## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 28 July 1982

**The PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DROUGHT

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare):** I seek leave to make a statement on the subject of the drought.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, is making a similar statement in another place. Honourable members will be aware that much of South Australia has not received useful rain since May, and in some areas since April. While we have not reached a crisis point, some producers in marginal areas will face low crop yields if the current dry weather continues. In the Murray Mallee, parts of the Yorke Peninsula and parts of the Mid North, cereal crops will be down on last year. Some of the safer areas could also have problems, and the risk is increasing daily. We are in a drought situation on some pastoral properties in the Upper North and North-East.

I wish to inform the Council that with the full co-operation of the Premier the Government has formed a committee consisting of representatives of the Treasury, the Department of Agriculture and the United Farmers and Stockowners to examine closely the effects of the current dry spell in South Australia, and both the long-term and short-term effects this would have on both the farming community and the State as a whole. A meeting of this group will be held this afternoon.

For the information of members, I point out that in South Australia drought assistance for primary producers is supplied and administered through the Rural Assistance Branch of the Department of Agriculture. There is no provision for declaring regions 'drought affected'. The provisions of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act enable applications lodged by individual landowners to be promptly processed by the department. The loan assistance is repayable over terms up to 20 years at interest rates largely determined by the capacity of the individual to meet these commitments. When individually assessed, interest rates and repayment periods are determined by the Minister of Agriculture.

There is no upper loan limit, with most loans during the last drought period ranging from $20 000 to $30 000. There is a threshold at which Commonwealth assistance becomes available to the State. Currently, this is $3 000 000 for South Australia. After this figure is reached, the Commonwealth will provide $3 for each $1 provided by the State for drought assistance.

Officers of the department are skilled in this field, following their experiences in the 1977-78 drought and the devastating storm of November 1979, when collectively some $10 000 000 was lent to primary producers in South Australia. Reports from district officers are due to arrive in Adelaide tomorrow. From these reports an overall assessment will be made. This should be available by Friday.

We are also closely monitoring livestock prices, which have already shown a down-turn because of the dry period. In this area I suggest that, if it were not for the price obtained for export sheep, the situation would already be disastrous. Our live sheep market in the Middle East is proving yet once again a saviour for our national sheep industry.

Mr President, I assure the Council, the farmers of this State and all South Australians, that the Department of Agriculture is geared and ready to assist any primary producer who demonstrates hardship because of drought. As I pointed out earlier, help has already been provided for pastoralists in the Upper North and North-East in the form of livestock transport and fodder carriage assistance.

## QUESTIONS

### ROXBY DOWNS

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question about jobs at Roxby Downs.

**The PRESIDENT:** Is leave granted?

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** No.

**The PRESIDENT:** Leave is not granted.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Is the Attorney-General aware that, since 16 June 1982, 37 jobs have been lost at the Roxby Downs site? Secondly, is the Attorney-General aware that he gave information to the Legislative Council on 16 June 1982, during the debate on the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill, that there were some 207 employees at Roxby Downs, 92 being directly employed by the joint venturers and 115 being employed by non-joint venturer contractors working on the site?

Thirdly, is the Attorney-General aware that Roxby Management Services advised last week that there were 170 people employed at Roxby Downs, that is, 37 fewer than on 16 June 1982? Fourthly, can the Attorney-General say why there has been this loss of 37 jobs at Roxby Downs, despite the passage of the Roxby Downs Indenture Bill in June?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The information I supplied to the Legislative Council during the debate on the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill was information supplied to the Government as being an accurate figure of jobs directly involved in Roxby Downs at the time the indenture was being considered by the Parliament. I am not aware of the information referred to in the Leader's third question. All I can say is that I believe the information I supplied to the Chamber was accurate and reflected the true position of jobs directly involved in the Roxby Downs project.

Of course, what I also said, and what the Premier has said since, is that for every one job directly involved in the project or in any resource project between three and four jobs are created indirectly.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** Why don't you get yourself to a public meeting next week at Port Augusta? I'll go up with you.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The figures that have been given are, as far as I am aware, accurate, and, if the Leader of the Opposition has any information to the contrary, he should make it available, and it will be checked.

### MENINGIE LAKES FISHING

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Fisheries, a question regarding fishing in the Meningie Lakes.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I should like to read to the Council a telegram that was sent to Mr Lucieer, of Meningie, who is a very successful fisherman in that area. As the telegram explains the question that I wish to ask the Minister, I will read it. The telegram states:

Mr J. Lucieer, Meningie S.A.

