition allege that there has been misappropriation of funds by the council which could total more than \$1 million. Is the Minister prepared to consult with his Federal colleague on this matter and bring back a report to the House at the earliest opportunity?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question. If the honourable member is able to provide me with information to back up the very serious allegations he makes of fraud, embezzlement or some other misappropriation of funds within that community organisation, then I will be pleased to have the matter very thoroughly investigated. I will certainly pass on the general comments that he makes to the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs.

As the honourable member has said, a grant is made from the State Government for the work of that council each year, but the substantial funding is received from the Commonwealth Government. I will ask the Federal Minister whether similar representations have been made to him and whether he is aware of any of these events that may have been brought to his attention by auditors or by other checks that are made from time to time. But I think it is important to say that, if allegations of this type are made, they should be substantiated so that they can be very thoroughly investigated.

#### THIRD ARTERIAL ROAD

**Mr TYLER:** Can the Minister of Transport report on the progress of planning to date on the third arterial road which will be built between Bedford Park and Reynella? Early last year, the Premier announced that a third arterial road south of Adelaide would be constructed. As there is great public interest south of Adelaide in this proposal, can the Minister please report to the House on its planning to date?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. Briefly, the current position is that the emphasis of work on the third arterial road is being directed towards defining in more detail the alternative alignments. Aerial survey and mapping of the land is complete, as is the analysis of a questionnaire survey of drivers' travel patterns. Soil and rock properties have been investigated, and valuation of those alternative alignments, taking account of cost, operational effectiveness and the environmental impact, is continuing.

Guidelines for an environmental impact study are being determined in conjunction with the Department of Environment and Planning, with the aim of holding a public display early in 1987. An information bulletin was issued to over 1 000 households adjacent to the corridor early this year, and I am pleased to be able to advise the honourable member and those people who have an interest in the construction of the third arterial road that a second bulletin is now about to be issued and will be letterboxed to the people whose houses adjoin the corridor. Copies of the bulletin will be available from the Highways Department at Walkerville, the Darlington Police Station, the Marion, Happy Valley and Noarlunga council offices, the Trott Park Neighbourhood Centre at Hessing Crescent, Trott Park, and the electorate offices of the State members of Parliament for Hayward, Bright, Fisher, Mitchell, Mawson and Baudin. It is still intended that the construction will commence in 1990, with the completion to be five years after that.

### CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES BILL

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** My question is to the Premier. Is it the Government's intention to present the Controlled Substances Bill at tomorrow's meeting of Executive Council for the assent of His Excellency the Governor?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** It is not usual to canvass what matters are to be put before Executive Council.

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The Bill that has been passed by Parliament will be processed in the normal way. It may well be that it will be presented tomorrow.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Briggs.

### STA BUS EVAPORATIVE COOLERS

**Mr RANN:** Can the Minister of Transport assure STA staff and commuters using STA buses that the evaporative coolers will not be switched on again whatever the weather until public health authorities advise the STA that the coolers pose no health risks? Following some references on radio this morning to the problem that the STA had with the legionella organism early this year, I have been telephoned by STA commuters living in my electorate who are worried about possible risks to health if bus coolers go back into operation before the STA is 100 per cent certain that they are safe. Perhaps the Minister could explain the latest position.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I can certainly give a quite categorical undertaking that the evaporative coolers in STA buses will not be turned on, no matter what the weather conditions, until an absolute clearance has been provided to the State Transport Authority by the Health Commission. I do not believe that any responsible Minister or Government could do less. Our responsibility is to the health of those people who use and operate the STA buses. Members may recall that the problem surfaced in March, when routine testing discovered organisms in two of five buses sampled. Members may also recall that the STA acted with commendable speed once the discovery was made, as I recall on a Friday evening.

Throughout that night and the next morning STA and Health Commission officers worked to treat all air-conditioning units in 800 buses with the appropriate chemical. It was thought that by the Saturday afternoon the units would be cleared to go back into service. Again, I believe that the STA showed commendable discretion by declining to take the slightest risk. That caution was justified completely when additional organisms were found in units in April. We have had a very short burst of hot weather and we will have some prolonged bursts of hot weather if the summer of 1986-87 is as we can always expect in this beautiful city and climate of ours.

We need to be certain that whatever actions we take do not put at risk in any way those people who use and drive our buses. It should be clearly understood by members opposite and other people generally that we have evaporative cooling systems in buses in South Australia, and they were introduced eight years ago. In common with Western Australia, that makes us the only States in Australia that provide a cooling system in metropolitan bus services. Victoria and New South Wales do not have cooling, and

Queensland has a fan system that is widely regarded as ineffective.

Nevertheless, we will allow the fans in our cooling systems to be put on, perhaps to have some effect having regard to the dry nature of the weather in South Australia, as opposed to that which applies in Queensland. The safety and welfare of staff working in our buses and those carried in our bus system is our No. 1 priority. As my colleague the Minister of Health has already pointed out, it is not an easy thing to isolate the legionella bacteria. It has a habit of appearing when one thinks it has been isolated and action taken, as the member for Murray-Mallee has already pointed out.

We will not use the evaporative coolers until we are absolutely certain that the evidence exists to ensure that they can be used safely. It is our expectation that that evidence should be with us by the end of this month. We certainly hope it is. If it is not, and if I and my colleague cannot be satisfied on the professional advice given to us by those people charged with the responsibility to make those decisions, we will not turn on the cooling systems. We hope that information is with us. If it is, they will be turned on.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I call on the member for Light.

**The Hon. G.F. Keneally:** We will be working on it all the time. If you're an expert—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister of Transport has responded to the question. The member for Light has the call.

### INJURY COMPENSATION

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Can the Minister of Emergency Services say what representations the Minister has made to the Attorney-General on behalf of Constable Adrian Burnett, the Whyalla police officer who was injured in the course of duty and whose claim for criminal injuries compensation has been denied by the State Government? The Attorney-General has now admitted that there are anomalies in the system as far as compensation payments are concerned, and that he will now review the legislation under which Constable Burnett's case has received so much publicity.

The Attorney-General has, however, refused to allow any changes to compensation procedures to apply retrospectively, which means that this police officer, who risked his life and suffered shocking injuries, will not receive compensation even if the anomalies are removed. As this matter has considerable ramifications not only for Constable Burnett but also on the morale of the entire South Australian Police Department, I ask the Minister what representation he has made on behalf of police, and whether he will ask the Attorney-General to make retrospective any changes to compensation as a result of his review, so that Constable Burnett is adequately compensated for his injuries which were caused in the line of duty.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** As I recall, there has been an exchange of notes between the Attorney-General and me. Then, on Monday afternoon we discussed this matter immediately before Cabinet met. The Attorney-General's position, which has been stated publicly, is that the fund to which the honourable member refers is compensation of last resort (if I may put it that way), a fund that has been set up to help people who have no other recourse. Given the fact that the unfortunate police officer has recourse to workers compensation, the Attorney-General's ruling has been that a call on the other fund is not appropriate. How-

ever, my colleague has promised me a further report on the matter, and I await that report.

#### ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

**Mr HAMILTON:** Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Government is continuing negotiations with the Federal Government for funds to improve Adelaide International Airport? On 25 October, I attended the opening of Perth's \$63 million international airport. In officially opening that terminal, the Prime Minister indicated the tremendous boost that that terminal would give to tourism in particular and Western Australia in general. Further, the *West Australian* dated 28 October contains the following report:

The first passengers off Qantas *City of Fremantle* Boeing 747 from Hong Kong were cleared through to the arrival lounge in an impressive 10 minutes.

In light of the criticism that has been expressed and the delays that have occurred at Adelaide International Airport, I ask the Minister of Transport whether funds will be made available for work there, as I understand that plans have been prepared for the extension of this airport.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The Government, through the Minister of Tourism and me, is continually making representations to the Federal Minister responsible for the construction of airports, especially international airports, in Australia. As the honourable member pointed out, there are plans for improvements to the Adelaide International Airport. It is a matter of some regret that we are not having built in South Australia an international airport of the size and capabilities of those in Brisbane and Perth. Until South Australia has an airport comparable to those of our sister cities of similar size, our efforts as a Government, of whatever complexion, should be directed towards achieving that.

I do not want in any way to reflect on the role played by the international airport for South Australia. It has been of tremendous assistance to the local economy and, as I have done previously, I pay a tribute to those who achieved its construction, although I have criticised the size and type of international airport constructed here. There is no doubt that events such as the Grand Prix and Jubilee 150 would not have been as successful as they have been had it not been for the facility that we have in South Australia at that airport, and the events that have taken place this year and in recent years have placed Adelaide and South Australia on the international map much more firmly than ever before.

The recognition of Adelaide throughout the world, especially in Europe, Asia and North America, has had effects in terms of those people wanting to come here as tourists. The growing number of people going through the Adelaide International Airport is the strongest argument that we can put to the Federal Government when we ask that this airport be improved. Those efforts will continue. I will obtain a report for the honourable member on the improvements planned, the funds that will be required to meet that planning and the timing of those funds.

#### ABORIGINAL TELEVISION SERVICE

**Mr GUNN:** My question is to the Minister of State Development and Technology. What financial commitment has the South Australian Government made to assist in the establishment of a commercial television service controlled by the Central Australian Aboriginal Media Association, and will the Government review that commitment following opposition by local Aboriginal communities? The Aus-

tralian Broadcasting Tribunal recently granted a licence to a subsidiary of CAAMA, *Imparja Television Proprietary Limited*. This service will cover Central Australia, including an estimated 120 000 residents of South Australia.

In a letter to the Broadcasting Tribunal earlier this year, the South Australian Government said that it supported *Imparja's* licence application but did not quantify the extent of capital and recurrent financial support it would provide for the operation of the service, although I understand a sum in the region of \$1 million has been mentioned. I have been informed that, in giving this commitment to the tribunal, the South Australian Government did not first seek the views of local Aboriginal communities. Communities at Woomera, Roxby Downs, Andamooka, Coober Pedy, Mimili, Mintabie, and Fregon are in fact quite hostile to the tribunal's decision. This is because CAAMA, through its FM radio broadcasts, has demonstrated a preoccupation with unfortunately racist broadcasts.

In a recent statement, Bob Liddle, the first Aboriginal alderman in Alice Springs, has forecast that the new Aboriginal controlled television station would become nothing more than a platform for failed radicals to vent their racist spleens and suggested the licence has been granted as a payoff to stop CAAMA continuing to agitate over land rights. A number of my constituents have expressed concern about South Australian Government support for this organisation because they believe that their needs and views have not been adequately considered.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The South Australian Government did advise the Broadcasting Tribunal at its hearings in Alice Springs early this year that we were prepared to offer a loan guarantee to the *Imparja* application, which is sponsored by CAAMA (Central Australian Aboriginal Media Association) to the tune of \$1 million. We also indicated that we were prepared to consider the purchasing of time on an *Imparja* network by Government departments in South Australia. Some canvassing of the amount of that time was done during the questioning that I, as the Government representative, underwent at the tribunal hearing.

In the process of arriving at that decision, the South Australian Government—through either myself or my colleague the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs—had meetings with representatives of CAAMA over a period, and the matter was considered at Cabinet level. In the process of the discussions we had with CAAMA we clearly indicated that any application for the broadcasting licence for the regional network covering the Northern Territory and South Australia had to meet a number of criteria, one of which was that, from the point of view of South Australia, clearly Alice Springs was a preferred broadcasting point rather than Darwin.

There were two applications before the tribunal: one from Darwin and one from Alice Springs. On that count *Imparja* came through ahead. Furthermore, recognising that the characteristics of the isolated communities of South Australia are not only Aboriginal populations living in the north-west of the State but other populations in the State, we indicated that we would only be prepared to support an application that promised to provide a service to the isolated populations of South Australia in all its diversity.

Evidence was given to us by the principals of *Imparja* that in fact they would provide programming that would meet the needs of the various communities in South Australia, including those in the north-west of the State and other communities in South Australia. Conversation on that matter related to the type of programs that might be broadcast in the central footprint of the Aussat satellite. In the light of that, the Government was satisfied that *Imparja*

showed a capacity to meet the criteria that we believed were important—that it could meet the broad population needs of the isolated population of South Australia and not just one section of it.

The Government was satisfied also that it met the criteria of Alice Springs being a preferred broadcasting point as opposed to Darwin, and in that context we supported and remain in support of their application. The Australian Broadcasting Tribunal did not accept NTD8 Capricornia's application and favoured Imparja. That has now been subject to appeal. NTD8, based in Darwin, has appealed against that finding, and I understand that the Northern Territory Government has sought full status at the appeal hearing, although the latest information I have is that they are not definitely opposing the Imparja matter; they are just asking a series of questions for clarification. The South Australian Government remains of the belief that the Imparja application met the criteria of the South Australian isolated community.

### REAL ESTATE INSTITUTE VIDEO

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Can the Minister of Education indicate to what extent the Real Estate Institute J150 project video 'Choosing and Buying a House' explains the title? Is it just the selection of a residence or does it take a broader look at documentation? As this project has been introduced as an elective subject into secondary schools, my community is interested to know whether it takes into account the legal understanding of contracts and documents relating to purchase or rental. It has been stated recently by the Minister of Housing and Construction that some 10 000 young people are identified as seeking housing, and that only 3 per cent would acquire Housing Trust accommodation. I have been approached on a number of occasions to assist in situations which have occurred through either misunderstanding or misinterpretation of documentation in respect of purchase or rental accommodation. It is for these reasons that I ask the Minister to report on this project.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for her question. Obviously, the purchase of a home is one of the largest commercial transactions any citizen makes, and the ability to have some component of school curricula touching on the subject is of importance. I must correct the comment that the honourable member made and, indeed, the statement that was made in the *Advertiser* recently about the release of this video, that in fact a new subject has been introduced on this topic in our schools. That is not the case, but this video in fact provides a valuable resource tool for teachers and those advising in the preparation of the school curriculum, and it will form an important part of the resources available to teachers in a number of key related areas: in legal studies, business education and in home economics. The video has been assessed by advisers in those three curriculum areas and has been seen as appropriate as a resource tool for use wherever it is seen to be appropriate in our schools.

The video is perhaps of more relevance to senior students, to parents and teachers, to those in the community who are more closely associated with the purchase of homes and other commercial transactions relating to the obtaining of accommodation. So, in that sense it will also provide a valuable resource for those teachers and for parents in the wider community through school libraries.

### TRAINEESHIPS

**Mr S.J. BAKER:** Can the Minister of Employment and Further Education advise whether guidelines from the United

Trades and Labor Council adopted by his department in the establishment of traineeships under the YES scheme are a significant reason as to why no training schemes involving private employers are in place? The Minister has reported to the House on several occasions that he is disappointed with the response from private employers since the Government's announcement of the YES traineeship scheme. One thousand traineeships were promised prior to the last election. I have been advised that there is considerable resistance among private employers to the terms being imposed and many valuable job opportunities are, therefore, being wasted.

The major problems appear to lie with the guidelines issued by the UTLC which state that: all trainees be required to join a relevant union; trainees should have access to leave for trade union training; all traineeship proposals shall be approved by the relevant unions; union officials shall have the right to enter workplaces without prior notice to check that trainees are receiving training and employment in accord with union agreements. I therefore ask the Minister whether he believes the interests of the trade union movement are being considered ahead of job opportunities for young South Australians.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** In fact, the situation with respect to trainees has not been as easy as one might have expected. I have indicated that previously to the House. Some of the principal areas of concern are not those raised at all by the member for Mitcham, who, if he had done his homework, would understand the situation a bit better. Some of the areas for debate, not only in South Australia but, indeed, nationally, have focused on matters of additionality, of award rates of pay, and what it is exactly that is being paid for—in other words, is payment being made for three days work only or is it being made for the time at work and the time at study under the traineeship proposals?

These are the matters that have proved the thorniest areas for all States of Australia in pursuing the traineeship aspect. I can say with respect to traineeship matters requiring union approval, as suggested by the member for Mitcham, he would know, if he had done his homework, in fact, all traineeship proposals are required to be approved by the Industrial and Commercial Training Commission, which is a tripartite body. It is that body which gives approval for any traineeship proposal: it involves employer, union and Government representation.

With respect to traineeships, we believe that there will be a number of trainees in place at the beginning of the 1987 calendar year and I have indicated that previously. As to the question why some of them are not in place now, that is because it is the preferred viewpoint of the South Australian Government that it would be better to start traineeship schemes being approved now at the start of a calendar year and not midway through one. This is not a view held by the Commonwealth Government. The Federal Minister has indicated a difference of opinion with me on this matter, as he would prefer us to start right now some traineeship schemes which have already reached the approval stage and have the agreement of all parties in the process.

We believe that it is better that students stay at school rather than be taken out of school to enter traineeships at this stage, and that it is better for them to wait until the beginning of the next calendar year. We believe that the steady development that we have undertaken in South Australia, as has happened in other States of Australia, has not met the target figures indicated earlier, but we do believe that the long-term outcome of that will be a much healthier traineeship scheme.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** The member for Mitcham mentions that there are none at all. That is not correct: there are some in the Australian Public Service at this stage. However, the points of issue and concern are not those raised by the honourable member, but rather the issues I have identified; such things as additionality, awards and what applies, and also for what period of work time or other time is the trainee being paid—is it just work time or work and study time, as well?

#### NORTH TERRACE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

**Mr DUGAN:** Can the Minister of Transport give any information on whether or not the pedestrian crossing on North Terrace between Bank Street and the top of the railway station ramp will remain following the opening of the underpass connecting the railway station concourse to the mall in the STA building? Last month, in answer to another question about the Adelaide railway station underpass, the Minister indicated that he would be seeking a progress report. As a result of asking that question, I have been contacted by a number of constituents over this issue.

However, they do not all speak with one voice. Some wish to have the underpass as the only link across North Terrace on the grounds of safety and free traffic flow (particularly in view of the likely impact on traffic of access to the Hyatt) and convenience. Others argue, for very much the same reasons, that the existing pedestrian crossing should remain and be improved. The Minister would be aware that traffic is increasing in the area, mainly as a result of the casino, and that most railway commuter traffic comes from the southern side of North Terrace. I understand that care and control of roads and streets in Adelaide resides with the Adelaide City Council. Does the Minister know whether the STA or the Road Safety Division has any preferred position about the pedestrian crossing remaining where it is?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I understand that the preferred position of the STA at the outset was that there should be an underpass and no street level pedestrian crossing. However, that certainly did not meet with the approval of a number of people, including members of the Adelaide City Council, who believe that there should be a street level pedestrian crossing. For all the arguments that the honourable member has enumerated to the House, this debate raged for some time. In any event, a position has been agreed to. There will be a street level pedestrian crossing. It will be moved from the east side of Bank Street to the west side of Bank Street. As all honourable members would know, prior to the commencement of the construction work there were two pedestrian crossings on North Terrace in the vicinity of the railway station. Of course, one of those has already gone, and it will not be replaced, and the present street level crossing will be moved.

**Mr Ingerson:** Will there be decent pedestrian lights there?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** The honourable member asks whether decent pedestrian lights will be put up. I guess that is a reflection on the existing lights, but certainly the lights will be appropriate; they will be the most modern that are available and will do the job quite clearly that road safety standards require.

I understand the importance of the question asked by the honourable member. The traffic within that precinct will be very heavy and it will need to be adequately controlled. As I said earlier, the preferred position of the STA in this was not to have pedestrians crossing at street level, but that

view was not shared by the Adelaide City Council. Of course, they certainly have—and quite rightly so—an influence in such decisions that are made. Its preferred position was that there be a street level pedestrian crossing, and that is the decision that the builders and the planners have made.

#### GRAND PRIX

**Mr INGERSON:** Will the Premier say what sum of money will be paid to the company formed by Dr Hemmerling and Mr Barnard for running the 1986 Australian Formula One Grand Prix?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** I am not aware that any sum of money has been paid to a company owned by Dr Hemmerling and Mr Barnard, but I will certainly refer the honourable member's question to the Grand Prix Board.

#### AIRPORT LUGGAGE TROLLEYS

**Mr FERGUSON:** I direct my question to the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Tourism in another place. Can the Minister inform the House whether the Department of Tourism is aware that there is a lack of luggage trolleys at the Adelaide domestic airport? I have received information from a constituent that the Adelaide domestic airport has the distinction of being the only airport in Australia or overseas with virtually no luggage trolleys. My constituent had just returned from overseas, via Perth, having passed through a total of 15 airports during a world tour, the largest being Vancouver, Prague, Madrid and London, and the smallest being Lusaka, Harare and Perth—all of which had an entirely adequate supply of trolleys.

My constituent, who has stated that it is inexcusable for the Adelaide airport not to provide a sufficient number of luggage trolleys, wrote to the Manager of Ansett, who explained that, because the airport is a joint user terminal, it presents that company with certain problems. He went on to explain that he agreed that there was an inadequate number of luggage trolleys and that a certain amount of theft had occurred. The airport manager for Ansett stated that he considered that the issue was a Department of Tourism problem. He alleged that the department supplied approximately 300 units for the international terminal, where there was only one aircraft arrival usage.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I shall be quite happy to refer this matter to my colleague the Minister of Tourism. Frankly, I am not able to understand what the manager of Ansett's operations in the domestic terminal is saying when he believes that it is the Department of Tourism's responsibility to provide trolleys to the domestic airport. It seems that the honourable member's constituent who has just flown around the world and who visited 15 airports—they were all international airports—has perhaps forgotten that the South Australian international airport has luggage trolleys.

I am not sure whether all domestic airports provide luggage trolleys, but I believe that they ought to. However, I believe that some responsibility should rest with the carriers in our domestic terminal in Adelaide. Overall, trolleys in Australia are available free of charge, but I am not sure that that advantage is available to travellers in many other parts of the world. In any event, the domestic airport in Adelaide ought to be able to provide an adequate level of service to the people who use it. If there is any question at all by the management at our airport that it is the responsibility of the Government through the Department of



Tourism, then that suggestion should be further researched. Personally, I do not believe it is the responsibility of the Department of Transport. I will take it up with my colleague, who I feel certain shares my view, and I will bring down a report for the honourable member.

### CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

**Mr OSWALD:** Can the Premier say whether it is the Government's intention to take action to ensure that all Grand Prix cars carrying cigarette advertising, such as that driven by Alain Prost for Marlboro, also carry a health warning against cigarette smoking?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr OSWALD:** I ask this question in view of a letter to the Editor in yesterday's *Advertiser* from the Executive Director, Public Health Service, in the South Australian Health Commission. In that letter Dr Baker makes the point that cinema advertising and billboards featuring the Marlboro car carry health warnings. He then asks, 'Could a Philip Morris executive explain to me why it is that cinema ads and billboards showing Marlboro cars are plainly cigarette advertisements but that the Marlboro car by itself is not?' The plain implication in this question is that the Marlboro cars either should not be allowed to advertise cigarettes in the way they do, or that they should also carry a legible health warning.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** That is an interesting point and I will certainly get a report on it.

### BHP

**Mr GREGORY:** Has the Minister of Labour seen the article in today's *Australian* relating to BHP's position as the world's cheapest steelmaker? Is the Minister in a position to comment on this article, given the recent accusations that Australian workers are to blame for this nation's economic ills, because they are overpaid, adopt restrictive work practices and cause untold needless industrial disputes?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I thank the honourable member for his question. The answer is, 'Yes', I did see the article in today's *Australian* and I was delighted to see that Australia had indeed become the world's cheapest steel producer, particularly as I live in and represent the steel city of Whyalla.

**Mr Becker:** How many people did they sack over the past few years to achieve that?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I will tell you that in a moment. It is all coming.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is not the place for a private discussion between two members.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** It was peaceful while he was away last week. The position is that in the past four years in the steel industry there has been a significant increase in productivity. That has been achieved in a tripartite way with an agreement that was reached between the Federal Labor Government when it first came into power, BHP and the steel industry unions. They sat down and discussed the position of the steel industry, having regard to the world market levels of productivity, work practices, and the like, and they have worked through those problems in those four years and arrived at a situation where they are now the cheapest steel producers in the world and are considering expanding the steel industry in Australia. I commend the Federal Government, the State Government, the manage-

ment of BHP, and the unions concerned for that great achievement, which benefits all Australians.

While on my feet, may I briefly contrast the attitude of BHP in dealing with the problems in the steel industry with the attitude, for instance, of Peko Wallsend, who seem to think that the very real problems existing in the iron ore industry can be solved by throwing workers out on to the street and saying, in effect, 'All the awards and agreements mean nothing. We are the boss. Out you go,' and that is the end of the story. That will suit some members opposite but not the more thoughtful members on that side, if there are any.

The problems in the iron ore industry, the heavy engineering industries and other industries can best be worked out, as BHP, the steel unions, and the Federal and State Governments have demonstrated, by consultation, arriving at agreements, and sticking to those agreements, rather than the perceived anti-Australian, but Liberal Party style, action. It is interesting to note that more and more employers are coming out and saying that the Peko Wallsend way is not the way to go and that agreement among BHP, the unions and the Government is the way to go. I am delighted that in a small way I have assisted by being part of that process.