I understand you have approached the department Research Officer (Inland Waters) regarding an electrofishing field trip to the Murray River on 29 July. I also understand that you once again threatened to go to the media if certain actions are not undertaken by the Minister and the department. In these circumstances, the department will not undertake any research work with you. Instead, we will seek assistance from fishermen who are prepared to fully co-operate with us. Any future co-operation between the Department of Fisheries and yourself will be dependent upon the following: (1) Withdrawal of threat to go to the media. (2) A guarantee from you that you will submit correct catch and effort data as required under Fisheries Act. (3) Receipt from you of a submission regarding your use of electrofishing gear as per the department's notice to you of 8 December 1981. The department has attempted to be fair with you; I consider it's high time you were fair with the department.

Mr R. A. Stevens,
Director of Fisheries.

This telegram includes an incredible threat to the fisherman that he should not use his democratic rights to go to the media to complain about the actions of the Minister of Fisheries and his department. The department is, of course, threatening to withdraw its research effort from the fisherman if he should go to the media. The complaint which the fisherman has against the Minister and the department and about which he wished to go to the media was that the Minister was destroying completely his fishing enterprise. The facts of the matter are that in this area—

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** What is the date of that telegram?

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** It is dated 20 July 1982. The facts of the matter are that the Government's policies are destroying completely Mr Lucieer's fishing enterprise. Mr Lucieer has been fishing in that area for a long time, and the Government has decided to reduce to such a low level the number of nets that he is able to operate that Mr Lucieer cannot continue as a viable fishing operation.

It seems to me that it is quite legitimate for a fisherman in those circumstances, if he is unable to get his viewpoint across to the Government, to complain publicly through the media. Yet, Mr Lucieer has been threatened in this telegram by Mr R. A. Stevens, the Director of Fisheries, with a withdrawal of the Government's research effort, as far as his fishing activities are concerned, if he makes that very legitimate complaint.

Did the Minister instruct the Director to issue this telegram to Mr Lucieer, threatening to withdraw the department's research effort? If that was a direction by the Minister of Fisheries, on what grounds does he justify this attempt to blackmail a fisherman into submission?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I will refer those questions to the Minister of Fisheries and bring down a reply.

## ROXBY DOWNS

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I desire to ask a supplementary question in relation to my earlier question on Roxby Downs. In view of the fact that I have provided information to the Council indicating that there are now 37 fewer jobs available at the Roxby Downs site compared with the situation on 16 June 1982, will the Attorney-General ascertain why there has been this loss of jobs since the passage of the indenture Bill in June?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I am not convinced that there has been a drop in jobs. If the Leader of the Opposition asserts that he has that information, there is a simple way of checking it, and that will be done.

## ABORIGINAL HEALTH SERVICES

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question about Aboriginal health services in remote areas.

**The PRESIDENT:** Is leave granted?

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** No. If he cannot phrase his question without obtaining leave he is weak and incompetent.

**The PRESIDENT:** Leave is not granted.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Obviously the honourable member is not interested in Aboriginal health.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** Mr President, I rise on a point of order. Over the years I have demonstrated in this Chamber that a member can obtain leave to explain a question or ask 21 questions without obtaining leave. If a member of the Opposition front bench is not competent to do that, he does not know the portfolio he is shadowing and he should be in intensive care.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

**The PRESIDENT:** Is leave granted?

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** No. That's what you did to me the other week, you scungy bludger. Thanks for giving me the opportunity to return the compliment.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Leave is not granted.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** You can tap your head as much as you like, but insults will get you nowhere.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! If the Hon. Mr Foster wants to speak in those terms, he can continue his conversation with the Hon. Dr Cornwall outside this Chamber.

## MILK PRICES

**The Hon. C. W. CREEDON:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about the price of milk.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. C. W. CREEDON:** The price of milk was increased last Monday by 3c per 600 ml container. Except for a brief mention by one of the news services on Sunday night I believe that no preliminary warning was given about the increase. No doubt many people were shocked when they went out to collect their milk on Monday morning and found that the money they had left did not buy the milk they were expecting.

If my memory serves me correctly, the price of milk was increased by 2c a bottle in about December, making a total increase of 5c in the last six months. It seems that the price of milk is more than keeping up with inflation. How many times has milk increased in price since June 1981 and by how much on each occasion? What is the percentage paid to the producer, processor and retailer?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** The price of milk does not come within my portfolio; it is handled by the Metropolitan Milk Board, which is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture. Of course, the price of milk is the only fixed price in South Australia. The Prices Act, which does come within my portfolio, provides for the possibility of fixing maximum prices. This is the only area in South Australia where there is an ability to fix a price.