### PROSTITUTION

**Mr LEWIS:** Having had 24 hours to sleep on it, does the Premier now know whether or not he supports the decriminalisation of prostitution?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question is out of order: it is a repetition of an existing question.

### RAILWAY POSTS

**Ms LENEHAN:** Will the Minister of Transport further investigate the removal of unsightly steel fence posts on the STA railway corridor between Hackham and Hallett Cove, on Edinburgh Crescent, Reynella? I have received a letter signed by all residents of Edinburgh Crescent who have asked me to contact the Minister regarding the removal of these posts. In part, the letter states:

An officer of the STA said that we could go ahead and remove them (the fence posts). However, these posts are in the ground up to six feet down.

As many tenants and ratepayers in this street are elderly, it is obviously impossible for them to remove the posts. We consider that the responsibility for their removal and landscaping the land rests with the STA. Will the Minister further investigate the removal of these fence posts?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for her question. She has put a persuasive case to the House as to why the STA and not the local residents should consider removing the unsightly fence posts. I shall have the matter investigated and bring down a report as soon as I can.

### GRAND PRIX

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Has the Premier made representations, or does he intend to make representations, to the Federal Government about the impact of its taxation policies on Grand Prix finances? The Chairman of the Grand Prix Board, Mr Tim Marcus Clark, has said that the major reason the 1986 event lost more than \$2 million was the Federal Government's decision to stop tax deductibility for corporate entertainment. This resulted in the Grand Prix



organisers being unable to sell some super gold reserve corporate boxes.

I have also been informed that the fringe benefits tax is another factor because of the way it is squeezing the car industry. One car company which had planned to spend \$120 000 on corporate involvement in this year's Grand Prix finally contributed only \$30 000. The financial results of this year's Grand Prix make clear that the Federal Government's—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member to order. I shall allow him to continue a little longer, but he is straying into comment as part of his explanation and, if he continues to do so, leave will be withdrawn.

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** The financial results of this year's Grand Prix make clear that the Federal Government's tax policies have significantly increased the net cost to South Australia of staging this event, and it is for this reason that I ask whether the Premier has made, or intends to make, representations to Canberra over the matter.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Before calling on the Premier, I point out that, if it is necessary for a member in asking a question to repeat it at the end of his explanation, that suggests that the explanation was excessively long. The honourable Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The effect described by the honourable member applies not only to the Grand Prix but, to the extent that there is any such effect, it would apply to any such event held in Australia. As members would be aware, we have made a number of representations to the Federal Government about the fringe benefits tax and its impact.

### APPRENTICESHIPS

**Mr De LAINE:** Can the Minister of Employment and Further Education say why it is deemed necessary for an applicant to have matriculated before he or she is considered suitable to be indentured into a trade apprenticeship? Over the years there has been a gradual raising of the minimum standard of educational requirements for young people wishing to become apprentices. In many cases the applicant is required to have matriculated. Some people are naturally talented towards practical 'hands-on' activities, while others are naturally talented academically: very few are talented in both areas. Therefore, many young people who wish to become apprentices and who would be happy to stay in their chosen trade for the rest of their working lives are denied the opportunity because they do not have the academic ability to matriculate.

On the other hand, many young people with the academic qualifications to gain apprenticeships use their trade training only as a stepping stone to higher studies and qualifications and are therefore soon lost to the particular trade. This is undoubtedly a major reason why Australia is beginning to experience a severe and serious shortage of skilled tradespeople.

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Most of the applicants for apprenticeships are expected to have completed 12 years education: that is to say, year 12. To use the term 'matriculated', as the honourable member has done, may give the impression that a certain set of courses available at year 12 is what is required of applicants for apprenticeships, but that is not the case. Year 12 consists of a series of courses offered by the Senior Secondary Assessment Board. Some of these subjects are externally examined or assessed, and others are internally assessed within the school structure, although moderated by the board. That procedure takes

over from the previous system of the Public Examinations Board exams, which were generally tertiary entrance exams, and the school standardised test (SST) subjects that were non-tertiary entrance.

Apprentices would often be doing SST subjects under the old system, or the non-tertiary entrance requirement subjects under the new system of SSABSA. The view held is that it is important that all young people get as good a general education as is possible, and we in South Australia have had the view of encouraging young people to stay on at school as long as possible before they start specialising in one area or another. Our efforts in encouraging young people to stay on to year 12 have been successful. In 1982, 38 per cent of age cohorts stayed on to year 12, and by 1985 the figure was 50 per cent. Indeed, we believe that the percentage should increase further still. That gives young people staying on to year 12 a good general education on which they can build with any form of further training or education that they want.

The honourable member mentioned those who would be happy to stay in their chosen trade for the rest of their working lives. Many of the trades involving apprentices will change significantly during the working lives of those people and it will be important for the people who have done these apprenticeships to have the learning skills with which they can train in other new areas as the trade in which they are trained changes over the 40 or 50 years that they have been involved in it. So there again general education is a very important thing for young people to have.

There are some exceptions, but we generally believe that young people should go on with a general education to year 12. This benefits not only their capacity to handle the apprenticeship but also their further life experiences. Given the 100 or so subjects available at year 12, we do not believe that this will count out some young people from being able to complete it. It is possible for the vast majority of young people to be able to do some subjects at year 12.

### DUBLIN TO WINDSOR PIPELINE

**Mr MEIER:** Is it acknowledged by the Minister of Water Resources that it will not be possible for the Health Commission to determine the concentration of chlorine or other substances in the water pipeline between Dublin and Windsor during the past summer and previous summers because the chlorine and other substances which were officially or unofficially placed in the pipeline have long since gone? Will the Minister give the House an assurance that a section of the suspect pipe will be removed forthwith to enable the existing contents of the pipe to be analysed immediately so that, if the pipe is at fault, it can be replaced before this summer and thus alleviate the fear of further people contracting cancer in the area?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** It is not acknowledged by me, but I am prepared to get whatever information I possibly can from my colleague the Minister of Health and make it available to the honourable member, to my department and to the House. It is not possible to move forthwith on the matter. I have publicly indicated what the timetable is, and we will adhere to that.

### ROAD UPGRADING

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** Can the Minister of Transport say when it is intended to complete the upgrading of the road link from Fullarton Road through Brownhill Creek to the

Old Belair Road? The Old Belair Road has been upgraded to an excellent standard. However, there is a build-up of traffic to an extent where constituents are complaining that it extends back into the Blackwood main street on some days, and in the evenings there is a build-up of traffic back along Fullarton Road, causing chaos. Work is required on only a short length of road connecting those two roads, and constituents have asked me to find out when the work will be carried out and completed.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. I acknowledge the Highways Department's appreciation of the congratulations offered by the honourable member for the work that it has done on the Old Belair Road. As to the other project mentioned by the honourable member, I will have to have a report prepared for me by the department, and as soon as it is available I will notify the honourable member.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ST VINCENT GULF PRAWN FISHERMEN

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**Mr HAMILTON:** During Question Time yesterday the member for Chaffey asked the Minister of Agriculture whether he had been approached by myself and a number of my colleagues on behalf of St Vincent Gulf prawn fishermen. It is not my intention to reflect on the very precise answer given by the Minister; suffice to say that it could be inferred from the member for Chaffey's question that I had not approached the Minister. I place on record that I did approach the Minister on behalf of a Mr Morris Corigliano and a Mr Norm Justice, but not on behalf of the St Vincent Gulf Prawn Fishermen's Association.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### APPROPRIATION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the Minister of Labour that he should not leave the Chamber while a message is being read to the House. Call on the business of the day.

#### CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Crown Lands Act 1929. Read a first time.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill is designed to allow any new land parcels created by the division of Crown lands or land held under Crown

tenures to be numbered as allotments in particular survey plans in a similar manner to divisions of freehold land. The Lands Department is implementing measures to simplify and unify certain survey plan procedures which are at present dealt with by different means in the Survey Division and the Registration Division.

The Crown Lands Act provides that town lands be described as allotments in townships and that other lands, mainly in rural areas, be numbered as sections. The removal of these limiting provisions will lead to greater efficiency and uniformity in the sequencing of land parcel mutations and related survey records. It will also present a unified approach to land subdivision, to the benefit of both the Government and the general public. The present Bill will enable varying procedures for land division within the department to be brought more closely into line with each other.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes the requirement for land in Government towns to be described as allotments and other land to be described as sections.

**Mr GUNN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Irrigation Act 1930. Read a first time.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

The Bill is designed to place the responsibility for the legal boundaries of leases issued under the Act within the source document which is the relevant survey plan. It will remove the necessity to maintain plans of irrigation areas signed by the Surveyor-General which are in fact the public map of the irrigation areas.

This amendment, in conjunction with the proposed amendment to the Local Government Act, will allow the update of the public map system to be terminated, particularly those in irrigation areas.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals the requirement that the Surveyor-General shall keep a plan signed by him showing the subdivision of land in irrigation areas which are in fact the public maps of the areas. Clauses 3 and 4 amend the second and third schedules to describe the land contained in leases by reference to the relevant survey plan rather than the plan lodged in the Department of Lands (public map).

**Mr GUNN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Lands)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act 1934. Read a first time.

**The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Bill

This Bill is designed to change the way in which some public roads may be created. It provides that those roads which were previously created by delineation on the public map will now be created either by the transfer of the relevant land in the case of freehold land or the surrender of land to the Crown in the case of Crown leasehold land for use as a public street or road. It also provides that Crown lands, which were formerly delineated as road on the public map but which will in future be dedicated as road by notice in the *Gazette*, will be defined as public road or street for the purposes of the Local Government Act.

In introducing the Bill, the Government is providing an alternative method of creating roads which will relieve the public map of its legislative responsibility for this function and place the action with the appropriate source action and document. Together with minor amendments to the Irrigation Act and the schedules to the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, the Bill will enable the continuing update of the public map system to be terminated.

The public map is confined to depicting lands and tenures of the Crown, and the Department of Lands is now reworking the former valuation map series into a single all purpose system which is known as the land tenure map series. This new series encompasses all the information shown on the public map together with tenure details of freehold land and information required by the Valuer-General. The series will serve all the needs of the department, other Government departments and the public at large for land tenure information and is available for public search. The land tenure map program is about 60 per cent complete and is scheduled for completion in 1988.

However, the accumulating cost savings and benefits promised by this program cannot be fully realised until amendments to the appropriate legislation are made to permit the termination of public map activity. These savings and benefits will accrue by eliminating significant duplication in updating two map series and by providing a series of maps free of legal constraint which will lend itself more easily to a more fully integrated and automated land information system.

The present Bill will provide the major thrust in achieving the proper benefits from the land tenure map series. The Department of Local Government has been consulted when necessary in formulating the proposal and has raised no objection to the amendment. Although other amendments to the Act are in train, they will not be ready for some time and the immediate benefit to be gained from the present amendment will far outweigh anything which may be gained by delaying it until the other amendments are ready for consideration.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2(a) adds to the definition of public road or street any land dedicated as road by notice in the *Government Gazette*; (b) defines as public road or street, any land transferred or surrendered to the Crown for that purpose.

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

### STEAMTOWN PETERBOROUGH (VESTING OF PROPERTY) BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 4 November. Page 1805.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to say very briefly that I support this Bill. As it will be referred to a select committee there is little point in making a speech of any length. However, I inform the Minister that this measure has my whole-hearted support. It is a matter which should never have had to be dealt with in this manner. Unfortunately, personalities being as they are—and to resolve what is a most difficult and complicated set of circumstances—it is necessary to legislate in this area. I sincerely hope that in future matters of this nature can be resolved without having to go to the length of bringing legislation before Parliament.

This measure has the support of the overwhelming majority of the citizens of Peterborough, of the corporation and of other people. I believe that any fair-minded person who has been involved in this exercise and who has read the evidence of the select committee will come to the conclusion that the only way to resolve this matter is by way of legislation of this nature. I think it is unfortunate that certain people who have played such a significant role in getting Peterborough's Steamtown organisation off the ground and operative have taken the action they have, which has resulted in this legislation.

I believe that if there had been a bit more goodwill on all sides it would not have been necessary, and the organisation could have grown and provided an opportunity for the travelling public to see at first hand a working steam train. I hope that, with the speedy passage of this legislation, the organisation again will be able to operate as an effective tourist attraction at Peterborough. I support the Bill and hope its passage through both Houses of Parliament will be speedy.

Bill read a second time and referred to a select committee consisting of the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore and Messrs Ferguson, Gunn, Hamilton, and Keneally; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 18 November 1986.

### DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 17 September. Page 933.)

Mr GUNN (Eyre): This matter has been on the Notice Paper for a considerable time. It is not a nation-rocking piece of legislation, even though it is in complete conflict with the measure we will be spending considerable time debating this afternoon. We have on the one hand this measure, which sets out to give the Minister of Agriculture the authority to restrict the issue of further dairy licences in South Australia, and to allow him, by way of ministerial direction, to carry out that course of action, which is a regulatory measure. It is the imposition of a system of quotas on industry. On the other hand, we have listed on the Notice Paper a measure which will do the exact opposite. So, we have a conflict. The Opposition believes that two improvements should be made to this Bill, and I hope the Minister will give it his serious consideration, because we do not want to unduly take the time of the House dealing with this measure and the other measure which will accompany it.

We believe that the Minister should not be given such extreme executive powers to determine whether people who wish to enter the industry have that right. We believe there ought to be an advisory committee, and I intend to move at the appropriate time amendments to that end. Further, I believe that it is essential that this legislation has a sunset

clause so that after it has operated for some 18 months, and we are aware of the implications the Kerin plan is going to have on the dairy industry in South Australia, we are then in a position to reassess the situation. If it is again necessary to bring to the House the ability of the Minister to restrict the issue of further licences, the Parliament ought to be asked to again consider it.

It is most unwise in my judgment (having been in this House for a considerable number of years) to give Ministers unfettered power. The Parliament should be very careful in transferring its authority to a Minister. Once we place power of this kind in the hands of a Minister, the Minister is never keen to come back to Parliament. He wishes to maintain that power in his hands, and the Parliament should be very careful and give great consideration to the matter before passing such rights to a Minister.

The Bill restricts the issue of further dairy licences, both in the metropolitan milk supply area and in the area covered by the Dairy Industry Act. But, of course, no restrictions are placed on production levels of existing dairy farmers. If the aim of this exercise is to restrict milk production in South Australia, there are many ways in which people could get around it if they so desired.

I have had discussions on this matter with the United Farmers and Stockowners and with the dairy industry, and I think it is fair to say that they are not particularly fussed whether this legislation is passed or not. If it is offered to them, they will accept it, but they do not regard it as a matter of great moment. I received from the United Farmers and Stockowners a letter dated 17 February (the matter has been on the Notice Paper for some time). Addressed to me, the letter states:

Thank you for your information regarding amendments to the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act. I wish to confirm my verbal advice regarding the UF&S attitude to this amendment Bill. Basically, amendments were sought by the South-East dairy farmers who believe without undue restraint the dairy industry in South Australia could become unviable in the total framework if unlimited licences were issued for milk producers. Accordingly, they concurred with the Minister that amendments to the licensing enabling the curtailment of licences would assist in the maintenance of an economically efficient dairy industry in South Australia. While the UF&S members have no strenuous objections to the legislation presented, we would nevertheless point out that it had been considered by us, rather than by the Minister being the sole determinant in the restrictions of licences, that the Dairy Industry Advisory Committee would be established to assist in such deliberations. While we still believe this would provide positive safeguards for such legislation, the committee nevertheless believes that the Minister's right to arbitrate restrictions of licence should not be seen as a reason to hold up the passage of this legislation.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** What does all that mean in straight language?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I am easily put off, and I am a very shy fellow.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member should be addressing the Chair and not taking any notice of the interjections.

**Mr GUNN:** Quite, Mr Deputy Speaker. As I was saying, I am easily put off and lose my place. The aspects of the Bill dealing with penalties obviously are a reaction to the attempts by the Bi-Lo organisation to enter into the field of discounting milk, which would have such a detrimental effect on those people involved in delivery. I, like most members, received a letter from the South Australian Mixed Business Association, and I quote from it:

The South Australian Mixed Business Association represents approximately 1 200 small food retailers, the vast majority of whom would sell milk, and we therefore support Mr Evans's Bill, for the following reasons:

1. Discounting of milk would have a disastrous effect on the livelihood of our members. Already this association is receiving reports from members outside the metropolitan area (where discounting is taking place) of a severe downturn in trade due to milk discounting.

2. Experience in other States has proved deregulation of milk prices has brought about an increase in prices.

I hope the Minister takes note of that when discussing another matter this afternoon. The letter continues:

3. Service to the community would suffer, particularly the aged and disabled, who depend upon the local shop and home deliveries (which would cease) for supplies.

4. The present penalty is insufficient to deter any retailer contravening the Act.

In the interests of small food retailers who are already experiencing economic difficulties, we urge your support for Mr Evans's Bill.

We do not have to support Mr Evans's Bill, because the Minister has quite drastically increased the penalties in relation to both these measures. I have received another letter, this time from the Master Retail Milk Vendors Association. I might just inform the Minister that I will not have any comments on the second measure, except to move my amendments. Really, both Bills are the same. The letter states:

If discounting does occur, the current marketing system will break down permanently, resulting in, eventually, the collapse of the retail vending system, due to loss of trade. This, in turn, would have the following consequences:

1. Bottle sales would vanish; consumers would no longer have the choice to buy 'pasteurised only' milk, which is available only in bottles.

2. Small businesses (delis, etc.) would suffer considerable loss of trade, which is generated by milk sales in their stores.

3. Many people, e.g. the elderly, the infirm, those with young families, the disabled, etc., rely heavily on the home delivery of milk. Discounting of milk would result in this service being no longer available.

4. As daily production of milk is constant, and discounting promotes bulk buying towards the end of the week, the result of such practices would be that a storage problem would be experienced by producers and/or manufacturers and would cause milk purchased by supermarkets to have a much reduced life when eventually sold to the consumer.

5. Discounting will cause much insecurity and instability in the milk industry, e.g. lack of expansion by dairy farmers and milk processors which may result in lost job opportunities in these areas, as well as in milk vending.

6. Sales and consumption of milk most certainly would drop if milk is no longer delivered to householders on a daily basis. This has been the experience in other areas and States which no longer enjoy a home delivery service.

7. In South Australia, over-production in the dairy industry is a widely recognised problem and any means to maintain our consumption rate must be encouraged.

8. Should milk only be available through shops and super markets, a steep increase in the price can be expected. This is evidenced in a comparison with bread, which has practically ceased being home delivered, and has dramatically increased in price. Not so long ago a loaf of bread was sold for approximately the same price as a bottle of milk. At present a loaf of bread costs more than twice the price of a bottle of milk.

I think that that letter clearly indicates the need to make sure that the practice of discounting advocated by the Bi-Lo group and others should not be encouraged. Therefore, I support the increase in penalties contained in this Bill.

I have some reservations about the process of restricting the issue of further licences. Having been in an industry which was affected on some occasions by the imposition of quotas I know the problems that can arise, and I believe that the two amendments that I will put forward later on behalf of the Opposition will resolve those concerns, fears and problems that I have briefly outlined. I conclude with those brief comments and will not reiterate my remarks in relation to the Bill that is complementary to this measure. I will be moving my amendments at the appropriate time.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I must admit, first, that I have a vested interest to a degree in this matter: even though I have received no income from this area for 15 years, I have a share in a dairy licence. I have the same reservations as the member for Eyre with regard to giving a Minister this sort of power.

**The Hon. Ted Chapman:** Those on the other side of the House.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** It does not matter what side of the House the Minister is from, because it is fair to say that in practice most human beings do not like giving up power unless it causes them a lot of bother. However, if it gives them a bit of status, the tendency of human beings is to hang on to it. I think that that is what the member for Eyre refers to when he says that there is a danger in this area.

There is no doubt that the member for Eyre is right when he says that there are ways of getting around this problem. One would have great difficulty saying to a farmer who farms 100 hectares and buys 200 hectares next door that he could not graze his dry stock and heifers on the newly acquired land and keep his milkers on the original 100 hectares, or cut a lot of fodder from that 200 hectares to supplementary feed his cows on the 100 hectares. People can get around that. I suppose that when this occurs (and it will occur) the person with the power—the Minister of the day—will come back to the Parliament and say, 'I want more power.' He or she may even argue that they have power under the present Bill. I doubt that that will be the case, even when the Bill becomes law.

I hold that concern. Discounting by other bodies will be picked up in another Bill later, but once Parliament gives the power to departments or individuals to control by licence we create problems for ourselves. The point arrives where individuals become dependent upon the licence—the licence is their protection. Those with the licence should regard it as a privilege and do all in their power to ensure that it is handled correctly and to become as efficient as they possibly can, considering weather factors, where a particular dairy is situated, the size of that dairy and how much should be spent on equipment or other facilities.

Often people have got into bother because they have over-capitalised the property for the size of their venture. In saying this, I give credit to the vast majority of South Australian dairy producers, who have proved themselves very efficient over the years. They have endeavoured to keep up with the times and to suffer the consequences of Government legislation by trying to work within it. I support the Bill. I will also support the amendments to be moved by the member for Eyre, because I believe that they will improve the legislation. Sunset clauses can be quite beneficial in keeping Ministers in order and in preventing them from taking their authority too far.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** Members on both sides of the House will recall that I took a fairly parochial view of actions taken by the Minister previously in relation to dairy legislation. I support this legislation and its aims. I do, however, share the caution expressed by other members on this side of the House that the Minister should not be given the extreme sweeping powers that this legislation gives him. This legislation could adversely affect the ability of young farmers who wish to enter the dairy industry in future years, but I believe that the Bill is directed towards survival of the dairy industry, and I support it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Minister may direct that no further dairy farm licences be issued in certain circumstances.'

**Mr GUNN:** I move:

Page 1, line 18—Leave out 'section is' and insert 'sections are'.

This amendment inserts a sunset clause in this measure, allowing it to expire on 30 June 1988.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** The Government is at a bit of a disadvantage here: first, we did not have the amendments, this being our first opportunity to look at them and, secondly, I would like comment from the Parliamentary Counsel in relation to this matter. I do not feel uncomfortable about the amendments, but I would like to ascertain that they actually meet the spirit of the Act.

**The CHAIRMAN:** This amendment has been on file for about eight weeks and we should have had the amendments before us before this time.

**Mr GUNN:** I do not want to apportion any blame, but I had the amendments drawn up a considerable time ago and I was of the view that they had been circulated. If there is any problem, I have to accept it, but I am just making that point.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Minister is conferring with Parliamentary Counsel.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** At this stage, in relation to the intention of clause 4, let me say that I do not feel uncomfortable about having an advisory committee or about having consultation with such a committee. I am perhaps going a bit beyond clause 4 at this point and flagging my views in relation to the constituency of such a committee, but I feel that it might be important to recognise on any committee (and certainly the member for Mount Gambier would probably want some comment on this) the interests of the South-East dairymen. In looking at this Bill, which of course directs itself in particular to that area, I think it is important to acknowledge their role and function in the industry as a whole. I need time to have discussions with the industry as a whole before we agree, certainly in principle, but also in relation to specifics and the details. I think we perhaps need the opportunity to consider this matter. I indicate to the member for Eyre that I am not offering my support at this point for a particular wording. However, certainly in principle I do not feel uncomfortable about the matter going to the other place and being returned to this place with certain amendments which we can then perhaps adopt.

**Mr GUNN:** I am happy not to proceed with the amendment at this stage, and to have it redrafted to include the extra dairy producer from the South-East, and I will get my colleagues in the other place to take the appropriate action. I hope that that will overcome the concerns of the Minister. I propose to move the first amendment to clause 4 and I will not insist on my second amendment, because it would be only a time wasting exercise.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Could I suggest that if the honourable member moves the amendment in that form it will not make sense. It is not for me to say, but I suggest that the honourable member might like to accept the Minister's assurance that he will look at these things when the matter goes before the other place. In the meantime, the honourable member will be able to get together and confer with his colleagues.

**Mr GUNN:** I take the advice from the Chairman that he believes that I cannot move the amendment, which was really inserting in the Bill a sunset clause. My understanding was that I had two separate amendments.

**The CHAIRMAN:** That is right, but the second part is consequential. The amendments are consequential on each other, and if the first amendment is carried the Bill will not make sense.

**Mr GUNN:** I am happy to withdraw the amendment, on the undertaking of the Minister of Agriculture that he will accept the first amendment, dealing with the sunset clause, and that he will give favourable consideration to the alterations to be made to the second amendment. I will make the necessary arrangements with my colleagues in another place. I think that we can resolve the matter in that way.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I am happy to look, in principle, at the idea of a dairy advisory committee. Parliamentary Counsel advises me that it is the best way to deal with this—that is, that the matter be dealt with in another place, following which the Bill will be returned to this place. Certainly, the director of the division feels that we ought to be taking into account the South-East farmers as well. I am sure that when the Bill comes back we can deal with it. In the interim, fruitful discussions can be undertaken between officers of my department, the member for Eyre, and all industry representatives, so that we can come up with a package that suits all needs, because I fear that if we left out the South-East Dairymen's Association there might be a hell of a reaction in the member for Mount Gambier's electorate, as they are affected directly in relation to licensing. So, I can say that I am prepared to give that undertaking.

I would like to make some comments about the particular aspects of this clause and its implications. It is important to note that I am not madly excited about Governments having a role in this sort of economic licensing process, but it seems to me that there is a feeling that the industry is interested in it, that it has some relevance because of certain implications in terms of the whole community. But its application and administration should be watched fairly carefully and monitored by Parliament as a whole. I know and understand the views that the member for Eyre has put forward, and I certainly share the majority of his views in relation to licensing of this sort, particularly where one is dealing with economic factors as against hygiene or proper standards of production.

In relation to the application of this Bill to amend the Dairy Industry Act, it seems to me that we must be very much aware of the importance of the role that the dairy industry plays. In relation to comments made by the member for Eyre and other members in relation to the delivery of milk to homes, in my opinion there is a particular and specific expectation within the community, and, of course, this fits in with that sort of infrastructure. That matter comes up in the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act Amendment Bill, but it is also important to note that aspect in relation to this clause.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 September. Page 933.)

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** The Opposition has made its view clear in relation to the previous matter, and I do not intend to go over it. I will not move the amendments that I moved on the last occasion but will accept the undertakings given by the Minister. We will pursue those matters in another place to bring into being the improvements that I outlined. The Opposition's view has not changed and, therefore, we will not delay the passage of this measure any further.

**Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport):** I introduced a private member's Bill in relation to this Act to increase the penalties for people who wanted to use their monetary power to destroy small operators. The Government, having the numbers, has used its power and this opportunity to delay discussion on my Bill until it got its own Bill up. With the resources that the Government has, I am surprised that it has had to resort to this sort of tactic against an individual who has no back-up staff. It is pretty poor.

I do not want to repeat all I said when I introduced my own Bill, which is on file. The Government has not responded, but I now have this opportunity to respond to the Government's Bill. There is no doubt that one super-market chain is out to enter into the field of discount merchandising to a greater degree than it has in the past. Its goal, in common with other big operators, is to discount until they remove the small operators from the market, when they can play around with the price in common with other operators who work with similar trade practices to the detriment of producers and consumers.

The people most disadvantaged initially by such action are milk vendors who deliver milk door to door. They, and indeed consumers, will be disadvantaged in the long term, and that will still be the case if we do not take action. Although we often think of milk vendors as people merely delivering milk to our houses, they carry out an important role in our society because there is much breaking and entering and other crime of all types, and there are fewer opportunities for the police to police. Our community is short of police and equipment, and Governments always seem to find an excuse why the police should not be properly equipped with manpower or equipment.

Therefore, having a milk vendor floating around in the early hours is important because they can notice the unusual that takes place. There is no doubt that if the police wished—although it would be detrimental to the overall cause—to make available the number of times that milk vendors had given them clues to major and minor crimes, we would all be amazed at the role that they play. That is one reason alone why we should ensure that milk vendors are not replaced or jeopardised by large operators.

The supermarket chain that tried to discount is owned by people who class me as a personal friend and whom I classify as friends. Therefore, it is not easy for me to stand up and say that we should not allow discounting to occur. However, I have a greater responsibility than just that connection, and I am sure that they realise that. I appreciate their right to use the law as much as they can to intrude into this field. However, I believe that there is a real threat, because the penalty is only \$200, that they will move into this area of merchandising milk in a big way by being willing to pay a fine of \$200 a time.

Whether the department would fine the company \$200 for each carton of milk sold, or for each day or week of trading, and so on, I do not know. I am not willing to take that chance—that is what it boils down to. Without going through all the arguments of the benefits of this service to the aged, the sick, the housebound and young couples both of whom may work and who have difficulties with transport if they live in outer suburbs (we do not have a good transport system in those areas), I would like to say that people trading as milk vendors are looking to this Parliament for some protection.

I support the Bill, except in that area where the Minister has not increased penalties sufficiently in regard to sections 44 and 49 of the Act, which are amended by clauses 5 and 7 of the Bill. I will move amendments to increase the penalties from \$2 500 to \$5 000 in each instance. Therefore,

I support the Bill only to the point that it gives me an opportunity to attempt to amend it later. Certainly, I hope that the House notes that there is concern on this side about how big business sometimes can exploit the community in the hope of improving its own position.

I wrote an article for the *Sunday Mail* some years ago, in which I said that a monopolistic system is just as objectionable as a communistic system, and I still believe that. Big business can be just as harmful to the rights of individuals and the opportunities to use one's own initiative to progress as can be a communistic system. So, there must be a balance. In this case, it might not be only a supermarket chain trying to get into the field. There is no doubt that if they got into the field they would look at taking over some of the processors. They would not have stopped at the point that they had reached but would have looked at processing plants, perhaps in other States, and they would have tried to play around with the Australian Constitution if they were determined enough.

There is a conflict when we come to the Hills because the metropolitan area cuts out just before places like Stirling and Bridgewater. This gives big companies a chance to exploit the system, because the Act does not apply in those outlying areas. The Minister will have to look at that aspect. Operators have a gentlemen's agreement and they are doing a great job. I support the second reading.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture):** I want to refer to a couple of points relating to the Bill. Other points have been raised. The penalty factor in regard to the metropolitan area was referred to by the member for Davenport. We know that Bi-Lo has been marketing by purchasing milk at the factory price of, I think, 59c a litre and delivering it to supermarkets in areas of the Adelaide Hills that are just outside the metropolitan milk boundary. The consequence of that is that the people in the Adelaide Hills are getting it for about 62c a litre.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** Some of them.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Yes, whereas others inside the metropolitan milk area are not. I do not know that Bi-Lo would want to be compared to a totalitarian government in its operation. We must consider the responsibility for the delivery of milk to the frail aged and the small children in our community and also be concerned about the overall economic viability and the necessary level of production so that we have a consistent supply of good quality milk to our community in the metropolitan area and throughout the State. However, this Bill deals only with the metropolitan community.

That is the basis of the Government's concern and its reason for sponsoring this Bill. This is an area in which we must tread with caution because of the obvious interference with the market forces that it contemplates. I do not feel wildly excited about the attitude that we are adopting in the Bill, but it is common to dairy industry legislation generally. The operation of this legislation must be closely watched. I have no difficulty in considering the amendments foreshadowed by the member for Eyre about an advisory committee or the sunset provision, because I believe that this type of legislation must be carefully monitored. Indeed, another Bill to be introduced later deals with that aspect.

In expressing the Government's point of view on the application of this Bill as it relates to the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, I point out that there is community support for milk delivery by vendors to the home. Indeed, that practice has been supported to a degree by the community's response to the legislation. I believe that all members have

received representations from vendors and the public regarding the supply of milk, and it would appear from the information provided by the industry that there could be a massive collapse of the home delivery service if we removed the present price structure mechanisms.

However, that is a subject for debate and we must keep this aspect of the legislation under review because of what might happen in other States. In fact, moves are afoot in Victoria for a review of the industry. I support the Bill, but I must have the ability to review any of those mechanisms if market factors or community attitudes change. For instance, if there is a move away from the system of milk delivery by vendor, one may not be able to support this legislation past the factory door or the farm gate.

**Mr S.G. Evans:** Then it will have to come back to Parliament.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Certainly, it should be done in that way. Obviously, I would not be here today sponsoring the Bill if it was not to be tested in that way. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, and other of my metropolitan colleagues on both sides have been contacted by concerned milk consumers and also vendors, of whom there are about 400 or 500 in the metropolitan area, all of whom are concerned about the impact of any changes, especially a possible attack by Bi-Lo which was referred to by the member for Davenport. Admittedly, as the honourable member said, Bi-Lo may challenge constitutional aspects of the legislation, and that course of action is open to it at any time, as everyone knows. We need to keep under review the provisions of the legislation that interfere with market forces operating in the industry. After all, this Bill interferes with the free market forces that could operate and it does not lend itself to the *laissez faire* system of finding supply and demand and pricing as a consequence. I make these comments to qualify the overall thrust of the Bill, so that it is not taken as an open cheque as regards its impact on the industry as a whole, whether in the metropolitan area or in country areas.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

**Mr GUNN:** In view of the undertakings given by the Minister that he is not unfriendly towards my amendments but needs time to consider them, I shall not move them now but will make any adjustments that the Minister considers necessary and have them moved and discussed in another place. I therefore will not proceed with my amendments at this stage.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Refusal of licences.'

**The CHAIRMAN:** There is a correction to line 27: the word 'declaration' should be 'direction'.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—'Rights of holders of milk treatment licences.'

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I move:

Page 2, line 2—Leave out '\$2 500' and insert '\$5 000'.

This amendment relates to people who hold a milk treatment licence, mostly big operators. If one of these operators contravenes an order, he or she is liable to a fine of \$200 under the present legislation. The Bill provides that that sum shall be increased to \$2 500, but to the big operator that is not much money. If the Committee increases the penalty to \$5 000, that will be the maximum, and a court will impose a fine of whatever amount it considers warranted.

Parliament does not change penalties very often. Indeed, 10 years may pass before a penalty is increased and, if we bear in mind that the inflation rate is about 8 per cent a year, that makes the increase in this case, to \$2 500 accord-



ing to the Bill, very minor. My amendment does not affect the Government's philosophy or the Bill's operation, and it does not do any harm. However, it allows the courts to impose a maximum fine of \$5 000 on people who, holding a licence, seriously contravene an order. I ask members to support my amendment, which allows for the present inflationary trend and for the continuation of that trend for a certain period in future.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I oppose the amendment, on the basis of the honourable member's own comments. We cannot be seen to be imposing draconian penalties in this legislation. After all, a prosecution may be launched each consecutive day on which an offence is committed and we are here considering someone who commits an offence and then deliberately commits the same offence on following days. Such an offender can suffer a penalty that increases by \$2 500 a day. Anyone breaching this area of the legislation would find it extremely expensive. I imagine that they would take other measures rather than commit this type of breach. Therefore, I think this penalty is adequate. I seek the Committee's support in retaining the penalty as it appears in the Bill.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** The Minister suggests that a factory could continue to commit an offence day after day and that the penalty would be too severe if the court imposed a fine of \$2 500, which is the Bill's maximum. I point out that the court would decide that and, more particularly, the Minister of the day would decide through his advisers how tough the provision should be. The Minister would decide how many offences should be prosecuted. No one can argue against that because in the end the buck stops with the Minister. I do not accept the Minister's argument.

I am disappointed. In a couple of years this fine will be insignificant and we will have to repeat this process, wasting time by recording the debate in *Hansard*. Leave it to the court. The court will make the decision on the seriousness of the offence, given the penalty provided in the legislation. It amazes me that, because this amendment comes from the Opposition, the Minister will not agree to it. That is a bad attitude to adopt in Parliament. The Minister knows from the Bill that I introduced previously that I want a fine of \$5 000. I think all milk vendors wrote in saying that they supported this.

The industry wants it. At no time have I mentioned the name of any supermarket—and I will not do that. I believe the practice of naming names should stop in this place, especially when we can make a general reference. If other members get away with the practice of naming names, other members will try to be in on it. We do not need to name people in *Hansard*, but that is occurring. I am disappointed that the Minister will not accept the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

*While the division was being held:*

**The CHAIRMAN:** There being only one member on the side of the Ayes, I declare that the Noes have it.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Penalty.'

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** I move:

Page 2, line 6—Leave out \$2 500 and insert \$5 000.

I am not allowed to allude to a previous debate, but I previously spoke on a similar subject. I ask members to think back to those words when I suggested quite strongly that milk vendors should be protected. One way of doing that is to ensure that the penalty is severe enough to frighten big operators in supermarkets who try to put small milk vendors out of business which, in the long term, harms the

profitability of producers and increases the cost to the consumer. I ask members to support my amendment.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** For the information of members and the public, we are increasing the penalty in this provision from \$200 to \$2 500. My comments earlier on being able to enforce penalties daily also apply to this clause. So the situation would be that anyone who contravenes the provision would incur that penalty recurrent for each day thereafter that they continued to be in breach or deliberately and flagrantly avoided the legislation by some means. I believe that this provision is certainly ample, and I point out that even the \$200 fine seems to have discouraged supermarket chains from entering the metropolitan milk supply areas. So it seems to me that it is not necessarily the penalty that has been the main discouragement: it is perhaps the public reaction that has caused those concerned to rethink their position. Certainly, I think that, if they have been discouraged by a fine of \$200, they will be discouraged by a fine of \$2 500.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Well, you can have a fairly draconian measure. The penalties in clauses 6 and 7 have been increased and I think they are quite adequate. Of course, you can use a sledge-hammer to crack a nut. In my opinion the member for Davenport's amendment is the sledge-hammer treatment.

**Mr GUNN:** As these are maximum penalties the Opposition understands why they have been moved. The Opposition will support it. However, I think any of these matters should be kept under constant review as should the organisations which have the responsibility for implementing them, to make sure that the provisions which they are enforcing are required and meet the current circumstances.

**Mr S.G. EVANS:** This fine was last changed 12 years ago, when it was \$1 200, and taking the period of 10 years at 10 per cent, the fine, to be in comparison, would have to be about \$11 000. That is the sort of figure we are talking about. The figure I am talking about is about half what it should be if we compare it to when we first introduced the penalty in 1946. That is where we get into the stupid thinking about when we used to buy a pound of butter for about one tenth of the price we do today. Inflation has killed that.

If we are to talk in real terms, with that comparison when we took it to \$200, this figure should be \$10 000 or \$11 000; in fact, we could say more than that. I am saying that \$5 000 is appropriate and I know that a lot of people would be disappointed that the Minister does not have the courage to say that the Opposition is right for once, that the Bill is before the Committee and that he is prepared to accept this as an appropriate fine when we look at other penalties applied to other laws. I have asked the Minister to have a look at the sort of penalty we apply, and he has agreed that he will look at something in the Upper House for the member for Eyre, as the shadow Minister, although he has not said, 'Yes, we'll accept it.' This proposition has been before the Parliament for weeks, and I ask the Minister to accept it.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I am prepared to accept the member for Eyre's amendments and have indicated that, in relation to the principle. I want to talk to the industry about the detail of it, so I am not putting my head in the sand and ignoring the point raised by the member for Eyre. I resent the comments of the member for Davenport in not being able to acknowledge that I, in fact, have had the decency and ability to accept in principle the point raised by the member for Eyre.

I think that the member for Davenport's comments are totally out of tune with my response to those earlier amend-

ments and, certainly, it is not worthy of the honourable member to make them in these circumstances. I believe, in relation to the penalty situation, that these are adequate and supportable and, if the member looks at what is happening in the real world in terms of the instance to which he referred, the circumstances of the very minor penalty which he said has not been reviewed now for 12 years, in fact, was discouragement enough for the group of companies concerned not to invade the market in the metropolitan milk supply area.

So, it seems to me that the adjustment suggested here is reasonable and sensible. If I thought there was some shortcoming in the Bill, I would be happy to accept an amendment and I am sure that, when he sees that the Bill as returned from another place, there will be amendments which I will be happy to accept. I make those comments to him so that *Hansard*, at least, acknowledges the correct situation that I have adopted in relation to some amendments from the Opposition.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16)—Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, D.S. Baker, S.J. Baker, Becker, and Blacker, Ms Cashmore, Messrs Chapman, Eastick, S.G. Evans (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, Ingerson, Meier, Oswald, and Wotton.

Noes (25)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Blevins, Crafter, De Laine, Duigan, and M.J. Evans, Ms Gayler, Messrs Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hoggood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes (teller), Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Rann, Robertson, Trainer, and Tyler.

Pairs—Ayes Messrs Lewis and Olsen. Noes—Messrs McRae and Slater.

Majority of 9 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### EGG CONTROL AUTHORITY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 October. Page 1516.)

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** The Opposition is totally opposed to this measure. This Bill comes to the House with a lack of proper discussion or consideration of the views of the egg industry and the farmer organisations. It fails to properly understand that the process of orderly marketing of primary products has been one of the success stories and the hallmarks of our successful agricultural industries in this State. This measure cuts right across those principles for which I believe the Labor Party has stood for many years: that is, adequate, full and proper consultation with the people affected before the legislation is brought before the Parliament.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I do not need to be told by the little impudent wimp who has never managed to be involved in primary industry or agriculture about what effects this legislation will have on primary industry. The United Farmers and Stockowners of this State believe that this measure is the test case in relation to statutory marketing in this State. The Liberal Party, as the largest group representing rural industry in this State, would be failing in its obligations to the people who have built South Australia and who will maintain the standard of living that we have in this State by the export income that they generate if we did not make the most vigorous opposition to this proposal.

The Opposition has been attacked and maligned in the Minister's second reading explanation. In my 17 years in this Parliament this is the first occasion on which I have had to sit and listen to a second reading explanation which has made such an outrageous and inaccurate attack upon the credibility of producers, upon the Opposition and upon other people in this Parliament. It is traditional in this place that when second reading explanations are given they are factual, accurate and do not contain the sorts of slurs and attacks made in this Bill.

*Mr Tyler interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The honourable member will have an opportunity to tell the House how little he knows about this subject, and many others, at the appropriate time. I suggest that this is an important debate and that we do not want to be here all night. Commonsense should apply and the honourable member should at least have the courtesy to allow the Opposition to have its say on this measure. The Opposition is not, and never has been opposed to responsible deregulation. It was the Tonkin Government which put into effect in this State a sensible program of deregulation, lifting of controls and repealing of unnecessary Acts of Parliament.

I foreshadow for the benefit of members opposite my intention shortly to again bring to the Parliament a piece of legislation that will set up a parliamentary committee to consider the future of all statutory authorities in this State—legislation based on the unsuccessful Tonkin legislation which did not proceed in the Upper House. However, commonsense has to apply, and the Liberal Party supports a competitive and commercially oriented marketing system for primary products. It acknowledges the need for the operation of statutory marketing authorities, where sought and supported by producers. Such authorities must have commercial flexibility and be accountable to Parliament and the industries concerned.

The Liberal Party believes that the present Egg Board does need certain streamlining. Areas within its operation that can be improved, and action ought to be taken to improve the egg marketing system in South Australia. However, that is not a reason why the existing operation should be completely overturned on the whim of the Minister or a few political activists who have influenced him and his colleagues. I suppose that this legislation ought to be called 'the Blevins proposal', because it was initiated by the Hon. Mr Blevins as Minister of Agriculture and has been carried on by the present Minister. However, one unfortunate aspect of this legislation is the attempt to raise community expectations of considerable savings for consumers.

**Mr D.S. Baker:** At the expense of producers.

**Mr GUNN:** Exactly, at the expense of producers. However, no evidence has been provided to this Parliament, the producers, or to the community at large to support and justify those claims. This legislation was introduced as a result of an alleged inquiry. We have not seen the results of that inquiry. We do not know what it contained. Why not let us have on the table of this House all the evidence presented to that inquiry? We are quite happy to answer, debate and discuss any of that evidence, but let us have it on the table in the House so that the people of this State are in a position to make a judgment on it.

It is very easy to make decisions based on some illusory inquiry if one does not have to front up with the evidence. I do not in any way object to the Egg Board being subjected to proper consideration and examination, but, in so doing, commonsense ought to apply and there ought to be an opportunity for all sections of the community in public—not behind closed doors—to put their point of view, and

then everyone who is interested can read those submissions and comment upon them. When decisions are made in the back rooms of the Labor Party by their political activists and others, commonsense rarely prevails.

I want to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table containing information that has been provided to me regarding the variation in egg prices at various outlets. As I said earlier, the Minister has indicated to the public at large that there will be some 20c to 30c a dozen saving to the consumer on the cost of eggs. We have not seen evidence of that, but I have available to me in this chart a range of prices gathered from surveys conducted by the Egg Board of a number of supermarkets on a weekly basis in South Australia.

I point out to the Minister and to the Government the range of those variations. For instance, on 26 September, the variation was 23c; on 19 September, it was 19c—and that is between one supermarket and another (and approximately 12 supermarkets are surveyed each week); on 12 September, the variation was 19c; on 5 September, 19c; on 29 August, 25c; on 15 August, 25c; on 1 August, 22c; on 25 July, 22c; on 11 July, 22c; on 4 July, 21c; on 27 July, 31c; and on 20 July, 21c.

I hope that the member for Florey is taking note of all these prices because we are looking forward to his response. I continue with my list of variations: 13 June, 22c; 6 June, 22c; 30 May, 22c; 9 May, 31c—and the wholesale price on that day was \$1.70; 23 May, 29c; 2 May, 29c; 25 April, 33c; 18 April, 29c; 11 April, 24c; 4 April, 31c; and 28 March, 39c; 21 March, 39c; 14 April, 42c—and on that day the wholesale price was \$1.70.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** That hardly rates as a built-up price, does it?

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Gayler):** Order!

**Mr GUNN:** The member for Light picks up the point I was making. On 7 March the variation was 32c; on 28 February the wholesale price remained at \$1.70 and the price variation was 49c. On 21 February the wholesale price was \$1.70, with the variation between those two figures that I mentioned being 46 cents. On 14 February, with the wholesale price remaining at \$1.70, there was a variation of 42 cents. Referring again to 7 February, the wholesale price was \$1.70, the variation being 42 cents. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a statistical return indicating the variation in prices.

Leave granted.

#### RETAIL EGG PRICES

Week ending 15 February 1985 (Wholesale \$1.65)

Refers to 55 gm eggs:

Retailer	Range of Retail Price Operating			Variation Between Highest and Lowest
	Highest	Medium	Lowest	
A	1.87	1.79	1.68	0.19
B	1.79	1.77	1.74	0.05
C	1.76	—	1.74	0.02
D	1.74	—	1.70	0.04
E	—	—	—	—
F	1.86	—	—	—
G	1.90	—	1.80	0.10
H	1.90	—	—	—
I	1.77	—	—	—
J	1.74	—	—	—

Retailer	Range of Retail Price Operating			Variation Between Highest and Lowest
	Highest	Medium	Lowest	
K	1.74	1.66	1.52	0.22
L	1.77	—	—	—
M	2.25	1.89	1.69	0.56

Maximum Variation over all retail outlets visited— Highest: 2.25  
Lowest: 1.52  
Variation: 0.73

**Mr GUNN:** Again, on 31 January, with the wholesale price at \$1.70, there was a variation of 42 cents. On 26 January, there was a variation of 34 cents. I could go through and quote a lot more, but I will skip a considerable number of pages. I then come to 15 March 1985, when there was a variation of 52 cents per dozen, the wholesale price being \$1.65. On 8 March 1985, the wholesale price was \$1.65, the variation being 26 cents. On 1 March 1985, with a wholesale price of \$1.65, there was a variation of 52 cents a dozen. On 15 February 1985, the wholesale price was \$1.65, and there was a variation of 73 cents a dozen. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a further table of figures of a statistical nature.

Leave granted.

#### RETAIL EGG PRICES

Week ending 7 February 1986 (Wholesale \$1.70)

Refers to 55 gm grade

Retailer	Range of Retail Price Operating			Variation Between Highest and Lowest
	Highest	Medium	Lowest	
A	2.17	1.95	1.75	0.42
B	2.09	—	1.93	0.16
C	1.90	—	1.87	0.03
D	1.92	1.87	1.83	0.09
E	—	—	—	—
F	1.98	—	1.96	0.02
G	1.98	1.85	1.78	0.20
H	—	—	—	—
I	1.96	—	1.93	0.03
J	1.89	—	1.86	0.03
K	1.96	1.93	1.87	0.09
L	1.96	1.93	1.87	0.09
M	1.99	—	—	—

Maximum Variation over all retail outlets visited— Highest: 2.17  
Lowest: 1.75  
Variation: 0.42

**Mr GUNN:** Referring to 1 February 1985, the wholesale price was \$1.65 and there was a variation of 52 cents, and on 25 May 1984, with a wholesale price of \$1.63 there was a variation of 22 cents. I believe that those documents indicate clearly that savings as alleged by the Minister are quite fictitious and cannot be justified, as I have clearly shown what the marketplace can do with the price.

I now turn to one or two other matters in relation to this unfortunate Bill. Little thought has been given to what effect this legislation will have on future investment in the industry, because the Bill itself grants to the Minister wide ranging powers to dispense once and for all with a hen quota system. We are not arguing today whether that is a good or a bad thing; it is here; it has been enacted by legislation, and, if this Parliament passes this proposal, what will happen to producers in other rural industries who have paid money for licences, to people who have bought fishing licences, to people who have purchased hotels, and to others who have

paid licence fees for other things that are set up under Statute?

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** Taxes.

**Mr GUNN:** Yes. They must all be under attack, because we are dealing with a fundamental principle where people have invested large amounts of money. They now run the risk, at the whim of the Minister and the Government of the day, of losing, without any consideration of compensation, that large investment. It is not a matter that can be treated lightly or that should be passed over. We must give very careful consideration to allowing clause 29 and clause 30 of this Bill to stand, because if we agree to those provisions we shall place in jeopardy all those hen quotas and the future of many people who are associated with the egg industry.