The price of milk is not a maximum and it is not a minimum: it is the price. The determination of the price of milk is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture; the price is fixed by the Metropolitan Milk Board. I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Agriculture and bring down a reply.

## CORPORATE CRIME

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Corporate Affairs a question about corporate crime.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Without any doubt there is a major and disturbing increase in corporate crime—

**The Hon. K. T. Griffin:** What absolute rot!

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** I wish you would get on with some of those investigations—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I had no idea that I would be so viciously attacked by the Minister immediately on my rising—

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** He's very sensitive.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Indeed. There is no doubt that there is a tremendous and disturbing upsurge in corporate crime throughout the world. In my opinion, South Australia is no exception. There have been many cases recently of apparent large-scale fraud by individuals and companies in which it has been found difficult to prosecute individuals effectively.

As I am sure the Minister is aware, one of the main problems is convincing a lay jury that fraud has occurred. It is an extremely complex area and one which I believe, even with the best will in the world, juries are not competent to assess in an informed manner. Therefore, I believe that the jury system in this area is not giving the community the protection that the jury system was designed to give. I concede that it is a complex question. The Attorney would recall that the previous Labor Government gave the Mitchell Committee an instruction to inquire into this field. I understand that this Liberal Government withdrew that brief given to the Mitchell Committee and scrapped the whole thing—

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** It scrapped the committee as well.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** It scrapped the whole box and dice. The Mitchell Committee was doing remarkable work in the area of suggesting law reform. One possible solution which has some appeal to me and which should be assessed further is, instead of using the jury system, we should use the system used in the maritime field, for example, a maritime court of inquiry with a single judge (in those cases in which I have been involved Justice Spicer kept those to himself) sitting with two expert assessors. In maritime and marine courts of inquiry, the two assessors are usually a marine engineer and a person skilled in the area under investigation.

Perhaps a single judge and a couple of assessors expert in corporate law, banking or finance, etc., could protect the community against corporate criminals much more so than could the jury system. I do not mean that to be any criticism whatever of the jury system. However, that is my view and I would like to see investigations made to see whether my view has any validity.

Will the Government initiate an immediate inquiry into the problems associated with corporate crime and the jury system, with a view to giving greater protection to the community by possibly updating procedures used in prosecuting corporate criminals?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I do not see any need to give any resources to an investigation of that sort. Certainly, there is no evidence, as the Hon. Mr Blevins suggests, of a disturbing increase in corporate crime in this State. He seems to have wandered around the field a bit without knowing exactly where he is going.

The statistics available quite clearly indicate that those charged with corporate fraud who appear before juries are generally convicted. In recent times there have been several instances which come to mind where convictions have been recorded by juries, so I do not accept the premise upon which the honourable member has raised this question.

There was a suggestion in the Mitchell Committee Report that there ought to be consideration given to special juries. I dealt with that question during the previous session of Parliament, when I indicated that I was not convinced that special juries had any particular merit over and above ordinary juries in this area of so-called corporate crime. Accordingly, I do not believe that the current jury system has been demonstrated to be deficient in such a way that would warrant a review of the jury system as it applies to crime involving fraud, companies and commercial operations.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Protecting your mates, that's what you are doing.

**The Hon. K. T. Griffin:** You have not got any facts. You have made a typical generalisation.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** You're protecting your corporate mates.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

## YOUTH ADVISORY PANEL

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, about the Youth Advisory Panel.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** The Minister of Industrial Affairs recently set up a Youth Advisory Panel. There has been a fair degree of controversy over the membership of that panel with various people complaining that young people had not been consulted and that they are not sufficiently represented on this advisory panel. I understand that the panel is to particularly concern itself with matters relating to the heart-rending unemployment situation which is affecting young people in this State. Unemployment, which is so prevalent among young people, is even worse among women than it is among men, as any examination of the figures will indicate.

One might have thought that a youth advisory panel which is to concern itself with matters concerning youth (which must include unemployment) would have a large proportion of women as its members. Regardless of any other qualification which members may or may not have as members of that panel, I was interested to note that only two of its nine members are women. That is nothing like the proportion of women amongst young people in the population, or amongst young unemployed people in the population.

In response to previous questions I have asked along the same lines, I have been informed that suitable people are looked for, regardless of sex, whenever appointments are being made, and that it is often difficult to find women with appropriate qualifications. My answer to this is that women with suitable qualifications certainly can be found if they are looked for. I am always happy to oblige by giving help to any Minister who has difficulty in this area.