In my judgment, it is not good enough to accept that this proposal will not be implemented for five years, as the Minister indicated to the House in his second reading explanation, because no-one can plan on a five year basis. What we have to do in this industry and in other industries in this State is to inject confidence for people to invest. We want people to do that. The Prime Minister has gone around the country imploring people to invest in industry. For people to invest they must have security of tenure and title, and they must have confidence. If we pass measures of this nature we will destroy all those ingredients that are necessary to inject confidence.

Heaven help us in that we have too few businesses in this State. Currently we have an industry that is not a burden on the taxpayer. It has been built up over many years. It guarantees quality and supply. It is a locally based South Australian industry and it employs South Australians. If this legislation was unfortunately to come into effect (although it will not; it will be defeated, I am pleased to say, as the numbers are there to defeat it), we would risk handing over a large part of the egg industry in South Australia to interstate interests.

I have been reliably informed that already producers have been approached by large international combines seeking to purchase their entitlements. Does the Government want that to occur? Does the Government want to hand over the local South Australian market to interstate producers, at the expense of South Australia and South Australians who are employed in the industry? That is some of the basis of our opposition.

*The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** It will; unfortunately, a monopoly situation will tend to prevail. I believe that people in South Australia should have the right to operate their businesses free from the sort of pressures and the problems that would be inflicted on them. It is no good quoting interstate examples, because they do not stand up to proper scrutiny. We know that people in New South Wales are in financial difficulties, and that in that State they can purchase their feed a lot cheaper. One of the problems in South Australia concerns another area for which the Minister has responsibility: producers must buy their meatmeals from Samcor at a rather inflated price. I could speak further on that, but I will not do so at this time.

I am concerned about the 400-odd producers in this State and their families. One would have thought that before proceeding with this legislation the Minister and the Government would have undertaken lengthy and ongoing discussions with the industry in South Australia and taken account of the views of the producers and the organisations that represent them. We all agree that the Egg Board ought to be reduced in size. However, it is not the fault of the producers, nor that of members on this side of the House,

that the size of the Egg Board was increased by two members. That was the direct result of actions taken by the Labor Government. People must remember very clearly that the affairs of this State have been administered for 14 out of the last 17 years by Labor Governments.

**Mr Rann:** Because you keep losing elections—because your Leader is not much cop.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Gayler):** Order!

**Mr GUNN:** The brainchild from the back bench—the voice from the back bench. May I say that he will stay on the back bench for a long time into the future. He will make one move—back to the corner behind me, the drop-off seat. That is the only place that the honourable member will go to.

**Mr Rann:** Not in your lifetime.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Eyre will direct his comments to the Bill.

**Mr GUNN:** Certainly. I do not need the assistance of the member for Briggs, who has probably been one of the political activists involved in dreaming up this measure. I was saying that the industry ought to be given the opportunity to put its point of view and that proper consideration should be given to those views. I have received a considerable amount of correspondence, and I hope that the Minister will respond in some detail to some of the comments that have been made. I refer first to a letter that I received from the Housewives Association. It is addressed to me—

**Mr Hamilton:** What date was that?

**Mr GUNN:** It is dated 12 September 1986. The letter, which is signed by Loraine Frost, Organising Secretary of that association, states:

I am writing to express the Housewives Association's concern about the proposals announced by the State Government to partly deregulate the egg industry in South Australia, including the abolition of the South Australian Egg Board.

It is our understanding that the Egg Board and egg marketing arrangements in this State enable consumers to have a consistent year round supply of eggs at prices that are highly comparable to other basic food items. We also believe that the Egg Board maintains strict quality guidelines from farm to shop. As well, the Egg Board conducts nutrition and education programs for schools, housewives and other organisations which are very much appreciated by the general community.

We are concerned that if there is no Egg Board then many of these quality controls and programs will also be abolished leaving the consumer in the hands of big business who will only be interested in their percentage mark-up.

Finally, we believe the board plays a vital role in the market place by providing a link between producers and consumers. This is reflected in the composition of the board that has members who have consumer interests at heart. We therefore support the retention of the South Australian Egg Board and associated orderly marketing arrangements.

That letter refers to consumer representatives. The consumer representative on the board has spoken in public and made her views known clearly. She cannot understand why the Government has embarked on this course to abolish the board. Indeed, she had great difficulty in conveying those views to the Minister; she could not get to see him, although she was the first appointment that was made by the Labor Party to try to get the board to see the Government's point of view.

Having failed in that appointment, the Government appointed another person—as I understand it, a person that was very active in Labor Party ranks—to try to undermine the board and to get it unrealistically to reduce prices. The public of South Australia have not been told by the Minister and by those supporting his proposals that the farmgate price is set by the Department of Agriculture, based on the cost of production. That is not an unreasonable way to set prices—based on the cost of production.

There are no controls on the price which shopkeepers and supermarkets can place on eggs. They can set the price at whatever figure they like. As I have already pointed out in this Chamber, there is a wide variation in the prices available in supermarkets in this State. If the Government wants to go down this road of deregulation, why does it not deregulate the labour market, because we would then be willing to enter into meaningful discussions with it? The Government should not merely select the 400 egg producers who are small in number. Unfortunately, the Government is adopting a very similar attitude to the attitude that the Commonwealth Government adopted in regard to the wine industry which, because of its small numbers, could be attacked, because its views were not of great importance.

The Liberal Party in this State believes that these people have a right to be protected, that commonsense should prevail and that the system of orderly marketing which has been the foundation of successful agriculture in South Australia, should not be undermined in this manner. I want now to refer to a copy of a letter that was sent to the member for Chaffey by Mr Fielke, as follows:

As Chairman of the Eastern Egg Producers of South Australia I write to you in regards to the Bill which will shortly be brought before the House pertaining to the partial deregulation of the South Australian Egg Board. As you would be aware the majority of producers in this State have expressed deep concern over the proposals and urge you as our member and as a member of the Opposition, along with your colleagues, to strongly oppose the Bill. We as a group believe that for the betterment of all producers and the public generally an efficient, effective board is essential. Hoping for your utmost support.

I have received a copy of the letter from Mr Fielke which he sent to the Minister on 13 October and in which he states:

The Eastern Producers of South Australia totally reject the legislation presented to the House by the Minister of Agriculture, Mr Mayes, relating to the partial deregulation of the South Australia egg industry as it will not protect producer income nor reduce long-term prices to consumers. The Eastern Egg Producers refute the suggestion of the Minister that producers favour the proposed Act. In addition the proposed Act will make us vulnerable to interstate pressures, to gain control of our industry.

Further to the resolution, the following points support our point of view:

As producers we are very concerned that the legislation before the House will have an adverse effect on those producers who are at a disadvantage because of distance from major markets, for example, major towns or Adelaide.

Further to the motion, we have been informed that already two major producers have been approached by interstate interests regarding sale of their farms since the announcement of your impending legislation, thus encroaching on the interests of other producers, large and small. Many of our producers in the State are considered small by standards, but form an integral part of our industry. The legislation, as it stands, appears to show little concern for them. A major concern of our producers is the pulping of eggs in this State. As producers, we have financed the establishment of the existing pulping plant and the necessary working capital. If it is sold, it is inevitable that we will have to re-establish not one, but at least a couple of pulping plants, complete with working capital. This cost will surely be passed back to producers.

Cost of production surveys in New South Wales by various departments indicate that producers in that State are receiving a nil return on capital. This can obviously not continue, and in fact Mr Baxter, the Chairman of the New South Wales Egg Corporation, has indicated that he will guarantee a return of 15 per cent on capital. There will have to be a dramatic increase in prices in that State to facilitate this objective. Sir, we urge you to carefully reconsider your proposal to ensure the continual survival of all producers, large or small, and the South Australian egg industry in the future.

That is a well put together submission to the Minister of Agriculture, and I will await with interest the Minister's response to it. In the course of the Minister's statement allegations were made that sections of the industry have stood over other producers to make them support this meas-

ure. That is a most serious allegation, and I call on the Minister to inform the House of those people who are responsible for these alleged standover tactics. If that has taken place, the police should be informed. We are constantly lorded over on a daily basis by the Premier and others who say that, if people have complaints to make, they should go to the police. I want to know whether the Minister or his informants have taken up these matters with the police so that these charges can be investigated.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I know that the Minister made the allegations. The honourable member has obviously not read the second reading speech. In his second reading explanation, the Minister clearly indicated to the House and the public of South Australia that certain producers and others have stood over the majority of producers to ensure that they continue to oppose this measure. Those are serious allegations to make, and they should be supported by the tabling or production in this House of evidence to support those claims. If the Minister has evidence, it should be given to the police so that they can prosecute the people concerned. I want to continue to quote from the United Farmers and Stockowners, who have written to all Liberal and Democrat members in the Legislative Council. In a letter of 27 October, they state:

As you will be aware, it is the intention of the Government to introduce legislation which will partially deregulate the South Australian egg industry. It is intended to achieve this through the repeal of the two existing Acts relating to egg marketing in South Australia and the enactment of the Egg Control Authority Act 1986. The UF&S is gravely concerned that the proposed legislation does not achieve benefits for either producers or consumers and does not assist in the efficient rationalisation of the industry in this State.

My organisation totally opposes clauses in the Act that allow the Minister to remove all marketing and production controls applying to the egg industry at his discretion, without reference to Parliament. The UF&S considers this is a dangerous precedent and one which should be rejected by Parliament. The UF&S also considers that, if this Bill is passed, all other marketing arrangements for primary producers in South Australia will be at extreme risk under the current Government. I therefore seek your support in rejecting the Egg Control Authority Act when it is presented in the Legislative Council. Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact either myself or . . .

That is a clear statement of policy and concern by the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia, who have clearly indicated to the people of this State their concern about the general principles and the future of agriculture. I point out (and the Minister and the Government should clearly understand this) that Australians eat the cheapest and the best quality food in the world.

**The Hon. M.K. Mayes:** It could be a lot cheaper.

**Mr GUNN:** At a cost to the producer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! This is not a shouting match between the two sides of the House.

**Mr GUNN:** It has been indicated that our food could be much cheaper, but I wonder how. As one who has spent almost a lifetime in primary industry, I know that the only way to reduce prices is to reduce the producer's costs. There is no other way that prices can be reduced. If anyone thinks that primary producers today are getting a fair and reasonable return on their capital, I suggest that that person look at the figures issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to ascertain what is the producers' net return. Thousands of producers will have a minus income for the current financial year.

Therefore, I reject out of hand the suggestion that the Government can drastically reduce the price of agricultural products to the consumers of this State and nation without turning our primary producers into peasant farmers. Indeed,

those who are engaged in rural industry in this State are being turned into peasant farmers. If the Government believes that it can do away with the primary producing sector, heaven help the people of this State who are involved in primary industry and those who rely on it. My concern for primary industry is even greater now. I have received a huge amount of correspondence on the subject matter of the Bill and have selected only a few quotations for members. Mr John Harvey has written to me, as follows:

As a producer member of the South Australian Egg Board with an 18 000 bird quota at McLaren Flat, I write to you in relation to the proposed legislation presently being put forward by Mr Mayes. Such legislation is neither workable nor practical and will lead to interstate trading—with the big operators getting bigger and the small being forced out of the industry, with the consumer eventually paying more for a poorer quality product. The New Zealand situation, where similar legislation has been introduced, supports the above. The South Australian Egg Board must remain, and I accept that there are further cost savings to be made even though they have reduced their staff from 35 to 20 over the past 18 months.

It is felt the existing board should be reduced to five—two producer members, two Government appointees, and a part-time chairman (a course of action that the Opposition completely supports) with the staff being reduced from 20 odd to 10 persons, plus casual labour on pulping as necessary. The existing hen levy could then be reduced from the current 13 cents per fortnight to 6 cents per fortnight. The South Australian Egg Board must retain the pulping plant, inspectors, marketing, quality control and a fixing of farm price. The pulping plant is the shock absorber to the industry, and the existing way in which the board levies all producers is the only fair way to operate.

The board has been criticised by the Minister for:

- (1) Maintaining a high price for eggs;
- (2) 'Standover tactics' with producers.

The answers to the above are as follows:

(1) (a) the retail price is not set by the South Australian Egg Board;

(b) the farm gate price is based on a cost of production done by the Department of Agriculture;

(c) prices have been compared to New South Wales—whose prices of feed are lower;

(d) because New South Wales has had their problems with a few producers who were not doing the right thing, the board kept the prices down; however, these problems have now been overcome and prices are firming.

(e) producers in New South Wales, in the meantime, have been living on their depreciation.

(2) I can assure you the South Australian Egg Board has not used stand-over tactics and has bent over backwards to maintain harmony with the producers.

I plead with you to block this legislation, as the poultry industry will be down on its knees and will finish up like the wine industry looking for Government handouts or, as in other countries, with large surplus production which, in turn, is wasting the taxpayer's money. It must be remembered that the South Australian Egg Board has been self-sufficient and has not had any Government subsidies. I will be pleased to discuss any of the above matters with you further if required.

Mr Harvey's letter gives an excellent explanation of how the Government proposal in the Bill will affect producers in this State. In accepting what Mr Harvey says, I am aware that the Egg Board itself has been concerned about its method of operation. It is fair to say that the board has not recognised soon enough that it must keep its operations under constant review. Where boards operate over a long period without having to consider their effectiveness, I believe that there is a tendency for them to become inward looking.

Not only should the size of the board be reduced by two: there should be a part-time chairman, and the chairman should not be the chief executive officer. The board should continue to streamline its operations by means of computerisation and other methods. The number of staff must be reduced both at the administrative level and in the pulping plant. Producers will have to carefully consider a farm gate price and the Opposition believes that the Government should negotiate with the industry. Any alteration of the

system should not be imposed on the industry: it should be made only after discussion and negotiation with producers. Consideration should be given to increasing, from 20 to 50, the number of hens that a private individual may own.

This Bill is totally unacceptable to the Opposition and it cannot be amended adequately. To put into practice those things that I have discussed at length this afternoon, as soon as possible the Opposition will introduce a private member's Bill which will improve the efficiency of the Egg Board but not repeal its operation to a degree that would have the disastrous effect that the Government proposes in this Bill. I give those commitments to the industry today. I shall have ongoing discussions with all sections of the industry soon with the aim of introducing a private member's Bill as soon as possible. It is unfortunate that the Minister has not allowed his officers to have meaningful discussions. I could not understand the Minister's attitude on South Terrace some weeks ago when the United Farmers and Stock-owners called a meeting, which was chaired by its Chairman and was well attended, to discuss this matter. Having been in politics for a long time, I believe that it is unwise to go to a meeting and tell people that, although you will listen to what they have to say, it will make no difference to your attitude. That was the attitude displayed by the Minister to those producers, and he should not have been surprised at their response.

**The Hon. M.K. Mayes:** I was not.

**Mr GUNN:** The Minister was wasting everyone's time.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister will have his chance to reply in due course.

**Mr GUNN:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Minister was kind enough to accept the invitation, but he should not have wasted the time of others. There was little point in the Minister's going to discuss matters when he was not interested in what the producers had to say. Following that meeting, the Minister should have been aware of the problems that this Bill would run into in Parliament. Fortunately, we live in a democracy and have two Houses of Parliament where the will of the people is expressed. On this occasion, the will of the people will be expressed in such a way that this legislation will not see the light of day: it will go out of the window as it deserves. I understand that the Minister said that certain people would desert the ship, but I assure him that that is not correct.

**The Hon. M.K. Mayes:** You're not correct.

**Mr GUNN:** I can assure the Minister that my colleagues in another place are quite firm about this matter and that they will ensure that this Bill goes out the window. The Minister has been living in false hope—I can assure him of that. The second reading explanation contains attacks on individuals which are not only quite unfair but cannot and will not stand up to proper scrutiny. When the Minister responds, I expect that he will clearly indicate who supplied him with that information.

One of the incorrect statements that the Minister has been making is that the Egg Board itself was told to lift its game three years ago. The Minister seems to know all about that, but the Egg Board does not. On my information, no written instructions have been given to the Egg Board by the Minister or by his predecessor. If the Minister has any written instructions, I would like him to table them in the House so that we can see what the instructions were and whether they were recorded in the minutes of the board, together with details of the action and response by the board.

I am aware that the previous Minister of Agriculture commended the board on 16 September for the way that it was carrying out its duties. The Minister claimed that eggs

would be up to 40c a dozen cheaper in other States. That may be correct, because the retail price on the one grade of South Australian eggs can vary with other States by up to 53c a dozen down to 1c. The South Australian Egg Board, unlike other State boards, does not set the wholesale or retail price but sets only the farm gate price and lets the market establish its own selling margin.

In fact, a drop in the average farm gate prices last September did not result in a drop in retail prices but a 2c per dozen increase resulted some months later. From what the Minister said about reducing the cost of agricultural commodities in South Australia, I am fearful about the effect that that will have on the industry in general. Another question thrown about by the Minister generally (and obviously his colleagues will refer to this) is why prices are lower in New South Wales and Victoria. The answer is simple: the producer price for all grades is very similar in all States except in Victoria and New South Wales.

For the past two years illegal producers in New South Wales who do not pay promotion, research and board charges to equalise on their surplus have been cutting prices. The New South Wales Egg Corporation responded to this pressure and dropped prices. In the meantime, legal action against these producers is continuing. As a result, producer prices in New South Wales are very depressed with a number of producers now on the verge of bankruptcy in the Tamworth area, even though they have access to very cheap feeds (for example, wheat at \$80 per tonne compared with South Australia where it is \$130 per tonne).

Victoria recently dropped producer prices by 12c a dozen as a result of the Fields report, much of which deals with the situation in New South Wales and is based on economic and theoretical models involving the cost of production. It may be solid economic theory but it does not take into account practical farm management. For example, the model assumed full production for 12 months. It did not allow for stand-down time or for the removal of old stock, cleaning of sheds, and the placing in cages of 18 week-old birds which do not reach full production until 27 or 28 weeks old. There are other marvellous anomalies of this nature, and the Fields report can be made available for members' information.

The Minister has also claimed that a public inquiry revealed that a number of producers had called for the disbanding of the South Australian Egg Board. Some two years ago the then Minister asked for submissions from the industry and the public. As a result, the producers and various organisations made submissions. Many of those submissions called for amendments to the board's operation and were critical of certain board practices. However, to the knowledge of the United Farmers and Stockowners, none called for the disbanding of the board. This matter could be easily resolved by tabling in the House the submissions and reports put before Cabinet. Again, during the Estimates Committee I asked the Minister to table these documents. Unfortunately, the Minister declined, just as he declined to table the report in which (allegedly) the Government makes its recommendation to abolish the Egg Board.

Some producers claim that this action resulted in only 5 per cent of producers surviving in this State. No-one knows the answer to this question—neither the producers nor the Minister. The only yardstick we have is what has happened in other countries or in other industries. In this regard producers are alarmed because they recently saw the State chicken hatchery business go under to interstate monopoly hatcheries. That has resulted in layer pullets increasing in price from \$3.50 to \$4.40 a bird over eight months. The Minister claims that, if he had not taken action, eggs could

have come in from interstate. The answer is that eggs can come in from interstate at any time. However, this has been avoided due to board relations with other States and quality controls insisting that eggs be regulated once they come from other States. The Northern Territory does not have a board. As a result, South Australia and Queensland can sell eggs in the Territory from time to time.

The Minister of Agriculture claimed that up to 20c a dozen can be saved by disbanding the Egg Board and that that can be passed on to the consumer. Total board charges amount to 15.6 per cent per dozen, which is made up of administration, quality control, promotion and equalisation. Some of these charges will have to continue. Regardless of whether or not there is a board, those charges would have to be picked up by the proper authority. In addition, past experience has shown that reduction of the producer price does not necessarily flow on to the consumer. They are some of the myths that the Minister has continued to put around in the community. I will read briefly from a letter to the Premier from Mrs Joyce Yeomans who was appointed to the board by the Labor Government as a consumer representative. The letter states:

Dear Mr Bannon,

Reference the Cabinet decision to partially deregulate the South Australian Egg Industry and to dismantle the South Australian Board and form another authority.

As a consumer, I am seeking the reasons for these moves and some measure of protection. I was informed by the Minister of Agriculture's office that this action was being taken to ensure that the price of eggs to the consumer will be brought closer to the cost of production by market forces. Most consumers are or need to be aware that the price of all products reflects the cost of production, handling, packaging, transportation, and marketing.

My concerns for egg consumers lie in the areas of price and quality.

Price: Currently, the farm gate price of large eggs is \$1.43 and are retailing at my local supermarket at \$2.01. It may be relevant to note that within one food chain of stores on the same day, there can be a price variation of up to 50c, which is a result of market forces.

Quality: Currently, eggs sold in South Australia are graded and packaged and carry a 'use by' date of three weeks. A free market would allow the sale of surplus eggs from interstate, which have been oiled and held in cold storage. This extends their shelf life for up to 6-8 months and is not readily detectable. ('Use by' dating is only applied after grading and packaging. Oiling of eggs is not permitted in South Australia for eggs sold on the local market.)

Why increase the cost of the public wage commitment, as all Public Service employees will have to be absorbed into Government departments. Casual employees will be unemployed and their capacity to purchase South Australian goods will be diminished.

This is being done at a time when:

1. the egg industry in South Australia through orderly marketing is now producing only to meet local demand. A feat not easily achievable;
2. the cost of administering the board is approximately 4c, equalisation 9c per dozen eggs (equalisation has been seen necessary to guarantee the all round year supply of eggs to the consumer); this is not a Government cost.

Who will fund the new authority?

Changes may be necessary but only in the best interests of all, the South Australian economy and me, the consumer.

That is a quite damning condemnation of the Minister and of the Government. The Liberal Party has made its position very clear.

I want to round off my remarks by saying that this matter has been brought to the Parliament at a time when primary industry is in one of its troughs. It would be quite irresponsible if this Government were to proceed down the track on which it is headed and make unviable another group of rural producers in this State. The evidence provided by the Government does not stand up to proper scrutiny. The egg producers in South Australia have been an efficient and well organised group of people.



The Egg Board, as I have indicated, does need streamlining and rearranging. We do not object to that at all, but totally reject the concept that the Government has put up. I point out to the Minister—and I hope that when he responds he will explain—that in the composition of the new authority I am having trouble understanding how he will get a board of five. One or two of my colleagues and others have been through the legislation, and can easily understand how he will have four members of the new authority but not how he will get five. I hope he will have a close look at that. I and my colleagues have read this and are yet to understand how he arrives at the figure of five, although I have not spoken to the Parliamentary Counsel on that matter. I refer to page 3 of the Minister's explanation, which states:

Let there be no doubt about it. The majority of efficient producers are in favour of deregulation, but are afraid to speak out because they fear a reaction—whether perceived or real—from the Egg Board. I make this statement on the basis of discussions I have held with individual producers. Some of these allegations include warnings that outspoken producers would have their hen quotas either reduced or taken away. This is an intolerable situation.

No Egg Board or authority would last for one day if it were to act in such an intimidating manner. This is either a figment of the Minister's imagination or he has misunderstood what was said to him. I would ask the Minister to indicate to this House who are those people who are expressing fears. Some 18 months to two years ago, when I had people under threat or intimidation about a situation in which they found themselves, I referred that matter to this Parliament, and a select committee was set up. We finalised that arrangement today when we appointed a select committee to inquire into the Peterborough Steamtown situation.

If this situation is taking place in South Australia as the Minister has alleged, for goodness sake get the police in to resolve it once and for all. That is a quite intolerable situation. I am concerned about those allegations, as is the industry. I quote to the Minister, in conclusion, a report in the *Advertiser* on 7 September 1986 headed 'Egg move would "Cost 1 000 jobs" in South Australia', which states:

Up to 400 producers would be forced out and at least 1 000 jobs lost in South Australia if the Government abolished the Egg Board, an executive of the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia said last night. Mr David Dean said deregulation of the industry would have a detrimental effect on the quality of eggs being sold to South Australian consumers. The move would be a major blow to both producers and the buying public. Quality control measures enforced by the board would not exist under the proposed legislation.

His comments followed a meeting of about 120 South Australian egg producers and the Minister of Agriculture, Mr Mayes, at UF&S headquarters in Adelaide last night. Mr Mayes told the meeting that South Australian consumers could save up to 20c on a dozen eggs . . . Proposed changes to the industry were based on the findings of a public inquiry in 1985.

We want to see the documents relating to that public inquiry tabled in this House, because if we are to base a course of action on the results of inquiries, let us look at the submissions, the comments, and let us have the relevant documents tabled in this House. The article continues:

Prices have been monitored over a two year period and were found to be between 18 cents and 43 cents higher in South Australia—

they varied more than that—

The Cabinet has approved draft legislation . . . But Mr Dean said South Australian consumers could not expect cheaper eggs in the long term if the Egg Board were disbanded. 'Since the Government's plans were announced the UF&S has been besieged by egg producers and consumers expressing support for the board.'

I ask the Minister to guarantee that, if these proposals are enacted, 1 000 jobs will not be lost in South Australia. The

Minister started off with a propaganda exercise, with press releases in country newspapers saying 'Eggs to be cheaper', but that, we know, is a gross misrepresentation of the situation.

The Leader of the Opposition made our position very clear on 22 September, when he issued a press statement criticising the Minister's handling of this situation. The Opposition will oppose this measure with all the vigour at its disposal. It is an attack upon the concept of orderly marketing in South Australia. We have put forward a series of suggestions which we believe will greatly improve the operation and efficiency of the Egg Board in the interests of consumers and producers. We will not support a course of action which will downgrade the incomes and lifestyles of ordinary South Australian producers.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from the Minister's statement that food prices in Australia and South Australia could be a lot lower: that producers across the board in South Australia have to expect lower prices and lower returns. The concern of the UF&S is well founded when the Minister makes those statements, because they are concerned, as I am, that the concept of orderly marketing which has been of such benefit to the nation as a whole is now under attack.

If this Government wants to see that system thrown out the window it will have to bear the heavy burden of the drastic effects it will have on the living standards of all South Australians and Australians, because the end result will be that people will not be in a position to produce or to export, therefore the nation as a whole will suffer. This Government and the Minister, and those people who sit behind them, have to clearly understand that this country was built and developed by the farming and mining communities, people who were prepared to go out under very difficult circumstances, work hard, take a chance, borrow large sums of money, and eventually expect a reasonable return.

If those people and those who have followed them in the industries which have such a large amount of capital involved are to be subjected to this sort of treatment, I fear for the welfare of the people of this State, because that is what we are talking about: the welfare of the people of this State. We are not talking about some illusory 20c or 30c saving to consumers which the Labor Party pulled out of the air at the time of the last election.

The Government wants to continue this foolish escapade in which it has now engaged itself under the guise of a free market, but, as I pointed out earlier, the Liberal Party supports the responsible and sensible implementation of a deregulation policy where it can be justified to be in the long-term public interest; where it will not destroy industries; where it will not reduce the quality of products, and where it will not put out of operation efficient producers. As a direct result of this proposal we will see producers put out of the industry.

If that is what the Government wants, I believe that it is acting quite irresponsibly and has not thought through its program. I have indicated those areas in which we believe the Egg Board should be involved to make sure that the efficiencies take place. There was one thing I overlooked. I believe that the Egg Board should allow producers and packers to purchase direct from the consumer products which they require for the packaging and marketing of eggs.

I oppose this measure, as I believe it is not possible to effectively amend it, and I will be raising other matters of concern in the Committee. I know that a number of my colleagues wish to take part in this debate. I sincerely hope the measure is given short shrift in the Legislative Council.

**Mr GREGORY (Florey):** I support the Bill. In the few years I have been in this House I have never ceased to be amazed by the mental gymnastics members opposite go through when it comes to their philosophy on how the country ought to be run. They claim to be the champions of free enterprise, and today we have had their major spokesman on rural affairs standing there denying the right of free enterprise to operate and talking about deregulation. I remind the House of what was said in this place on 7 May 1985:

The Government has appointed a person to supposedly make recommendations on deregulation only because the Liberal Opposition had, just before that, released its policy on deregulation which made it quite clear that when, not if, a Liberal Government is returned at the next State election action will immediately be taken to reduce the number of statutory authorities and to deregulate the over-control that presently exists in South Australia.

That statement was made by the former member for Todd, who, at that time, was secretary to the shadow Cabinet.

I realise that the member for Eyre was not a member of that illustrious body at that time and might not have been aware of the decision made by that organisation. But that is what was said:

... action will immediately be taken to reduce the number of statutory authorities ...

I would have thought that, on this occasion, they would have been jumping in with both feet to do it. These agrarian socialists over there are a marvellous group of people: they say that they want labour deregulated and want industry deregulated, but when it comes to the farming industry they do not want to do it. We have heard here today a prime example of that. I wonder why. There were statistics quoted of a survey that was conducted. I do not know the criteria used for that, but I do know that, when collecting statistics, it is necessary to be careful about the statistical base used.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** The honourable member would know because he claims some fame for that. The Australian Bureau of Statistics has a reputation for being fairly accurate, so I thought I would read to the House the statistics that it has been able to collect on the price of eggs in various States at certain times throughout the year. I am referring to the price per dozen of 55 gram eggs. In March 1985 South Australia had the highest price per dozen: 13c higher than New South Wales; 6c higher than Victoria; 9c higher than Queensland; and 21c higher than Western Australia. In June 1985 South Australia's price was 24c higher than New South Wales; 13c higher than Victoria; 20c higher than Queensland; and 30c higher than Western Australia. In September 1985, 19c higher than New South Wales; 12c higher than Victoria; 13c higher than Queensland; and 26c higher than Western Australia.

In December 1985: 29c higher than New South Wales; 16c higher than Victoria; 22c higher than Queensland; and 33c higher than Western Australia. In March 1986: 33c higher than New South Wales; 17c higher than Victoria; 13c higher than Queensland; and 32c higher than Western Australia. In June 1986: 43c higher than New South Wales; 19c higher than Victoria; 8c higher than Queensland; and 36c higher than Western Australia.

*Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** Those figures are from the Australian Bureau of Statistics and would be more accurate than the Mickey Mouse business that the member for Eyre mentioned in this place. That sets out the record. The Egg Board has been doing a job, but certainly not for the consumers of South Australia. I, for one, am not going to say that if the Egg Board ceased operating in South Australia (which it will) and was replaced by an egg control authority we will

gain as much as 43c a dozen, because I am not that much of a fool. However, there will be a significant reduction in the price of eggs.

I think that it is important that consumers have a fair go. Whenever CPI figures for this State are published, members opposite, either through their Leader or other leading spokesmen in their Party, 'tut tut' because the cost of living has increased in this State. Yet we are taking action in this Parliament to reduce the cost of living and members opposite are hopping in with both feet to stop that. That is a piece of agrarian socialism—I do not think that members opposite can deny that one little bit.

Turning now to the operation of the Egg Board, when I was advised of what they do, how they look after themselves and how much they are paid, I was amazed. I am given to understand that the Egg Board has a full time Chairman who is paid \$48 000 a year plus a car; an administrative officer or manager who is paid \$48 000 a year; and other employees, making a total of 22 people. If this were a Government department they would be lucky if the leading figure was getting \$30 000 a year—he certainly would not be getting a package.

I do not believe that they have been doing a job for the consumer. The Government has a right to put forward a policy to assist all the people of South Australia—the people who buy the eggs. In 1983 the Minister, in discussions with the Chairman of the Egg Board, wanted to know why egg prices in South Australia were always higher than those in any other State in Australia. He also wanted to know why there was a problem with large surpluses. Two workshops were held to try to discover that fact—in 1983 and 1984—and an attempt was made to improve efficiency, but nothing happened.

The Minister then held a public inquiry in May 1985, inviting the public of South Australia to comment and to make submissions. When that was sorted out there were three options: first, to do nothing, leave it as it was, and keep ripping off the people of South Australia; secondly, a total free market, which I thought members opposite, because of the adoption of the theory of capitalism and its efficiencies, which they espouse here from time to time, would have adopted (but they do not want); and, thirdly, a free market with control of the industry itself (which the Minister of the time preferred). The Minister advised the industry of his preference for the third option, and that is where the matter has remained. We are now in a position to implement that option, and I think that it is very important that we do so.

Comments were made by the member for Eyre, particularly about the consumer representative on the board who wrote a letter to the Minister indicating her personal disapproval of this measure. She has a right to do that. At the same time, the member for Eyre should not try to make out that the organisation that she comes from supports that letter because, in fact, it does not and is directly opposed to the sentiments expressed in her letter, because it is of the view that there should be a free market for eggs. It is quite true that there will be an overall reduction in the price of eggs.

I understand that the Egg Board costs about \$1.5 million to operate, which is collected by way of a levy from the producers. The producers say that they pay that levy: I suppose that they do, but they really collect it from the people who buy their eggs in the shop. About \$500 000 goes into promotion and \$1 million into administration. It is estimated by the Government that the administration of the egg control authority will cost about \$200 000. If \$500 000 is still spent on promotion it will be up to the producers to

get together and make a decision about that. The three principal packers of eggs will have to decide how to promote their product.

I was concerned to hear comments about efficient production in the egg industry. I am of the view that if we do not enact this Bill there will come a time when the egg production industry in this State will be confronted by eggs imported from interstate and the egg producers will not be in a position to compete, because they have grown lazy, have had the protection of the Egg Board, and have been able to rip off the people in this State by the high prices that they have charged. We will find that they will survive and compete. It seems to be standard argument: from members opposite—

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** The honourable member wouldn't know what he is talking about.

**Mr Meier:** Do you think that they are lazy?

**Mr GREGORY:** I never said that.

**Mr Meier:** You did!

**Mr GREGORY:** I did not. You just shut up. You have got your chance to speak later. You are a mine of misinformation. Members opposite do not understand their own philosophy on which to base their Party.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Florey should address his remarks to the Chair.

**Mr GREGORY:** I have often listened to these people over there talk about how you set prices—

**Mr Lewis:** Which side of the House is the honourable member addressing? I want to get this straight; I want to know whether he is lecturing his colleagues or lecturing me.

**Mr GREGORY:** These people (who seem to want to talk a lot before they get the call) claim that the current Egg Board and the industry are not a burden on the taxpayer. I believe that they are, and I refer members to my earlier statements about the price of eggs in South Australia being much higher than those paid in other States. They are a burden on all people in this State, whether they pay taxes or not. I do not believe that we should allow a statutory authority to exist that can just rip people off like the Egg Board is doing at the moment. The Egg Board has refused three requests to improve its operations. It has refused three requests to reduce costs so that the people in South Australia could get cheaper eggs.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr GREGORY:** I have the figures here for March 1985 to June 1985, and the situation might have been plausible if on any one of those occasions the price per dozen in South Australia had been less than that in any other State. However, the Egg Board did not crack it on any occasion. I do not believe that it has ever tried. It is now crying crocodile tears because the pressure has come upon it. I believe that this measure is a very important one. It is a very good measure, which will ensure that the people in South Australia get a fair go.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I rise briefly to support the comments made very capably by the member for Eyre in his address to the House, on which occasion he outlined clearly the position of the Liberal Party and what we believe will happen to the industry if the minister has his way. I noted with interest the comments made by the member for Florey and the statistics that he quoted to the House. Unfortunately, he was not able to give us the deviation within those figures, which would have given us a much better indication of their accuracy. When one considers the variation of prices in South Australian supermarkets, a matter to which the member for Eyre referred, of some

50c per dozen, unless the member for Florey can provide details of the deviations in the statistical figures that he provided his figures are really quite worthless.

The Minister ought to be looking at that 50c variation that is occurring in the supermarkets, instead of trying to destroy another primary industry in South Australia. That is what he is all about. As the Minister of Agriculture in South Australia, he seems intent on grinding one primary industry after another into the dirt. Quite obviously, if we act in the manner that the Minister and the Government suggest, then we can purchase every requirement that we need in this country from overseas at a far lower price than what it costs to produce here. Perhaps the aim is to have a wage structure which is determined by arbitration and which is mandatory on the community, with every other cost in this nation flowing from that, whether workers compensation or anything else, which is a cost plus on the industry concerned. However, the Minister wants to come in and totally deregulate industry which creates the productivity in the first place and which employs and supports all the other secondary industries and the employment down the line. This is exactly the path that the Federal Government is treading, and it is leading to the destruction of one industry after another in this country.

I have been involved in the primary industries of this country all my life. I know what it is like trying to exist out there, when margins do not even exist. It is a loss situation. It is high time that the Minister knew what the situation is in relation to the horticultural industries in South Australia. Day by day horticulturists (and the egg industry is no different) are confronted with ever-increasing costs and charges, whether it be for electricity or water rates, imposed by the Government, or workers compensation and all the other cost increases over which we have absolutely no control whatsoever, and ever-declining returns for the products that we produce. Yet, the primary producers are the ones who initially create the productivity out there in the real world as far as Australia is concerned. If you destroy that initiative to get out there and produce, the economy of Australia will never improve.

I believe that it is an absolute disaster that the Minister, acting in accordance with the philosophy under which the Government operates, comes into this place with the intent of destroying existing orderly marketing arrangements. I am not suggesting for a moment that inefficiencies do not exist there. As I have said, I have been involved in primary industries all my life, and I am conscious of the fact that inefficiencies exist, and it must be determined just where those inefficiencies are and they must be eliminated. That goes for all marketing boards, whether the Egg Board or the Citrus Board, for example.

**Mr Lewis:** Or the Arbitration Commission.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** It does not make any difference what it is. It all really comes back to the effect that this has on those out there in the real world who are endeavouring to be productive and who create the real wealth of this nation in the first place, on which every other person in this nation exists in the longer term. I have said in this place before that, from a practical point of view, as a member of Parliament I am non-productive; I do not produce anything in this place; and I do not create any goods. However, as a primary producer I believe that I produce significant wealth to the benefit of this country, State and nation. I derive no benefits from that activity whatsoever, because I do it at a loss situation, having provided a number of jobs. Looking further down the line from the initial primary products that I produce, probably another 50 or 80 persons are involved in that aspect. For the privilege of

creating that productivity I derive no benefit or profit whatsoever.

So, if we are going to continue down this path, effectively the end objective of which is to destroy one industry after another in Australia, and particularly in this State, then as I said before, we will continue the economic slide that this country is in. It was interesting to note the comments that came from overseas only a day or two ago which clearly showed that the indicators illustrate that the economic situation in Australia will not improve. Indeed, it will get worse next year—and this is the type of action that is creating that situation. It gives other countries absolutely no confidence as to the future of our economic stability.

So, I totally support the remarks made by the member for Eyre. The Opposition is strongly opposed to this legislation. The member for Eyre, on the Opposition's behalf, will introduce amendments to improve the situation in relation to the egg industry as far as egg marketing and control in South Australia are concerned. So, until that situation is clarified and the Opposition endeavours to put those improvements into effect in this State, the Opposition must oppose the existing Bill.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I certainly support the Bill. I am rather intrigued, like the member for Florey was, about, as he put it, the mental gymnastics of members opposite. I have a vivid and long memory about the attitude of members opposite prior to the last election, when they spoke about deregulation, saying that they would deregulate this, that, and the other. It was not so long ago (last year, if my memory serves me correctly), when we were talking about the potato Bill, and members opposite were in a great quandary because they had representations from people in the South-East as well as from the Adelaide Hills. The Opposition was running around like chooks with their heads chopped off and did not know what they were going to do. So they were in a hell of a mess.

Reference has been made to the former member for Todd (Scott Ashenden). I refer to comments that he made, as reported in *Hansard* (7 May 1985, at page 3941), as follows:

So much for its window dressing on deregulation—  
talking about the Bannon Government—

Let us face it: the Government has appointed a person to supposedly make recommendations on deregulation only because the Liberal Opposition had, just before that, released its policy on deregulation which made it quite clear that when—not if—a Liberal Government is returned at the next State election action will immediately be taken to reduce the number of statutory authorities and to deregulate the over-control that presently exists in South Australia.

The Opposition cannot get away from that.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** That is repetitious.

**Mr HAMILTON:** You can call it repetition; you can call it what you like—the truth hurts. The member for Light knows well enough—he has been here longer than I have—that since I have been a member he cannot browbeat me with his interjections. It just does not work.

The member for Hanson has continuously asked questions about statutory authorities in South Australia. Good luck to him; that is his role as a member of Parliament. When I was in Opposition members opposite queried the number of questions that I had on the Notice Paper. What about the number of questions about statutory authorities in South Australia that the member for Hanson has on the Notice Paper. Let us not hear any more about the hypocritical attitude that we are now getting from members opposite. They know damn well that they are caught in a hell of a bind—there is no doubt about that. I make no

apologies about coming from the working stock whom I am here to protect and represent. I am also concerned about the price that these people pay.

The Opposition speaks about lack of consultation. If any group can talk about lack of consultation, it is not the Opposition. I refer to the industrial Bill introduced by the then Government Minister (Hon. D.C. Brown). The Opposition now has the gall to attack this Government about lack of consultation. The Opposition is in cloud-cuckoo-land. There is no question about that.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** Get back into your burrow. You can have your turn later; you can bob your head out then.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable member should try to refrain from responding to out of order interjections. The member for Albert Park.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Sir, I take your advice. I have tried very hard to restrain myself, but it has been very difficult.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair has already advised the House that it is out of order for a member to make provocative interjections, and the interjection of the member for Murray-Mallee was certainly in that category.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Thank you for your protection, Sir. I understand that in 1983 the previous Minister, Mr Blevins, raised this issue about the high price of eggs in this State. He raised the question about the large surplus of eggs being pulped. I further understand that Minister Blevins had discussions with the Egg Board Chairman and other producers and that, in addition, as the member for Florey pointed out—this is the information that we are getting—two workshops were held on the question of the egg industry and the need for improvements in it.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** I can assure members that it is not the same speech. These are my own notes and, if they like to come and look, members opposite are quite at liberty to do so. These workshops were, I understand, held eight months apart—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** They might have been knocked off my desk and someone could have duplicated them. I do not know. It does happen in this place, they tell me.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** No, indeed not. Also, I understand that before the last election there was an open inquiry in May 1985 including a well publicised advertising program in which submissions were called for. I understand that no politicians—including me—cared to make a submission on this matter.

**Mr Lewis:** What was that?

**Mr HAMILTON:** It is the right of every member of Parliament to make a submission. I understand that 16 submissions were sent to the Minister.

**Mr Lewis:** What was that about?

**Mr HAMILTON:** The member can read it later. I do not have to waste my time. Three main issues arose from those submissions. They were, first, to retain the *status quo* in the industry; secondly, get rid of all red tape, etc. and have an open market situation and, thirdly, free up the market but have some controls over the industry. Before the last election Minister Blevins indicated to the industry that he preferred the last option, and this was subsequently supported by the new Minister in charge of the Bill.

My colleague the member for Florey referred to the ABS survey, but I will not repeat that. As to support, the member for Eyre spoke about some of the opposition expressed

about this Bill, but he did not say that support was given to it, particularly by the Consumers Association in South Australia. The honourable member was very crafty and did not say that there was support.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** From whom in particular?

**Mr HAMILTON:** The Consumers Association. I do not think the member for Light is deaf. The association supported the Bill.

*The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** A representative did, but I do not believe that that is the association's view. We will find that out later. The position is different from what I have been informed. Clearly, savings are to be made, and the member for Florey went into the cost of running the board. I believe that the Minister is on the right track, and I give my support to the Bill.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** In the brief time available I will touch on one or two points. The Minister talks of partial deregulation and then recommends industry destruction.

**Mr Lewis:** It's a Clayton's approach.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Yes, it is a Clayton's approach. Clearly, the Minister has not thought that through, and I will come to that after the adjournment in relation to the emotional and incorrect statements that were made by the Minister when introducing the Bill.

I refer to the point made by the member for Florey, who told us that the Egg Board was in great difficulty because it had a full-time Chairman on \$48 000. I point out to the House that, in action taken by the previous Labor Government in 1983 when it saw fit to alter the nature of the board and increase its numbers, it did nothing at all about taking away the responsibility of the Government in appointing the Chairman of the board. I refer to the Marketing of Eggs Act 1941-1973, where, under the heading, 'The South Australian Egg Board' in section 4 (3) it provides:

From amongst the persons referred to in paragraph (b) of subsection (2) of this section the Governor may appoint a person to be the Chairman of the board and a person to be the Deputy Chairman of the board.

Paragraph (b) relates to three persons appointed by the Governor, and in the amendments of 1983 that increased to four. The Government, through the Governor, has appointed the Chairman of the board consistently over those years.

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

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Just before the dinner adjournment I described to the House the way in which the Chairman of the Egg Board is elected. That person is a public servant who has had long experience in the egg industry and is given due regard not only for the work that he has done for the State but also for the high position that he holds on the Australian scene. I then said that I wanted to take the Minister to task about a number of statements that he made when bringing down this measure. I do so on behalf of egg producers right across South Australia, many of whom are my constituents, and many of whom were my constituents in the Point Pass/Eudunda area before the last redistribution. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

This legislation is aimed at lifting artificial price fixing, regulated marketing and unnecessary imposts being placed on the consumer.

The Minister then went on to make what I believe were rather unministerial comments when he said:

These unsavoury activities have become accepted within the industry over the years and have encouraged inefficiencies that have led to South Australians paying 30 to 40 cents more per dozen eggs than in most other States. This is despite the fact that similar situations exist in other States. In Victoria, for example, estimates of the cost of regulation to consumers range as high as 50 cents per dozen.

What that is supposed to mean I do not know, and it certainly gives no clear indication of what the Minister was trying to say. The Minister then continued:

Egg marketing in South Australia needs a 'shake-up' in a dramatic way.

I suggest that it is the Minister who needs the shake-up, because he has been full of comment without putting down any facts. The Minister has condemned people within the industry without providing any facts; he has been long on rhetoric and very short on fact. The Minister then said:

Let there be no doubt about it: the majority of efficient producers are in favour of deregulation but many are afraid to speak out because they fear a reaction, whether perceived or real, from the Egg Board. I make this statement on the basis of discussions I have held with individual producers.

I challenge the Minister to say which producers. There are some 70 producers in the area which takes in Yorke Peninsula, Eyre Peninsula, Clare, Port Augusta and Point Pass/Eudunda. Of those 70 producers, 21 are in the Point Pass/Eudunda area; there are 60 producers (and I am referring to people who have more than 500 hens) who are in the area between Balaklava and Strathalbyn; and there are about 60 in the area of Murray Bridge down through the Mallee to Pinnaroo, Lameroo and including Mount Gambier. There are about 18 producers at Mount Gambier, 12 at Pinnaroo/Lameroo and six at Murray Bridge. There are also producers at Renmark. I again challenge the Minister to say from where he obtained this information.

Members who are producers have put their names to petitions and letters clearly indicating that they do not hold the view expressed by the Minister. The Minister's credibility is on the line, having made that statement without providing any evidence. If there has been the action mentioned by the Minister, why has he not asked the Fraud Squad and other organisations whose services are available to him to find out where the collusion has occurred, where the standover tactics originated, who are the responsible parties and why they should not face criminal action? I believe that the Minister put his mouth into gear before he put his brain into gear and made these assertions about people in the industry without regard to reality and the truth.

Unfortunately, the matter was flamed by the member for Florey before the dinner break when he suggested that members of the industry were lazy. He said, 'Growers have gone lazy.' Under the new situation, growers are likely to find themselves in quite a bit of difficulty when it comes to getting their act together. There is a very large number of egg producers in my electorate who I have known for 35 years; in some cases it is the second or third generation in the same family. I say without equivocation that they have shown through persistence and endeavour that they are the equal of producers anywhere in getting out and finding their markets and providing a service to their customers. In the first instance their customers are the shops or the organisations that they supply and, through them, the consumers. The consumers keep coming back for the same eggs, in many cases even after they have left the particular neighbourhood where the eggs are purchased, because they know the brand and the supplier. That is a clear indication of how these people respect these efficient producers who are in the industry not as fly-by-nighters but as operators over many years.

Further, the market or gate price is not set by growers in the field, that is, the producers: it is determined by the Department of Agriculture, which sets the gate price, and the producer then sells at that price. What will happen if this destruction, which the Minister seems hell bent on causing, proceeds (and of which members on this side will have no part) and producers are left to the whims of the Minister's newfound double advisory committee structure which seeks to replace the Egg Board with further bureaucracy? We will have these producers and others throughout the State at the mercy of interstate dealers.

We have already had evidence of interstate pulp manufacturers writing to people in the industry in South Australia and saying, 'We'll take your eggs for pulp, and we'll give you 60c a dozen—a price that is below the cost of production; so where will the industry go other than off the board backwards when it is subject to the pressures of interstate wheelers and dealers? To my knowledge, nothing of any great significance has been said about the potential danger of egg and egg products in the community.

It is a fact of life that egg and egg products are potentially the greatest sources of food poisoning in the world. Very many of the large food poisoning problems which have existed throughout Australia have arisen from egg or egg products, particularly egg pulp—and, more specifically, I refer to hot egg pulp, which has been produced on a number of occasions in the past by persons with access to surplus eggs who were pulping them and then selling them to outlets. The Whyalla Hostel, for example, some years ago obtained its egg pulp from such a source, and there was a massive food poisoning problem in Whyalla.

The Egg Board, its officers and its producer members have watched very closely the importance of monitoring the market to make sure that eggs of top quality are available at all times. They have made certain that eggs starting to lengthen in age from the time of production have been replaced on the shelves of the selling organisation.

They have maintained a very close control—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the member for Light to resume his seat. I would also ask the member for Alexandra, who is completely out of order at the moment, to resume his seat. I ask members on my right hand side to maintain their places in their seats and not wander about. The level of conversation is too high, and I wish to be able to hear the member for Light.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I made the point that the producers and the Egg Board over a long period have been meticulous in making sure that eggs in the market place are maintained at a safe and high standard, even to the point of replacing stock where there has been any suggestion that it may have been on the shelf for too long. There is no clear indication that the new, open market place structure which the Minister suddenly wants to embrace will necessarily give the degree of protection that the present structure has provided.

I have referred to the potential danger of eggs and egg products in relation to food poisoning—salmonellosis being the major danger with a series of sub-types of salmonellosis. There must be close monitoring and clear production control, specifically of pulp, and if the Minister succeeds in forcing a number of people into pulping on the home front, let him not come in and say, 'Yes, but we'd control that by the Health Commission—or by other people—placing an embargo on that sort of action.'

If someone has his back to the wall and is going further backwards through the wall, he will take every opportunity he can to get his product onto the market, even to the point of undertaking behind the scenes pulping to provide an

outlet. There is a potential danger there to which I believe the Minister has failed to give proper attention. As I said, the Minister's comments about members in the field using standoff tactics and being responsible for a rip off were echoed by the member for Florey in this debate. He said that the Egg Board had been 'ripping people off'. When we have an Egg Board comprised of seven people, four of whom are appointed by the Governor on the advice of the Minister, the senior one being a top public servant, I ask where has been the rip off.

The Minister has not brought a stitch of evidence into this place to indicate that there has been a rip off. If the Minister's credibility stands for anything, he will disclose, so that everyone can see and test it, the evidence that he claims to have that people within the industry have been less than truthful or less than favourably disposed towards ethical practices. He has not done so, therefore I question that integrity.

He talked further in this part of his second reading explanation (the like of which I have never seen in my 16½ years in this place and am unlikely to see again) of strongarm tactics being used to placate the feelings of a few influential egg producers. Where is the evidence? Where are these influential egg producers? It is all very well to come in here and make wild assertions that these strongarm tactics are being forced on people within the industry by influential egg producers, without offering any evidence of this.

I have indicated previously that I have a great regard for the people in my electorate and, indeed, those whom I know across the State who have been involved in the egg industry over a long period. I do not suggest for one moment that what the Egg Board has been able to achieve over the years has necessarily been as effective as it might have been. Like other statutory organisations, it sometimes finds that it has to hasten slowly because of the system under which it is working and the direction it is getting from the Minister.

It is much easier for an organisation to undertake necessary changes when it has access to its Minister but, when members of the board are denied the opportunity of discussion with their Minister, where does that leave them?

I refer specifically to the appointee of the Minister—who was mentioned by the member for Florey—the person who is there to represent the consumers. That member of the Egg Board has been very open in her criticism of the fact that, having been appointed by the Minister, she has been unable to get to see the Minister to put him right on these wild assertions he and his officers have been making. I believe that the earlier suggestion by the Minister that he will save \$1.8 million is cloud-cuckoo-land.

There is no way that the necessary monitoring currently undertaken by the egg industry to make sure of quality and the necessary research (which, for example, has most recently produced an egg product for Hungry Jack's in the form in which Hungry Jack's wants it, and there are other examples of research) will be undertaken by the airy-fairy type of arrangement the Minister has put forward in this measure. I believe that some degree of rationalisation is necessary. It will not be achieved by the method suggested here by the Minister, and I will give great support to my colleague the member for Eyre in denying the passage of this Bill.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** As indicated here a few moments ago, I am a little disappointed that the Parliamentary Library is not open this evening. Obviously, there are some good reasons for that situation prevailing—not that I frequent that area all that much, but this is one of those occasions when I would have very much desired from it a piece of statistical information, and I therefore

express some disappointment in members not having access to the Library at about 10 minutes to 8 on this parliamentary sitting night. However, I will not be critical of that situation because it could well be the result of sickness or some other unfortunate incident beyond the staff's control.

Let us look at the nub of the question in this Bill. Let us look at what the Minister is really seeking to do in this instance. We have heard in his second reading explanation that the Egg Board in South Australia needs a shake-up. We have heard that, indeed, it has overstepped the mark in administration of its own Act, an Act of this Parliament; that it has had too much authority for too long, and words to that effect flow on in other areas of criticism directed at those involved in the industry in general and on the board in particular by the Minister of Agriculture. I am not so fussed about his personal opinion of the board. Nor for that matter am I so fussed about the eccentric attitude of the Labor Party in recent times to do away with statutory authorities *per se*. They have been, and still are, in the process of knocking them off one by one.

What I am concerned about is a statement by a Minister of the Crown and that such statement is untrue and inaccurate. I have before me the Minister of Agriculture's second reading explanation of 28 October 1986. Following an interjection by the member for Light while the Minister was delivering his speech the Minister responded, 'I wrote the speech': in other words, it was not the work of a departmental officer; it was not the work of any other agency of the Government; it was the opinion of the Minister, and to be taken as read. He said during the early stage of his address to the House:

The board has powers to control egg marketing, set egg prices, administer egg weight and quality regulations and carry out promotional activities.

Some of that paragraph is correct, but some of it is grossly untrue and does not portray the real activities of the board and has not done so in some parts from its inception, and in others more latterly in the past 12 months. I want to take this particular paragraph part by part. First:

The board has powers to control egg marketing...

Indeed, that may be true in the broadest interpretation that one may put on the board's activities. The Minister then said that the board has the power to set egg prices. It clearly does not, never has; and nor is there authority under the Egg Marketing Act enabling the board to set retail prices. In the past 12 months it has had no powers nor has it sought to exercise powers over the wholesale price of eggs, either. It only sets a farm gate price for the producer based on material produced from the Minister's own Department of Agriculture, which does its homework—and I make no reflection on that division.

*The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister will have a chance to reply in due course to all points made by the Opposition.

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** I appreciate your support Mr Deputy Speaker. When we come into this House to debate a matter of public interest, and indeed debate the merits or otherwise of an amendment to an Act of the Parliament, we expect Ministers of the Crown to tell the truth. We expect them to lay the position on the line and, in the absence of detail and by the clouded method by which the Minister wrote and delivered his address to the House on 28 October, he has misled us—he has not told the truth.

By implication, clearly, the reading of his second reading explanation to this place could deduce only that the Egg Board in South Australia has control over the marketing of

eggs from the farm gate to the breakfast plate. That is not true. I repeat, it is only true to the point of the producer's gate and not in the wholesale sense, and has not been for about a year—and never has it been the case in relation to retail price fixing—that is, the real end price to the consumer.

I switch from the Minister's misleading statement, and turn to the remarks made by the member for Florey—a colourful gentleman, to say the least: a colourful address to the House, especially when one considers that he was speaking on a subject about which he clearly understands very little. But full marks to him for trying on behalf of the Labor Party, which has to scratch gravel like a chook to find someone who has any sort of real feel for the industry.

*The Hon. M.K. Mayes interjecting:*

**The Hon. TED CHAPMAN:** The Minister has already been told by the Deputy Speaker to hold his peace. He had a go and misled the House back in October. He will have another go at the end to correct that or to get himself into further bother. In the meantime, let him sit there and take a bit for a while and not cackle away there on the front bench.

In his address the member for Florey cited a situation surrounding the 55 gram egg. I am not sure whether a 55 gram egg is the standard/large or large egg, but I know it is not the very large egg. I can only presume, therefore, that it is the egg that is most regularly and consistently marketed to consumers. He cited the price situation as it applies to South Australia, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia. I will not go through those statistical details as he did, nor in this instance will I seek to have them reinserted in *Hansard*, for obvious reasons, but I clearly admit that on the table produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, drawn to the attention of this House by the member for Florey, the picture reflects an extreme difference in prices and the fact that in South Australia, consistently from March 1985 to June 1986, it has been significantly dearer to purchase eggs than it has been in any of the other States cited. On that basis he presented a plausible argument. However, it does reflect retail prices.

I come back to the Bill before us. The board, the centre of this argument, has never in its history—as I am led to believe by the industry and my earlier references some years ago to the Act—had any control over the retail price. I hardly see how it is justified, or even relevant, for the member for Florey to put forward this argument, unless it is, again, to mislead the community at large, unless it is to draw a red herring across the subject before us, or unless it is to present a set of figures to cloud the real issue.

What we are on about here is whether the egg industry in South Australia should have drawn from its own ranks along with those nominated by the Government to manage and promote its affairs following the production of eggs to the wholesale market arena. It has had that over the years, but, a year or so ago—just prior to this statistical schedule being collated by the Bureau of Statistics—the previous Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Frank Blevins) cut the board down a peg or two by taking away from it the authority directly to set the wholesale price of eggs—took away from it the opportunity to be involved in the grading of eggs—not, for that matter, that it had for a long period had anything directly to do with the packaging of eggs.

He put those other responsibilities out of the reach of the board and into the arena of the packers—Pritchards, Red Comb, etc. That was the first salvo delivered by the present Labor Government to the egg industry in South Australia. That occurred, as I have said, under the administration of the Minister's predecessor about a year ago. It is noteworthy



to pick up the scenario of events cited by the member for Florey and see the gross deterioration that has occurred since the last act of deregulation. I do not have access at the moment to the previous year's statistical figures, but certainly over the past 12 months the retail price of eggs in South Australia has skyrocketed, as the member for Florey drew to our attention.

It has gone wild, not only in total price but in comparison with all other neighbouring States, both to the east and to the west, and indeed in Queensland as well. We should ask ourselves why South Australia got itself into such an out of gear position. Why are we so far out of step? The only reason I can deduce from this argument is that, as a result of interference by the Government a year ago, as a result of the then Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Frank Blevins) taking the teeth out of the board in South Australia, the horse has been able to bolt, and away has gone the price.

What we have before us is yet another attempt to erode the authority of the board, to take away the principle of statutory administration over a well-founded, well-established and well respected industry in South Australia. I am appalled to think that the Minister of Agriculture has been so gullible as to be sucked in on this issue. I do not believe that it was by his department, and certainly from information that I have he has not been sucked in by the board itself or its respective members. Further, I know of no producer in the community at large who supports the Minister in this instance, although the Minister says that many of them support him. So, I can only take what the Minister says as read, and that is, that he prepared the second reading explanation, wrote it and delivered it—and indeed, he is way off the mark.

He is asking Parliament to further erode an industrial authority of the State and, indeed, it appears to me that he runs the distinct risk in taking away that authority of taking away the control over the ultimate price of eggs in South Australia. Certainly, over the past 12 month period to which I have referred in particular, the producers have enjoyed no more money. They have received about \$1.50 or \$1.51 a dozen net paid to them throughout the whole period since the previous Minister interfered with the Egg Board's activities. Apparently, there is not much chance of the producers enjoying any more money at grower level under the amendments proposed by the Minister.

Further, there is not much chance of having the overall price controlled. In fact, if anything with loose free marketing, as it has been described, there is a real chance during lean periods of the year for the price to fluctuate above—at times maybe below—the retail prices that are prevailing, enabling the big marketers of eggs to dictate to the industry at large. I do not want to name the big producers in particular, but whoever they are and into whatever category they may fall, you can bet your bottom dollar that the little producers will go out of the window in the exercise. If that is what the Minister wants, I can only deduce from that that in fact he and his colleagues in Government believe that they will ultimately have greater control over the industry because they will have fewer producers and therefore less to deal with.

For as long as I can recall, it has been the philosophy and objective of the Labor Party to in fact minimise the membership, to distract their attention, to have them fighting amongst themselves, and to have them bring themselves down on their knees, and thereafter it is easier for the Labor Party to manipulate them. I believe that in this instance the industry is vulnerable to yet another attack by not only one who is seeking to carry out a basic philosophy of the Labor Party but one who is ill-informed as well, and one

(and this is the part that really gets up my shirt, Mr Deputy Speaker) who has sought to mislead this Parliament and anyone else who should read his second reading explanation, because, at least within the ambit and boundaries of that part of the second reading explanation that I have quoted the Minister has misled the Parliament.

I believe that that is unacceptable, and I believe that the Minister ought to apologise for that. When the Minister concludes this debate I believe that he should give and indicate his recognition that he has erred and withdraw the legislation, to be brought back in a straight and honest way, so that we would be dealing with facts and not with some philosophically based idea and some personal opinion that he has derived on behalf of the industry, for which, obviously, he has little feeling, as he has little regard for the masses at large who are involved in it.

**Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee):** The obvious consequences of this measure are quite clearly the same as those entailed in the previous Bill that we were debating today, and that is that it will simply enhance and accelerate the rate and extent to which this Government establishes its sleazy corporatism relationship between big business, itself as big government, and big unions—but let us leave the unions out of this just for a minute, because we know what the storeman and packers and transport workers have in mind for the post deregulation of the Egg Board scenario.

The big producers will be told to whom their employees must belong, and if they do not comply they will find themselves in all sorts of strife. I will not make any puns about that. There is no question about the fact that the measure before the House at present is not deregulation at all. Anyone who thought that it was could be forgiven for being regarded by others as being a few kilos short of a tonne. The problem is that the part that is being deregulated is not the industry at large but the market. That means that the smaller producer (as was the case with the previous measure relating to the dairy industry) will be affected. There will virtually be cow quotas imposed.

This measure would deregulate the protection that has existed for the small producer while maintaining a regulation on the number of chooks that everybody who is already in the industry can run. It will not be possible for the small producer to protect himself in the deregulated selling environment. They are of such insignificance that the large buyers, who are the substantial retailers (and I shall refer to them in a minute), will not give a fig about whether they get any eggs from the small producers, one way or the other. The large buyers will become the chopper; the supermarkets will be the butcher; and the industry will be the block.

The big supermarket buying chains will simply go to the small producers and invite them to offer lower and lower prices in competition with each other and the large producers. That will reduce the price paid to egg producers by the substantial retailers. I know, I have been in this scenario with a number of perishable commodities like eggs—perhaps even more perishable, such as cauliflowers, lettuces and strawberries—and that is exactly the way they work.

They take the small producers and say that they will buy if the producers agree to sell at 2c or 3c below the market price. They keep screwing it down, they then go back to the big producers, show them the invoices that they have had the small producers sign as accepting that price, and say, 'We are not going to pay you any more than that.' So, you have to be tough about that if you are a tough marketer and a reasonable sized producer and not play their game. You must treat them with the same kind of respect with which they have treated you when egg supplies are short.

The point I am making is that the end result of this exercise is that it gives the muscle to large retailers. It will not reduce one jot the price to the consumer. There will be a cartel of substantial retailers in apparent opposition to each other. The Minister knows this: there will be no opposition there whatever. They will simply watch what each other does and for the most part of the year more than ample eggs will be available for the market as fresh eggs.

During the remainder of the year they will simply sit back, lift the price on the shelf and refuse to pay a higher price to producers. They will obtain a bigger margin on a smaller turnover, giving them, on the bottom line, an equivalent net profit from that commodity for that week, month or whatever the time frame is, when eggs will be in shorter supply.

Of course, during that period small shopkeepers who have a very low turnover and a very insignificant percentage of the total market will follow suit and will want to get something out of the eggs that they handle, if any. The regrettable part about their continuing involvement in the retail industry is that they will be looking for what they consider to be a reasonable percentage mark-up on that commodity, like the other commodities that they sell.

The other commodities are less perishable, and the turnover is lower than it is on the shelf in the supermarkets. The consequence, as the member for Light has pointed out, is that the number of eggs sold 'stale' will go up. It will be more difficult to maintain quality control on those eggs through small retail outlets and, even if quality control could be maintained, the end consequence would be to effectively disfranchise them. They will not be able to afford the shrinkage, the loss, through having stale eggs which they will have to discard or on which they will otherwise cop the loss. So, they simply will not handle eggs.

We will find that the consumer will buy eggs from fewer and fewer suppliers to the retail market. Those fewer suppliers will be extremely powerful in that market and, even though the wholesale price of the eggs paid to the producers will go down, it will not produce a price benefit to the consumer.

It could be possible to envisage a different result if you completely deregulated the industry and wiped out hen quotas—the lot—and introduced stringent controls and random quality checks on shelf displays of eggs where you prosecute not only the retailer but also the supplier, and you required the producer and packer to register themselves as such, so that you knew by their producer or packer number who they were and could trace the eggs back to the source.

That would still be regulation, but only to the extent that it protects public health interests; that is, the interest of consumers at large. It is real piffle for the Minister, the member for Florey and the echo—the member for Albert Park—to stand up and say—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** It was an echo. It was entirely the speech of the member for Florey given by the member for Albert Park all over again. The sequence of ideas presented to the Chamber were identical. I do not know who flogged which material, but clearly those two speeches were absolute duplications, each of the other, in every respect other than the words used: the ideas articulated were the same. I put to the House for the benefit of honourable members that the approach being taken to the egg producing industry at present by this Government will lead to a disaster, and the Government is conning itself if it believes that that will not arise. The Government is conning its supporters if it tells them that that will not arise—people will be worse off.

I want to illustrate that in yet another way. The member for Florey, backed by little Sir Echo, as I said, made the point that eggs were dearer in South Australia. The member for Alexandra has given one explanation of why eggs were dearer from March 1985 until the present time. Government members are not comparing like with like; it is being dishonest. That information was—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr LEWIS:** I do not know what that gesture means, but up yours, too, if that is what it means. I take exception to gesticulations of that kind that are made by the Minister out of your line of vision, Sir, because the Minister of Housing is standing in the line of sight between you and the Minister at the bench.

If one wants to compare like with like, one should acknowledge that the Australian Bureau of Statistics in all other States averaged the retail prices of a basket of goods from retail outlets, whereas in South Australia it took the recommended retail price for standard grade eggs. In other States no such grade comparison was taken into consideration in the determination of that average price. What is more, neither was the capacity for retailers in this State to sell at less than the recommended retail price.

If the Minister wants to be really honest, he should come out with figures that are like to each other for the sake of making that comparison and substantiating the argument that he wishes to put. He should not try to mislead this House or the community at large into believing that there will be some benefit by referring to an arithmetical projection of figures which would not stand scrutiny of an honest analyst. The second reading explanation referred to the strongarm tactics of the big egg producers. I acknowledge that those tactics will become more predominant after the measure that we are debating tonight becomes law. One simply cannot expect them (it is not in their interests) to give any consideration to the smaller producers.

If they can prevent the smaller producers from getting access to a market and send them to the wall, two things will occur. First, they will be able to pick up the few hen quotas that are left in the names of the small producers as they sell out at bargain basement prices in the shake-out that occurs. Secondly, if they want it, they will have a cartel. Frankly, if no further deregulation of the industry is to occur, it would be my advice to a prospective investor to buy up big on hen quotas in South Australian egg production now and get a good slice of the total market, especially if one is involved in the production and supply to retailers of other perishable and non-perishable foodstuffs. Then one will have substantial leverage as a big producer to screw those retailers for good profit margins, and there will be no way in which the Government will be able to prevent the retailers from taking whatever margin they want on top of that in selling to the consumer.

If Government members do not believe what I am saying, then I am happy to have my words shoved down my throat in two years time. It is my judgment that I am not mistaken. I have been involved in market negotiations of this kind over a long period of time and well understand what goes on. The Minister is playing into the hands of the larger producers and is spelling the death knell of the small producer. I guess that that is, as I said at the outset, convenient for the Government, because it wants to have the least number of 'shops' possible producing the commodity and supplying it to the market place and the greatest number of employees per producer possible so that it will be easy to unionise the industry. That will increase not by any great number, but by some significant amount of money, what

goes into the sustentation fund for the Party that the Minister and the Government represent.

In addition, it will strengthen the unions which will have control over what are regarded as staple food items and their supply to retail outlets. It will make it easier for the unions to hold the large retailers and producers to ransom and to play Coles off against Woolworths, and one big egg producer off against the other. Industrial action will be taken against one retailer at a time: it is divide and rule, and that is the technique that I call sleazy corporatism, because that will be the end consequence. I spell it out in this way to warn those people who will be involved in the near future in the decision making to be wary in any negotiations that may take place.

I think that the assertion was made in the second reading explanation that this Bill will save the consumers \$1.8 million per year. That saving spread throughout the community amounts to \$1.80 per person. I am prepared to bet that within a fairly short time it will cost a damn sight more than double that per year per person in this State. I have explained why I believe that, if this legislation is passed, that will be the scenario.

The last point that I want to make (and I make it with some emphasis) is that this Bill does not involve deregulation but, rather, it ensures a continuation of regulation in the industry that suits the political ends of this Government. Any attempt to argue that, of itself, it is deregulation is fallacious. How can the Minister claim that, by leaving hen quotas in place but removing market protection at one end, without the capacity to rigorously control the quality of the article going onto the market in terms of its bacterial count and grading according to size, that is deregulation? I believe that that argument is nuts and that it does not fit. There is no way that the industry will be in any sense deregulated. The industry will still be at the mercy of the Minister of the day as a result of the surgery proposed for the marketing arrangements by this legislation.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I take over where the member for Murray-Mallee left off and I emphasise that this Bill does not deregulate. The Government has accused us of having double standards (and that is a debate in itself), but this Bill simply transfers the right of regulation from one body to another. I endorse the remarks made by the lead speaker for the Opposition, the member for Eyre, and I draw attention to those remarks. It disappoints me that, despite some of the derogatory remarks made by the Minister in his second reading explanation, the egg industry has been faring exceptionally well, but that this Government wants to change it. It is changing it at a time when the rural industry generally is having to suffer tough times.

Why should such a sweeping change be made without a call, so far as I am concerned, by the rank and file? It was very distressing for me to hear the member for Florey say that he believes that if we do not enact this Bill there will come a time when the egg production industry in this State will be confronted with eggs imported from interstate; the egg producers will not be able to compete because they have grown lazy and have had the protection of the Egg Board; they have thus been able to rip off people in this State by the high prices they charge. That statement is reprehensible: I know many of the people who produce eggs and the last thing I would say about them is that they are lazy. They work a lot darn harder than most people in our community. They are the salt of the earth, in a sense. If they had it half as easy as many people in everyday, nine-to-five jobs, they would think that heaven had all come at once. I resent those remarks and I know that my constituents who are engaged

in this occupation would equally resent them. I am very disappointed that the member for Florey felt inclined to make those remarks and that he said he did not believe we should allow a statutory authority to exist that can rip people off, as the Egg Board is doing at present. Whether the member for Florey was misguided by the Minister's remarks, I do not know—only the member for Florey can answer that.

However, they are serious accusations and the member for Florey should know better. From his membership on boards or committees, he should know that one endeavours to do one's best. Things may not always be perfect, but the last thing the board would ever seek to do is rip off people. The performance of members of the board is clearly shown by the fact that the board has been operating since the early 1940s, and that is an excellent record on which they stand. Not too many bodies in a similar situation have such a first-class record. Yet we hear accusations not only from the member for Florey but also from the Minister in his second reading explanation. It was interesting that the Minister said:

Some of these allegations include warnings that outspoken producers would have their hen quotas either reduced or taken away.

There was an interjection from the Hon. Dr Eastick:

Who wrote that for you?

The Minister said:

I did—all of it.

It certainly shows that he wrote it, too. One would think that a relatively new Minister who has been in the position for less than 12 months would perhaps seek advice and allow one who is—

**Mr Lewis:** He has never had anything to do with primary production, let alone chooks.

**Mr MEIER:** The honourable member is quite right, but one would think at least the Minister would be prepared to take advice and not write his own speeches on such an important issue as this. I certainly hope that the Minister will answer the question that has been put by at least two members on this side as to whether he can substantiate the allegations of these so-called standover tactics. If he cannot, his credibility in this House will fall to a new low. We will await his reply. As the member for Eyre acknowledged, there is certainly the opportunity for streamlining the board, possibly with the reduction of the number of members by one or two. Computerisation would also add to efficiency, and the number of staff members in administration and the pulping plant could be reduced.

Let us look at these things reasonably and rationally. At least let the egg producers have a say on the matter and let us stop the Government just coming in with its bulldozing tactics because it is quite obvious to me that since the Potato Board is gone the next on the hit list will be the Barley Board. If the Government continues to pursue this course of action then not only will it see the rural sector completely opposed to it but these feelings will be vented through the ballot box in the metropolitan area also. You in particular, Mr Acting Speaker, because of your marginal seat would appreciate the fact that the Governments needs to take into account the views of the people of South Australia. It needs to at least recognise the people who are creating the real economic wealth in this State. Certainly with our current distribution of seats where country seats have little representation, the rural areas are getting less concern from the Government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Tyler):** Order! The House will come to order.

**Mr Gunn:** The honourable member is being very naughty.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Eyre will come to order.

**Mr MEIER:** I believe I overheard an interjection that was completely out of order from the member for Newland. Did she say, 'What about the workers?'' It is getting to the stage where the workers are first and foremost.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Murray-Mallee has made his contribution.

**Mr MEIER:** It is fine to consider the workers, and I will be the first to consider them. However, if you give the worker all rights and take away rights from employers and everyone else in the community including the self-employed, the whole economy will crash. It is amazing to hear this sort of interjection because surely at this time when our dollar has gone down to a new low of just under 60c to the US dollar, which is low anyway, we should be thinking differently. We should compare our dollar with the Deutschmark. It is now 1.2 Deutschmarks whilst not so long ago it was 2 Deutschmarks to the Australian dollar. The Japanese yen was 200 to the dollar and has dropped to 90 yen to the dollar. The Government at the State and Federal level is ruining the economy.

The Egg Board situation is another case where the Government is determined to keep on kicking the boots into the rural sector. The sooner this Government stops the better it will be. Whilst the Liberal Party will endeavour to solve the situation on returning to Government, we realise that this Government has three more years and can ruin a lot more people in those three years. I wish that Government members would see common sense. It will be shown in the ballot box at the next Federal election, without any doubt.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order. The member for Goyder has the floor.

**Mr MEIER:** I will not transgress into the general workings of the economy other than to repeat that this is one more nail in the coffin. I plead with the Government to start seeing common sense and to give some credibility to the rural sector and its people as they are still the backbone of this State. I certainly oppose this Bill and ask the Minister to reconsider his views. I ask that members opposite reconsider their views so that the Egg Board does not have to be dispensed with and a new *de facto* board created that will not change the situation in real terms other than to transfer all responsibility to the Minister and say that this Government wants to have control of one more body. It will lead to total control of everything in the long run. I urge all members to oppose the Bill.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I oppose the Bill. I am the first to admit that I am not fully *au fait* with the egg industry but I do understand some basic fundamental principles involved in orderly marketing, and it is for that reason that I most strongly oppose this Bill.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BLACKER:** If the honourable member will give me an appropriate interjection at the appropriate time, I will answer his question. I sought some advice from the producer organisation as to where it stood on this matter and what its ideas were in relation to this Bill. Needless to say, it was against it. I think it would be appropriate if I quoted from the following letter I received in reply:

Dear Peter

Thank you for your letter . . . regarding the introduction of the Egg Control Authority Bill into the Lower House on Tuesday.

The United Farmers and Stockowners is gravely concerned that the proposed legislation does not achieve benefits for either pro-

ducers or consumers and does not assist in the efficient rationalisation of the industry in this State.

Our views have been made known to the Minister of Agriculture and the Leaders of the Liberal and Democrat Parties in Parliament.

We consider that the proposed legislation is unworkable and that should it be adopted it will spell the demise of the egg industry in South Australia as we know it. Already some interstate parties are expressing interest in trying to encroach into the South Australian market.

This organisation also considers it most inappropriate that the proposed legislation allows the Minister to remove all marketing and production controls applying to the egg industry at his discretion, without reference to Parliament.

Demand/supply management is essential for the survival of the egg industry in South Australia. We have the case in the chicken meat industry where Manos is being pressured by the Inghams enterprise to close down business in this State and we are fearful that this situation could be repeated in the egg industry.

The UFS supports orderly marketing for eggs and therefore cannot endorse the proposed legislation.

The President also enclosed some background papers on that. I believe that probably sums up in a nutshell the views of many of the producers and the organisational people within this State. Mention has been made by other speakers about the Minister's terminology in his second reading explanation. I must express my surprise, if not condemnation, at any Minister wording a second reading explanation in such a way. I do not know whether the Minister is proud of those words but, since they are being circulated around the State, I am sure that some reflection upon him will obviously ensue. Needless to say, terminology like that is something that I hope we do not see a repeat of. The Minister said:

Egg marketing in South Australia needs a 'shake up' in a dramatic way. Let there be no doubt about it, the majority of efficient producers are in favour of deregulation but many are afraid to speak out because they fear a reaction, whether perceived or real, from the Egg Board.

That is almost vicious language.

**Mr Lewis:** It is libellous outside this place.

**Mr BLACKER:** I would have thought that, if it had been made outside this place, almost certainly legal action would be taken. It is under parliamentary privilege that the Minister has exercised a wrong discretion to make statements like that. He said further:

I make this statement on the basis of discussions I have held with individual producers.

I wonder whether the Minister consulted with the producer organisations in a similar vein. The Minister has been able to make up or create reasons for this legislation on the basis of talking to individuals. Let us face it: the Minister could concoct any sort of story that he would like by selecting the individuals to whom he wanted to speak. When the Minister goes above the local organisations and bases his arguments on discussions he has had with individuals, I think he is on pretty shaky ground. He added:

Some of these allegations include warnings that outspoken producers would have their hen quotas either reduced or taken away. This is an intolerable situation.

Then there was an interjection by the Hon. B.C. Eastick who said, 'Who wrote that for you?' The Minister replied, 'I did—all of it.' If I were the Minister, or any other member in this Chamber, I certainly would not be very proud to own up to that sort of response.

**Mr Lewis:** At least he was honest.

**Mr BLACKER:** It was probably more a matter of the Minister's being caught out by way of interjection. His immediate response was to own up and, in fact, he was caught out.

**Mr Lewis:** He's actually proud of the fact.

**Mr BLACKER:** I am not sure whether or not the Minister is proud of it, but it is on the record for the rest of the

State and the nation to see, and they will judge him on it in the future. One of the basic reasons given by the Minister, particularly in his press announcements, is that there will be cost benefits to the consumer. If there is a cost benefit to the consumer, it will be purely at the expense of the producer. We all know that the producers are squeezed to the limit now. Therefore, there will be peasant farmers in the egg industry. When that occurs I am sure that the Minister will be proud of his achievements. To my way of thinking, that is the only net result that can occur from this legislation. I do not know what the Minister bases his assertion on when he says that the consumer will receive eggs at 20c a dozen—I do not know at all. I think the Minister is obviously making a stab in the dark about that. For the life of me I cannot see how it can occur. Every other organisation with which I have been involved has not had that occur. However, the Minister seems to think that that will be the case.

One of the basic principles behind the legislation is the dismantling of orderly marketing. I was challenged earlier about my views on orderly marketing. If it is the producers' wish to organise themselves in order to present their produce in the best possible way, I have no objection to that. Older members of the community have related to me their experiences in the depression years. I know that many Government members will probably turn off when I mention this. My father has often told me of the traumas involved in selling grain during the depression years and soon after.

Producers would take a truckload (and earlier it was a wagon load) down to the siding and barter with Bungeys and other grain merchants as to the price they would get. When they sold their grain they had absolutely no idea of a reasonable market price. When it came time for harvest, and after they had been through all the rigours of the elements, they would load up their grain and take it to the siding where a buyer would offer a price; behind the next bush there would be another buyer offering a halfpenny more; and perhaps further down there would be another buyer. They would all barter for the grain before it was even unloaded. So, depending on the price you actually negotiated there and then on the spot, it would depend on which stack the truck pulled up beside to unload. Obviously there were many casualties during the depression years, and many of them occurred because of the lack of an orderly marketing system. That developed in more recent years and I believe it worked very well.

This idea of free trade crops up every now and again. Obviously it crops up in cases where there is trading across the border between the States. It will continue to crop up because many of the present day generation who are primary producers have not experienced that day to day or individual bartering method of selling grain or any other product. As a generation of people have passed through we get the new inquisitive community who say, 'Yes, this might be a better tactic. There might be a better short term benefit for me', but overall there is a degrading of the community. The grain industry is already one of the most efficient producers in the world, yet it faces considerable difficulties.

Earlier this evening we heard mention, particularly from the members for Florey and Albert Park, of arguments in defence of this Bill for deregulation. The counter argument was, what about the employees? I think those same people should start looking around at that industry and counting the number of jobs that have been lost to it through their own folly. Perhaps they would work out that 20 years ago the number of people employed within the egg industry—and I have no idea what the number would be—was probably at least 10 times greater than it is now, and all those

jobs have been lost because the demands by the employees have been so extravagant that there has been a trend towards mechanisation. Let us face it: the employers would shift over totally to mechanisation if it were possible. For as much as it is possible, they have shifted over to that.

I sought a comment, if I can put it that way, from an individual egg producer. As I said, I do not have large scale egg producers in my electorate; therefore I cannot speak from personal experience or from having close association with any egg producer. I did seek the comment and would like to quote the correspondent's comments into *Hansard*. The letter reads:

Dear Peter,

You are no doubt as confused as anyone about the Minister of Agriculture's proposals to 'free up' the marketing of eggs. Ten years or so ago the egg industry was in dire straits and measures unpopular to some were implemented to regulate production of eggs to local market requirements. These were essentially hen quotas and charges or levies needed to equalise prices to give a steadying influence over the egg prices throughout the year.

I just raise the point that these were the circumstances which arose 10 years ago and were raised to correct the situation that occurred then. What we are doing is trying to recreate the circumstances that occurred at that time. The letter continues:

The Egg Board took into note the cost of producing eggs and the marketplace demand in fixing egg prices. Whether these two together could be construed as a guaranteed minimum price to producers, giving them 'a cosy and comfortable arrangement' is debatable.

In the process, hundreds of little producers, those who considered themselves inefficient, were helped to leave the industry as the quotas had come to have a monetary value. The Minister is afraid an across the border egg war will develop, but if that appears to be imminent, no doubt the Egg Board would re-evaluate pricing at that time.

Eggs to the consumer cannot be too high in price as, with promotion, they are still being bought in competition with other foodstuffs. From what I have seen of the Minister's scheme the price to the producer will fall, and this will be the only 'reward' that the more efficient producer will receive for his efforts.

He is not in the business to provide cheap food to the masses at his own expense. There is the consequence to the measures already taken by the industry, through the Egg Board, of that becoming highly controlled and closed to others than those who stuck with it through the bad times of readjustment.

I have a fear that with deregulation the way would be left open for the big monopolies to control the industry, who, in the end, will have no qualms for either the producer or the consumer. At the moment there are only two major hatcheries and one smaller one producing for the whole of Australia. The two larger ones are what can be described as multinationals.

Is this what the Minister and his Party want? Then at some future date will it suddenly come to pass that the multinationals are not in the best interests of the people and will need to be controlled by Government takeover? Speaking with an Egg Board inspector this week, I asked if his job was secure under the new proposals. He said that the Chairman of the Egg Board had said, 'Yes', but that he had heard from another source that the inspectors under the new system will be employed from the Public Service.

He was not all that enthusiastic about the idea of being forced to join the Public Service to be eligible for appointment by the Minister. It seems as if deregulation does not go as far as preventing Government intervention from the back door. There is only one point that perhaps I am in agreement with, and that is that the Egg Board needs to be trimmed; it does not need doing away with. Any changes to the industry can still be efficiently dealt with through the board.

Those comments were made to me by an egg producer, one who I assume has a lot closer contact with the industry than I do. I think that the basic principle of orderly marketing remains. I will defend it to the end because I believe that this nation was built by primary producers on a satisfactory orderly marketing scheme. I recognise that not every orderly marketing authority has acted as efficiently as it could, but it does not solve the problem to do away with them. The problem needs to be fixed by readjustment, and by getting

the orderly marketing system to work in the way in which it was originally intended to work. I oppose the Bill because I believe no real advantage can occur to producers of this State from it.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture):** What a diatribe of hypocrisy from this Party that prevaricates in the electorate about deregulation. How amazing! Members opposite herald the free enterprise system and when it comes to deregulation they call it 'orderly marketing'. I note that not one city Liberal member has spoken on this Bill. Note that, Mr Deputy Speaker. Not one city member has spoken up for consumers. It is the rural rump of the Liberal Party, which is about all that remains of that which represents its interests on this Bill.

**An honourable member:** We care about people.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** We care about people—that is the very point. The member for Victoria heralded free enterprise, but when it comes to deregulation he runs away like a frightened rabbit because he has a rural rump interest and cannot front up and deal with the matter honestly. That is the way it is—not one city member from the Liberal Party has spoken on the second reading. That will be remembered, as will the Opposition reaction in relation to consumers in the metropolitan area, and in the country.

It is interesting that I have received a number of phone calls from country people interested in supporting the legislation. Some city members have indicated to me on the side that they basically support it, as well, so we will see what happens when the Bill goes to the other place. In addition, I have noticed that there was great support for deregulation by the Federal Liberal Party and quite an amount of support from the Leader of the Opposition in this State, but when it comes to the crunch, when it comes to members' own little sectarian interests they back right off. This should be noted by consumers in this State and in the electorate, because members opposite do not stand by what they preach—it is a matter of 'Do as we say, not as we do.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** The member for Goyder comments about this coming out in the ballot box. He will live to rue the day that he did not support this Bill in relation to deregulation. This will be reflected particularly in metropolitan seats, because the price of eggs in this State in comparison with the price in other States is much higher, whether at the retail or any other level of the marketing system. Let us not kid ourselves—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** During the currency of this debate I admonished the Minister for interjecting whilst Opposition speakers were speaking. I stated at the time that he would have an opportunity to answer those speeches. That opportunity has now arrived and I ask members opposite to show him the same courtesy that he showed to them. I ask the speaker to address the Chair and not to reply to interjections.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am delighted to address this issue to you as I know you are very interested in it as a member and as Chairman of Committees. It is important that we note the stance of the Liberal Party in relation to this Bill because it highlights the hypocrisy with which members opposite herald their policies to the community. It is the reason why they have lost two elections in a row, the last in a devastating fashion. If they again choose to go this way that in my opinion marks their direction in the next election. There is no doubt about it—if we look at retail prices or farm gate prices and

compare them with prices around Australia they are consistently higher here than in other States.

The other point that has been made concerned consultation with my predecessor (Hon. Frank Blevins). I know from his comments to me and comments from officers of the department that the Chairman of the Egg Board was involved in various meetings. At the meeting of the UF&S and the Chairman of the Egg Board, the Chairman acknowledged that. The former Minister said to me that he had made very clear in no uncertain terms that the Egg Board had to improve its performance in relation to prices and other administrative mechanisms for which it is responsible under the Act. He said that if any statutory authority under his jurisdiction as Minister of Agriculture should have got the message it was the Egg Board. However, it did not respond, and it has not responded. That is why we are in the situation that we are in with this Bill before Parliament. The Egg Board has not responded to the repeated requests from the Minister. There was repeated consultation with the UF&S and with the Chairman of the Egg Board. There has been an inquiry. A member has asked why there has been no public inquiry. The information supplied to the Minister and the Government was confidential, as in a select committee; it is not to be released.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** The member for Victoria wants to have another bite at the cherry.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I call the member for Victoria to order.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** So, the Government and the Minister went through that process. The Chairman of the Egg Board has acknowledged that those processes were undertaken by the Minister. In fact, the Minister made quite clear to me in handing over the portfolio that, in effect, if any statutory authority had ever been given any warning that its performance and future were on the line, it was the Egg Board. There is no question about that. The Egg Board has not responded. In a roundabout, wishy-washy way Opposition members dilly-dally around the periphery: they want to knock off one board member, or change it in some way. Talk about playing the fiddle while Rome burns! This is a classic example of their not wanting to get to the guts of the problem or to the cause of it. We have to deal with this matter in a direct fashion. The thing needs more than a radical shake up—it needs a major shake up, and very soon it has to have that as a part of a strong dose of medicine.

**Mr D.S. Baker:** It hasn't lost as much as SAMCOR over the years, but you have done nothing about that.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I can respond in relation to SAMCOR in due course, but I will deal with the egg legislation at the moment, because, although the member for Victoria may not want to, other members want to go home eventually. The legislation does constitute a new authority, one with significantly fewer powers but with an ability to promote the very things that members opposite have spoken of. Notwithstanding, members opposite want to dabble at the edges, slice off a bit here and make the board something a little less than it is but still with the same powers, the same administrative role and the same statutory function that exists at the moment. However, as I have said here again and again it has not proved that it is responsible, given those powers, so it has to be dramatically reviewed. Had the Egg Board heeded the notice given by the Minister in 1983, I am sure that we may not face the situation that we face today. I think that certain members of the board would acknowledge that privately—whether they would do



that publicly, is another matter. Some matters opposite seem to be a little cloudy in their own mind as to what powers the board has and, therefore, for their benefit I point out that section 27 of the Marketing of Eggs Act provides:

The board should sell all eggs of which it becomes the owner under this Act to such persons and at such prices and on such terms as it deems fit.

That gives it *carte blanche* to respond in the market; it is virtually writing an open cheque for market interference, everything, of course, that members opposite herald as being so evil when it comes to any other aspects of regulation in the community. Another factor is that the Government gave a very clear indication in its pre-election policy speech by the Premier that the efficiency and operation, of every statutory body would be reviewed, and that continues.

**Mr D.S. Baker:** You've done nothing about SAMCOR.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** We have. The honourable member shows his ignorance time and time again. God help us if the member for Victoria ever gets to run a statutory body because the mess will be horrendous. His understanding of industrial relations and other matters, financial and whatever, could be put on the back of a threepenny stamp.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I call the House to order. For the second time I request that members do not interject. I ask the Minister to address the Chair and not respond to interjections.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I thought I was addressing you consistently and constantly in relation to this Bill. It is very important that we highlight the aspects of this Bill in relation to the powers that are vested in the existing board and the powers that are proposed under the legislation that will take its place. Although I may be wrong in singling him out, I think the member for Light said that we would see the new organisation grow back to a statutory body similar in size and function to the existing board.

Certainly it will not, under the present Government, grow to anything like its present size, I can assure the honourable member it might, if ever there was another Liberal Government, because it would be in its interest to foster this rural rump which it seems to be so keen and eager to satisfy.

*Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Victoria. This is the third occasion on which I have spoken to him, and I assure the honourable member that he will incur my wrath if this continues.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I hope the honourable member is not reflecting on the Chair. This is the member for Victoria's first warning.

**Mr D.S. BAKER:** Being new to this establishment, I do not know how many warnings I get. Can you, Sir, tell me.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member will resume his seat. It is normal for the Chair to give two warnings. However, it is up to the Chair whether or not two warnings are given. In the mood that is prevailing here now, I may not be willing to give two warnings. I hope that the honourable member is taking notice: he posed the question and I hope he is taking notice of what I am saying, because he is now on a warning. He may not get another warning. It is usual to give a member two warnings.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Numerous points have been raised, and I referred to one raised by the member for Light, although I stand to be corrected about that. It is something that must be addressed in reply, given the points raised by members opposite concerning the Bill. Some interesting points can be raised by referring to the function and operation of the board over the years. I draw the attention of

members to comments put before another place by the Hon. M.B. Cameron, Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House, in regard to the operations of the Egg Board. I refer to his comments made on 21 July 1981 because they are relevant. The comments herald that there need to be changes.

Honourable members are covering their tracks or backs concerning the operation of the board, because they are all a little sensitive about coming out too far and supporting the board on the current information provided about its operations. Honourable members are a little nervous about sticking their oar right out in case it gets lopped off in the debate.

Much criticism and concern has been expressed in the industry. Growers have come to me and said that. I have had the opportunity to meet growers in various situations to discuss their concerns about the Bill. One major concern is the sale of the pulping plant and equipment in relation to the provision of material, the commodity, to the South Australian market.

We will address that quickly and responsibly. I am concerned, as indeed is the Government, about ensuring that we can provide that commodity to the local market from a local production. The discussions that I held with the large producers were quite useful. A great deal of misinformation has been forthcoming from the Liberal Party, and it is great at that in the current environment, in relation not only to this matter but also to other matters that have been before the House. Concern has been expressed about the capacity to deal with the pulping of eggshells in relation to supplying local commodities. That was the major issue that came from several large growers whom I met with to discuss the impact of this legislation.

Some members, including the member for Eyre, said that attention needs to be given to improving efficiency, which is again another euphemism for a major shake-up of the Egg Marketing Board and its operations. On 21 July 1981, the Hon. M.B. Cameron in another place said:

I should like to say something about one statutory authority that I believe needs to be examined closely by the Government and this Parliament. I refer to the Egg Marketing Board.

In 1981 we had that clear comment from the present Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House when the Tonkin Liberal Government was in power.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** A Government member at the time!

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** A Government member indeed. The Minister has joined me. His enthusiasm—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** —knows no bounds.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** That is so.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will be in trouble if he keeps interjecting out of his seat.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** The Hon. M.B. Cameron continued:

This may not seem to be a terribly relevant matter to this Parliament, although I believe that it is an example of why statutory authorities must be put under closer scrutiny, why they should give reasons for their existence, and why they should say how they operate.

Members opposite should remember this, because it will come back and haunt them. I am sure that they will see this come back to life if the Bill does not pass in another place. The present Leader of the Opposition goes on at some length and quotes from the Auditor-General's Report. He says:

It seems rather strange to me that, while we have a Federal Minister for Primary Production bitterly complaining about the European Economic Community dumping agricultural products on the world market, we should be guilty of the same thing.

The Hon. Mr Cameron there draws out the comparison that we currently face with the Americans. We are criticising



the Americans and the Europeans for their marketing practices both internally and externally, yet we have what the honourable member obviously draws out as a marketing practice in this State. We should not, as he would probably say, throw stones if we live in glasshouses. The Hon. M.B. Cameron continues:

I question whether the egg production scheme has reached a stage where orderly marketing is turning into monopoly marketing. . . I do not believe it is up to Parliament or the Government to continue a scheme that supports the protection of a monopoly production system.

The Hon. Mr Cameron, the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House, was here commenting on the operation of the Egg Marketing Board in 1981. If that does not make members opposite slightly squeamish, there is more to come. They should be concerned about the positions that they take in relation to the protection of a regulatory and marketing interference from the notice of the Egg Board. In effect, they are protecting, I suppose, a little precinct which has some unique powers of operation and administration in the egg industry. I suppose that members opposite are answering their rural electorates, which are lobbying them hard and fast.

There have been comments made that 1 000 jobs and 400 producers will disappear, along with other outrageous comments which have no foundation or support. I think that in this State we have 420 registered producers so, after subtracting 400, that leaves a total of 20 in the industry, which is an absurd proposition and one which has no foundation whatsoever. In relation to the jobs, the member for Murray-Mallee said that this is a plot by the Government to unionise the industry. Again, that is the twisted way in which the Murray-Mallee may view the legislation, but in fact he was arguing that there will be a rationalisation and that there will be more jobs in the industry. Obviously, the Liberal Party cannot get its act together and cannot think clearly, because basically it is trying to defend the indefensible at a level which I believe will lead to consumers and the industry as a whole in this State not benefiting from any exposure to methods and efficiency applying through the market forces.

I now turn to some of the more extreme points raised by some members opposite in relation to this Bill. Recently, the Egg Board dispatched an employee, or perhaps one of its board members, to New Zealand to see what happened there in regard to deregulation. The board has not officially advised me as Minister of this venture. One would have thought that, as the Minister, it would have been appropriate, suitable and systematic for the board to notify me of whatever activities it was undertaking on any matter of major concern to the board. That has not been the case but, fortunately, I have seen a copy of a report prepared by the board indicating some quite interesting facts as a result of the investigation in New Zealand.

As a result of partial deregulation in New Zealand (it was in a different form from that proposed in this Bill), during the first few weeks of the scheme the price dropped, but unfortunately that document is not officially available, so I cannot use it in Parliament. It would have been useful to have that report, and one would have thought it would be appropriate for me to have it but, because it does not support what certain interests in the community advocate, it seems to have disappeared and is not available to the community. In effect, there was greater flexibility, which is basically what this Bill will achieve in terms of the market price of eggs placed on the retail market. I suspect that, because the support that the egg industry expected to receive from such a report did not in fact eventuate, the report has disappeared.

In relation to the continued accusations by members opposite concerning price setting, the Department of Agriculture sets the farm gate price on cost of production. I think one has to make clear how that exercise was carried out and how the price was arrived at and then compare that with the cost basis used in New South Wales, which seems to be the State hailed as a comparison. I am happy to do that and to provide additional information which I think reflects on the final market price at which we see eggs being retailed in suburban Adelaide.

In September 1983 the Department of Agriculture carried out a cost of production survey on egg contracts involving the Egg Board. In relation to the terms of reference supplied by the Egg Board, I make clear that, if one sets the tune that the piper has to play, then one probably gets the tune that one desires. I think that that comment is very relevant to the basis of the cost of eggs in South Australia when compared with other States. The cost of production is arrived at by a Cost of Production Committee (and I mention this for the benefit of members opposite who have raised certain matters which I do not believe are a true representation of the situation) which advises the Egg Board on the BAE index, CPI adjusted, as a correction for the figure determined in 1983. (It adds the CPI to the 1983 base figure). The figures include operating, labour and management costs, capital depreciation and return on the costs involved, and it works out in 1986 at \$1.24 per dozen.

The comparable Victorian figure in 1986 was 93c. With a similar calculation, we might be able to achieve a true comparison, but we do not have that. If we are doing a proper analysis, we must look at the basis on which the terms of reference were set and the instructions upon which the officers of the Department of Agriculture determined the cost of production figure. We really have to say that the differential starts to be reflected as we begin the pyramid at the base, and the bases are different. Therefore, as we build we find that the price differential is exaggerated. In my experiences of the retail industry, percentages are added on, so the percentage on a higher base figure gives a higher figure in the end result. The retail figure has been widely canvassed. It shows that we are so much out of kilter with the other States that most comparisons are almost embarrassing.

It is important to note that there is a base differential, that the cost of production is significantly different—93c compared with \$1.24. That is quite a significant difference and it is reflected in the end result. Production costs were referred to by several members, who said that the retail figures did not give a true representation. The member for Alexandra and the member for Murray-Mallee came up with a base according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures. It is absurd to say that there is not a similarity or sameness about the base that the Australian Bureau of Statistics uses for that calculation. It uses the same basket or sample to compare each State, and that is how it comes up with a uniform figure. There is probably no more accurate calculation. Indeed, it is more accurate than the calculation made by the member for Eyre based on trips around supermarkets. The bureau works on a tried and tested system based on statistical formulae and scientific calculations to achieve a comparison.

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** The member for Eyre has probably not had the opportunity to do a course on statistics at university as the member for Mitcham and I did. If he understood what I am talking about in relation to the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, he would understand the comparisons.

*Mr Gunn interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** I will let the community judge.

**Mr Gunn:** Any time you like.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Who is talking academically? The member for Eyre has gone for little trips around supermarkets, but this comparison is based on real world figures and samples from the real world averaged across the whole of Australia. It is a fair comparison, not some airy fairy figure that has been dragged in on a non-scientific basis. It is absurd to debate the issue with the honourable member because, quite obviously, he has difficulty understanding it.

I was interested to receive a letter from a prominent individual in Victoria who indicated his support for the position taken by the South Australian Government. He put forward the view that the price of eggs in South Australia is about 50c more than it could be, while still providing a fair and economic return to those in the industry. That person bases his view on his experience in the Victorian egg industry and makes comparisons from a cost basis. He has presented a substantial, well thought out paper to support his submissions on the price of eggs in this State. It is interesting to note where the support comes from. It appears that a lot of people are frightened to come out and announce their views—I do not know why. I can only surmise what might be behind that.

It is also interesting to note the number of people from rural communities, from Eyre Peninsula to the South-East, who telephoned me saying, 'Keep it up. It must be reviewed. It needs a real shakeup.' They are the comments that come from a number of people in the community who have had dealings and contact with the Egg Board. It is relevant to record those views in *Hansard*. We must understand the background and the basis on which the Bill came before the House.

In relation to some of the points raised by the member for Eyre, I have addressed the issue of consultation. The previous Minister raised on numerous occasions with the Chairman of the Egg Board the position in regard to the Government's view of their performance. I have touched on the issue of confidentiality of the inquiry which was conducted, and the prices comparison. One point needs to be noted in relation to the price cited in New South Wales. If we look at the base price in New South Wales it currently runs, at the farm gate, at 95c compared with our \$1.24. Reflecting on the retail price, the sample we have taken is \$1.98 compared with \$1.53.

When I met with the Australian Council of Egg Producers recently, one of the prominent members indicated, in terms of discussions about New South Wales, that in his opinion the economic viability of those efficient producers in New South Wales was such that they could survive. He drew the line at around \$1.55 a dozen as the break-even point in terms of continuation of investment decisions by producers in New South Wales. He certainly acknowledged in discussion with me, as did other members of the delegation, the need to carefully look at what was happening in South Australia. In fact, he acknowledged that the Government had a responsibility to take a careful and close look at the operation of the Egg Board in this State. I got the distinct impression from what they said to me that they were surprised that it had not happened earlier. They felt that at this point they would prefer things to rest for a moment—a moment's moratorium—but in essence they believe that the situation is such that they can understand the South Australian Government wanting to address a review of the operation of this statutory authority. I make those comments in reply to those made by the member for Eyre,

particularly in regard to New South Wales and South Australian prices.

There is a basis for setting prices which have a foundation at a different level. If the honourable member had any knowledge of the retail industry he would acknowledge that, because they do add on percentages. The potential in this State is to see (through the operation of the Federal Constitution) an opportunity for other producers to enter at any stage, because there is no legal prohibition; no State court could resist the operation of the Commonwealth Constitution.

A number of prominent economists within the South Australian community from both academic and practical consultancies have raised on numerous occasions the inefficiencies that develop in closed marketing situations. The Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House (Hon. M.B. Cameron) made reference to that situation in July 1981 where you develop a structure which in its operation looks very much like the operation of a monopoly and therefore you develop innate inefficiencies, destruction of the various market operations, a distortion of pricing, a distortion of market supply and, as a consequence, the consumer or taxpayer ends up paying the final bill.

We have to be very careful of any statutory body that has the kind of powers vested in the Egg Board. It has to be carefully scrutinised, reviewed and brought before the Parliament on a regular basis to ensure that in all good fairness it is administering the brief and the powers of jurisdiction vested in it. I do not believe that that situation can be justified in the situation of the Egg Board.

I wish to look at the issues raised about interstate producers coming to South Australia. In my discussions with the large producers it was clear that they are not too worried about that situation. Most of the efficient producers could survive quite handsomely in that situation. Let us take economic comparisons between South Australia and the other States; the hen quota system, the prices, are similar and the return is much lower. One would suggest that that is the opportune time for people to buy quotas and move into the market. That has not happened. Interstate people may be interested in moving in, but why should they have a greater advantage than local producers who see the opportunity to expand their section of the industry and take the opportunity? Many large producers I am sure would be looking most anxiously at taking the opportunity to expand and draw their economies of scale from a larger operation.

I really think that it should be summed up as being a rubbish argument, quite frankly, and one that really does not hold any stead because, under section 92 of the Constitution, it just does not stand. Another point made was in relation to health standards or the quality of product which comes from the producer. We have a situation where most other food products are subject to the health food legislation administered by the Health Commission and local government. I really think it is a red herring that has been drawn across the path of sense and logic in this argument to achieve protection for a rural section which has been fostered, encouraged and supported by the Liberal Party in order to protect their rural rump and look after their own self-interest. If we are drawn into thinking that the quality of the product will deteriorate, that reflects not only on the producer but also on the packer and all of the middle people who step in on the chain of marketing to the final product being put on the table of the consumer. I really think that is a non-event, an argument that has no standing whatsoever. As I said, we could easily address it if it became an issue, but I do not believe that it is. Certainly, my advice is that there is adequate legislation at all levels in order to

deal with the quality of the product which will be finally presented to the consumer, so it would have a non-effect on the quality that stands out there.

A number of members made comment that we ought to trim down the operation of the board. I would be interested to know how they intend to achieve that. It seems that not only are they expanding the function but they are heralding new mechanisms which may in fact enlarge the operation, to have a large bureaucracy which they all seem to so keenly detest when they are speaking on everything except some of these 'closer to the heart' rural statutory bodies which they want to protect and foster. I do not see how they can in any way subject themselves to the test if they believe they will trim down the Egg Board and then they oppose the Bill as it stands. This basically represents a trimming down with some maintenance of the regulations in order to protect those members of the industry who wish to stay in it, who wish to expand in it and who wish to protect their investment from the initial outlay in relation to their hen quota and also the capital investment they have made in relation to plant and equipment which is needed to support the operation of their business.

The member for Flinders made reference to orderly marketing. He referred to his father's situation during the depression. I, too, can refer to my father's situation during the depression. In fact, I was talking to him the other day about this very legislation and asked him what sort of things existed when he was struggling in the 1930s. Like the father of the member for Flinders, he went through the same tough periods. He said he was stunned and amazed by the amount of mechanism and support available to the farming community and he never ceases to be amazed by another one which is opened up and exposed and comes before this Parliament or Federal Parliament in relation to questioning the operation of such a statutory body. So, the member for Flinders is not the only one who can reflect on people who have been through the depression. I have had the experience of growing up on a farm and going back to work on a farm during my university years, and I did that in several areas of the State, not just the area I came from. I worked in the Murray-Mallee and saw first hand, by working on them, how farms operate. So, members on the opposite side who want to reflect on my experiences can do so at any time and I will be happy to trade stories and exchange ideas in relation to how farms operate, including the efficient farms—those farmers who have upgraded their information base and those farmers who have not. We see producers in the egg industry who are well organised and efficient, and I freely state that there are many well organised and efficient managers in the egg industry who I believe will not only flourish but will grow as a consequence of this legislation. They will grow not only on the basis of the local market but on a State basis, as well.

Finally, I am not surprised, I suppose, by the reaction of the Liberal Party. I am sure that the electors of South Australia will have to look very carefully at any statements made by the Liberal Party in future in regard to deregulation. Of course, members opposite adopt the approach: it is deregulation for them, not for us. That is the philosophy that they follow—them not us. Whenever we see that on any policy statement put out by the Liberal Party we must draw a line down the middle and then say that it must be watered down.

The Liberal Party says, 'We will tell the electorate exactly what it wants and let it hear exactly what it wants.' But when the Liberal Party gets into government it does not make attempts in relation to deregulation. We have heard the member for Eyre say that he will place a private mem-

ber's Bill before the House for deregulation. What about the Tonkin Government? Talk about chaos! I went through that experience. That Administration spent two years drawing up deregulation guidelines. Is not that a classic case of regulating to deregulate? We see what members opposite have done in the past. This is another black mark in regard to the attempts by members opposite to prevent deregulation in this State.

**Ms Gayler:** It's double speak.

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES:** Exactly. As the member for Newland says, it is double speak. It is quite true that the electors of South Australia will know exactly where the Liberal Party stands in relation to deregulation. As a responsible Party and a responsible Government we will inform the community at the next election exactly where the Liberal Party stands in relation to deregulation. With those few words I conclude my remarks. I hope that I have addressed all the issues raised by members. I believe that I could continue the debate and be here all night without any trouble in answering all of the questions raised. I strongly urge members to support the Bill, because I believe it is in the interests of South Australia.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Agriculture):** I move: That the House do now adjourn.

**Ms GAYLER (Newland):** In addressing the House tonight I will lower the heat but deal with an equally important matter, that is, casual child-care and in particular the fees that apply to casual child-care in this country. I begin by paying a tribute to the superb Australia-wide policy of the Hawke Federal Government and its effort and commitment in relation to child-care services in this country.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I call members to order. This is probably one of the most important subjects to come before the House, and it should be listened to in the appropriate way.

**Ms GAYLER:** I wholeheartedly agree. The Federal commitment announced at the last election to create an additional 20 000 places over the three years of government was, indeed, one of the landmarks we have seen in recent years in this country. That commitment promised a range of child-care services including full day care places, particularly for those women in particular, but families in general, who are full-time workers.

It promised additional places in family day care and, for the first time, included a provision for additional places for occasional child-care, particularly for those women in the community who are full-time carers of children, to enable them to have respite care, to have care to enable them to conduct essential business, and also for those who need simply to take a break from the duties of caring for children, looking after family affairs, and so on. That Federal commitment, I think, is a crucial part of the Hawke Government's platform, and it is having results in all States in Australia as well as South Australia.

The consequences, for example, in the north-eastern suburbs, some of which I represent, have been quite remarkable and well appreciated by the local community. About one year ago we had zero in the way of subsidised child-care

services in the north-eastern suburbs; now, within that year, we have a number of new initiatives. Recently Mrs Hazel Hawke opened the Lurra child-care centre in Modbury. Lurra is a full day care centre which caters primarily for those people in the paid work force and enables them to go to their work knowing that their children are in superb care with wonderful facilities in a very well located child-care centre.

We also have a new centre developing called Emma, which, I suppose, has the distinction of being a private child-care centre but, nevertheless, is designed as a neighbourhood based centre to offer full day care in our local community. The main purpose of my comments tonight is to focus on occasional child-care, and I want to talk particularly about the experiences of Kelly's Farm child-care centre, which was recently opened in a shopping centre in the vicinity of Tea Tree Plaza.

This is a really unique endeavour in that it is an occasional child-care centre built by the developers of the shopping centre in a location right in the heart of the regional centre for the north-eastern suburbs. It is adjacent to shopping facilities, local offices, medical clinics, the Modbury Hospital, and right at the hub of the bus services, the O-Bahn routes that service the north-eastern suburbs.

So, Kelly's Farm is indeed a unique service. As I suggested, its purpose is to cater for occasional child-care, for mums who simply would like to have a regular, say, fortnightly break from the rigours of permanent and everyday child-care and also offers care for the families of disabled children, which is a very important need in our community. In relation to occasional child-care, the Federal Government has recently brought down new guidelines setting out the criteria for establishment—location, in particular—of new facilities, but also in relation to fees.

It is this aspect that I would like to particularly comment on tonight. A look at the Federal Government's guidelines for occasional child-care fees presents some very real problems for these services operating in the community. Kelly's Farm is a 17 place centre offering occasional, short-term and emergency care to families, as I mentioned.

It is subsidised by the Commonwealth at a rate of 40c per hour per licensed place with the remainder of the costs to be covered by a fee for service. The subsidy *in toto* from the Commonwealth Government amounts to \$10 200 per annum, but the estimated cost per annum of the centre will be in excess of \$65 000. This leaves the centre with no option but to charge a fee of \$2.20 per hour per child in order to break even.

There is no sliding scale for second and subsequent children. The result of that is that a family with, say, three children would pay \$19.80 for three hour's care. While Kelly's Farm does have a fee relief system, this is only as a concessional rate to holders of the benefit or pension card, or those eligible for a family income supplement. In those cases, the concession allowable is 50c off the fee for one child, making it \$1.10 per hour per child, and 60 per cent off the fee for two children, making the total \$1.76 per hour for two children.

This does not compare favourably with either full day care fees or family day care fees. A family eligible for family income supplement with two children pays \$5.28 for a three hour session at Kelly's Farm, while they would pay only 37c per hour in family day care or \$1.40 for a six hour session in a Government subsidised full day care centre. I repeat that the fee for a family with two children on family income supplement is \$5.28 for a three hour session.

The problem is that these fee arrangements seem to be inequitable. In only its first week of operation Kelly's Farm

child care centre had families turning away from it, because although the service offered was superb people were unable to afford the high fees; in other words, the fee structure meant that it was not affordable for a large section of the community. We have to remember that at least in our outer suburbs the families that need occasional child care will tend to be those with high mortgages and other family commitments, often with one income earner or no income earner and therefore with very little disposable income.

In order that occasional care is available to people in this situation, fees must be realistic. The Government has made a commitment to offering child care specifically to meet the needs of women who remain at home with their children, as well as those who choose to remain in the work force. But the fee structure prevents those very women, particularly those remaining at home with their children, from availing themselves of those occasional child care places which are now, thankfully, becoming available. I have urged the State Minister of Children's Services and the Children's Services Office to take up with the Federal Government the new occasional child care guidelines with a view to looking, again, at whether the fee structure can be made such that it is affordable for the kinds of people that the service is designed to meet.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I will use the short time available to me tonight to raise an issue of great public concern to farmers in central and eastern Eyre Peninsula who have been so seriously affected by frost damage to crops. I am not sure what is the history of the incidence of frost damage on the Eyre Peninsula, but I do not recall in my memory damage of such an extensive nature ever having occurred before. It is difficult at this stage to say exactly what is the real extent of that damage. Frost, when it affects a cereal crop, does so in three different ways. First, it can cut off the nutrients at the base of the head of the grain, making the head totally unproductive.

In the dough stage of development, when the grain is still soft, if the frost freezes that grain it kills it off and it goes black. That can occur at various stages in the grain head development: if the whole head is in the dough stage, the whole head can be lost, but if some has matured, firmed up and become relatively ripe, then that grain may be okay, but it may well be pinched. So, what I am saying is that the extent of the damage is quite unknown. The Department of Agriculture has undertaken extensive surveys in the area and it is conducting a number of field days there to try to ascertain the extent of the damage. In an article in the *Advertiser* a few days ago a map showed the area affected, from Yeelanna in the south to Kimba in the north and from west of Lock to east of Cleve, an area that is estimated to include some 200 to 250 farmers. In circumstances like that, we are talking about some half a million acres of crop that to some extent or other has been damaged by frost.

As I have said, this has involved an unusual set of circumstances. Basically, the situation has arisen because the grain season was late; in many areas it is running between six weeks and two months late for the year, and I guess that normally the frosts that would occur at about this time of the year would occur after the grain had hardened up, when the damage would be less. There is widespread concern in the community because this may well force some farmers out of business, particularly those farmers who have bought in the past three or four years, because the cost to them would be devastating, particularly when many of them are in financial difficulties or at least running close to the wall.

I have raised this matter now mainly because for the past four sitting days I have been trying to get a question to the

Minister of Agriculture. I had advised him today of my intention but, regrettably, when my turn came up today to ask the question the Minister was not here—he only arrived back in the Chamber during the last few minutes of Question Time and therefore I was still not able to ask my question. I hope that the Minister or his officers might be listening tonight and thus may be able to provide a report for Parliament. The question is: can the Minister explain to the House the extent of the frost damage on central Eyre Peninsula and can he also advise whether the extensive losses could be considered a natural disaster, and therefore be eligible for Commonwealth relief assistance?

At this point I wish to raise a further issue, and I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* of 1 November, headed, 'Farmers blast Mayes'. In the article the General Secretary of the United Farmers and Stockowners had some rather unkind things to say about the Minister, particularly in relation to the Minister's suggesting that the frost disaster on central Eyre Peninsula was unlikely to attract low cost Federal Government financial aid. I do not necessarily wish to defend the Minister, but I am sure that, like everyone else, at this stage he is not quite fully aware of the extent of the damage. I personally believe that the damage is of natural disaster proportions. I believe that on that basis there is just reason to apply to the Federal Government for consideration of provision of relief. I trust that the Minister will take up the matter in that light, with a view to seeking Federal Government assistance for what is quite obviously a natural disaster. Members probably saw an article in today's *Advertiser* where Mr Ray Giles of Tuckey had some rather strong words to say about the disaster that is facing him.

I believe, from some of the reports that I have received, that that account was probably quite moderate and that many other producers would be in a similar position, some of whom may be even more seriously affected. Accounts have been reported to me of some crops having been wiped out almost totally and of others where 40, 50, 60 and 80 per cent damage has been recorded. Obviously, when that occurs, the financial loss to the individual is excessive. My plea to the Government is that it treat this matter with the utmost seriousness and try to undertake every possible action to see whether some assistance or relief can be given to farmers in this position.

I wish to raise another issue, and just referring to it makes one question whether or not one gives added publicity to the matter. It concerns a couple of articles in the *Advertiser* in the last few days about a video that has been, or is intended to be, distributed in both South Australia or Australia wide. Headed 'Killer Santa may be top viewing this Christmas', the report is, I believe, disturbing. I hope that my raising the matter in the House is not giving it unwarranted publicity. However, there is concern in the community that such a video is being distributed. Dated from Melbourne, the report states:

An axe-wielding psychopathic Santa Claus on a murderous Christmas Eve rampage is the star of a video being released around Australia on Thursday. The R-rated movie, *Silent Night, Deadly Night*, already has been banned in Queensland. Despite opposition from the Festival of Light in New South Wales, retailers there are buying extra copies to cope with an expected rush.

The 82-minute horror movie made \$3m in the US before a public outcry saw it removed from cinema release. It was in the US Top 10 video rentals last Christmas. The movie is about a youth who becomes psychologically scarred when he sees his parents murdered on Christmas Eve by a killer Santa Claus. Thirteen years later he goes insane and embarks on a murder spree after being employed as a toy shop Santa. During his night of terror, people are killed with axes, hammers and, in one grisly scene, a woman is impaled on reindeer antlers.

The report then goes on a little about the distributor and some of the comments that he has to make. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, like every other member here, would think that that is a disgraceful video to have portrayed. I believe that Christmas, and particularly the role that Santa Claus plays in Christmas festivities, is something that children hold dear, and anything that will create an image of such a negative kind as is suggested in this video should be stopped.

*Mr Meier interjecting:*

**Mr BLACKER:** I do not know whether the Government will; I hope it will treat the matter seriously. There is every reason for commonsense to prevail. I look at members opposite and I do not believe that they would personally support their children being subjected to something like this.

*The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BLACKER:** I believe it is a disgrace. I hope that the Government acts responsibly on this issue and, if it is within its power to do something, ensure that the video is not distributed in this State. In the light of the explanation given in the paper, it would be a travesty, particularly to our younger generation, who should be protected in circumstances such as this.

**Ms LENEHAN (Mawson):** I would like to address myself to two topics in the grievance debate. My first topic relates to a question that I asked the Attorney-General, through the Minister of Education, in this Parliament, last week. I asked whether he would appeal against the leniency of the sentence handed down to a man who had confessed to five separate accounts of sexual abuse of a boy of nine years who was in his foster care. The sentence handed down was a maximum of three years, and the non-parole period was 14 months, to be served from 6 June, which meant in effect that from the present time the accused will be required to serve a 10 month penalty.

I was approached by a number of people in my electorate who were just as outraged as I was about the leniency of this sentence and about some of the comments that were made by the sentencing judge. A constituent, who is a member of my sub-branch, wrote to me and sent me a copy of the letter that she forwarded to the Attorney-General. In that letter she raised some of the issues that I believe many people in the community are concerned about, namely, the attitudes of many of the judges with respect to child sexual abuse.

It would seem to me, as it does to many of my constituents, that some of the judges do not understand what child sexual abuse is all about. For example, this judge talked about the fact that the victim, who was nine years old, was 'reasonably compliant'. A child, in a position of powerlessness and where the person responsible for him is in a position of trust, is said to have been 'reasonably compliant'? What would the judge have expected from that child? That child probably had no understanding of what was taking place at the time. The judge said that this offender was of past good conduct.

Does that mean that that person is just like the rest of us? Does the judge assume that people who sexually molest children have it written all over them? Of course, people who sexually molest children are ordinary, normal people—although I should not use the word 'normal'—they are typical citizens of the State. They come from all socioeconomic backgrounds and a broad cross-section of society. This House would be aware of that, because I have spoken about it in the past.

The other distressing aspect is that the judge also said that he had decided somewhat reluctantly not to suspend the sentence. This is a situation where a person on five separate occasions had sexually abused and assaulted a nine year old child, and there was some doubt that this person should be sentenced at all. I find that an absolute shame. The member for Hayward and the member for Newland joined with me in writing to the Attorney-General and requesting that he appeal against the leniency of the sentence. I am delighted to inform the House that tonight's *News* indicates that the Attorney-General will seek leave to appeal against the three year gaol sentence imposed on this man. I congratulate the Attorney-General on acting so swiftly and responding not just to community outrage but, I am sure, to his own sense of outrage at this very lenient penalty.

It is relevant that I raise this topic now because the first general meeting of People Against Child Sexual Abuse was held tonight. This group has been operating for some time, and has now adopted a constitution and is fully operational. Unfortunately, although I was unable to attend the meeting because of parliamentary commitments, my husband was able to represent both himself and me at this meeting, and I look forward to hearing the results.

I know that shortly we will see the release of the Child Sexual Abuse Task Force report which has been worked on for many months by a dedicated group of people who are trying to address this dreadful problem in our community. One agency is not responsible for dealing with children, from the reporting of the abuse through to its end. As members would know, I have devoted some time in previous speeches to talking about the problem of child abuse, specifically child sexual abuse, and about some of the remedies that we, as a Parliament, and the community, must address if we are seriously to look at this problem. I remind members that, if one looks at the daily newspapers, almost every day there is a report of a conviction, or of someone who has pleaded guilty to some form of child abuse, or of children who have been abused.

One of the things that we do not like to talk about is this whole question of child prostitution, which of course is a form—and a most insidious form—of child sexual abuse. I believe that that topic is something that we as a Parliament and a community will have to address in the very near future, because it is my understanding from evidence that has been presented to me that this is not just a very small problem in our community; in fact, it is a very large problem and one which we will have to address in terms of the whole question and area of prostitution. I hope that, when we get to that point, members will keep an open mind and

exercise their consciences with some degree of knowledge rather than some degree of prejudice, bigotry and lack of understanding.

My second topic is on a lighter note, but it is a very serious matter. I raised this matter in Parliament yesterday when I called on the Minister of Agriculture to consult with the Minister of Local Government in order to provide some sort of legislative framework by which local councils would have power to control the proliferation of wild cats within the urban area. This whole issue has been raised with me by cat lovers in the community and it should not be seen as in any way my being anti-cat. In fact, the situation is quite the opposite. Cat lovers and owners of cats (of which I have many in my electorate, and I think some of them are in the gallery tonight) feel very strongly that people should exercise responsibility in the ownership of cats (in other words, they should have them desexed and they should have them properly looked after).

Perhaps some country members are not aware of the problem which exists within the city where people allow their cats to breed at this amazing rate. There are then eight, 10, 12 or 15 cats roaming a small area in the suburbs. They cause not only noise problems to residents, but also, they urinate in residents' gardens and elsewhere, which is not particularly pleasant. Also, they fight and cause a great deal of disturbance. I believe that this problem should be tackled in two ways: first, local government must be given the power to do something about this. The Glenelg council involves the RSPCA in drugging these cats and, in the most humane way possible, they put the cats to rest, so to speak, but if, by some accident, a domestic cat should be included also in this procedure which removes the troublesome cats, I am informed that the council has no legal redress and that it could be sued by the owner of the domestic cat.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** The cat is a vagrant animal.

**Ms LENEHAN:** That is exactly right. I think that the power of the council must be looked at. However, I believe that the solution must go hand in hand with a program to educate the community about responsible ownership of their pet cats. I am sure that organisations such as the RSPCA and all responsible members of the community would support that proposition. On the surface it is perhaps a trivial issue but, if one talks to the people involved, it is very serious.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 6 November at 11 a.m.