Furthermore, as reported in the report of the Women's Advisers Office recently tabled in this Parliament, that office has set up a register of women called 'Talent Bank' which contains the *curriculum vitae* of women with particular skills and experience. The information is to be stored in a separate register so that suitable women may be recommended to the Government and to the private sector for consideration for appointment to boards, councils, and committees.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Is your name on the list?

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I have not inquired. The Premier instructed all heads of departments to provide lists of their nominees to boards, councils and committees with indications as to sex and term of appointment to ensure that suitable women would in future be considered from amongst suggested persons supplied by the Women's Advisers Office.

Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Industrial Affairs whether he consulted with the Women's Advisers Office before appointing the Youth Advisory Panel? Was the Women's Advisers Office advised that such a committee was to be set up so that it could offer the names of suitable women to be considered for appointment? If this procedure was not followed, as apparently requested by the Premier earlier this year, why not, and will the Minister please consult with the Women's Advisers Office so that a more balanced Youth Advisory Panel can be appointed?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** The Youth Advisory Panel, as I understand, is a panel consisting of people with expertise rather than a panel set up on a representative basis. I will, nevertheless, refer the question to the Minister of Industrial Affairs and bring back a reply.

## TAX EVASION

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General on the subject of tax evasion.

**The PRESIDENT:** Is leave granted?

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** No.

**The PRESIDENT:** There being a dissentient voice, leave is not granted.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** First, has the Attorney-General considered the report of the Victorian investigators McCabe and Lanfranchi into tax evasion? Secondly, is the Attorney-General aware that there is criticism of State corporate affairs commissions in that report and that, in particular, the following quotation appears:

> The lack of response of the Australian Taxation Office assisted in making the industry a growth industry of the 70s. In our opinion, the public is entitled to assess the reasons why no action was taken by the Taxation Office in respect of the matters outlined in this report. Otherwise, those interstate Corporate Affairs Offices whose practice it was to strike off the dumped companies without making all due inquiries are entitled to criticism. We are thankful to say that practice was not adopted by the Corporate Affairs Offices in the States of Victoria and Queensland.
>
> The disclosed abuse of the provisions of the Companies Acts of the States in course of implementation of a taxation avoidance or evasion scheme must be deplored.

Thirdly, is the Attorney-General aware that that quotation refers to the South Australian Corporate Affairs Commission and therefore is he aware that, apparently, the South Australian corporate affairs commission merely struck off dumped companies without adequate inquiry? Fourthly, why did the Corporate Affairs Commission in South Australia not make due inquiries about dumped companies before striking them off the commission's register of companies? Fifthly, what action has the Minister taken to overcome the criticism of the Corporate Affairs Commission in relation to tax avoidance and evasion schemes?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The report to which the Leader of the Opposition referred was one relating mainly to operations in the Eastern States. I am not aware of the basis for the suggestion that the Corporate Affairs Commission in South Australia acted in some way or other to facilitate tax evasion schemes. I will have an inquiry made in the Corporate Affairs Commission to see whether that criticism is justified. As I say, I doubt that it is. I do not know on what evidence McCabe and Lanfranchi based that assessment. If there is a difficulty, I will draw it to the attention of the Chamber.

## MIGRANT SERVICES

**The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs a question about the $21 000 000 package allocated to improve migrant services.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA:** An article which appeared in the *Advertiser* on Monday 26 June 1982 in relation to the extension of the multicultural television Channel 0/28 stated:

> The service, already operating in Sydney and Melbourne, will be extended to Canberra in 1982-83, Adelaide, Brisbane and Newcastle in 1983-84, and Hobart, Perth and Darwin in 1984-85.

Although one could demonstrate that Canberra had a geographic advantage in being close to Sydney, why should Canberra have this service provided first when Adelaide, for instance, has a far greater migrant population?

**The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw:** That's where the money comes from.

**The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA:** That is not a good answer. According to the report in the newspaper, the Galbally Report was brought down four years ago, yet the Minister, the Hon. Mr Hill, is reported as saying:

> . . . the State Government had pushed for multicultural television in Adelaide for 12 months.

What was the Minister doing for the three years before that? The article also states that there would be support for State translating and interpreting services for a further three years. I hope that this programme will be used to rectify the shameful and squalid mess which the women's adviser for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet exposed for all to see in the recent publication dated June 1982 on ethnic women patients in South Australian Government hospitals. Incidentally, I think it would have been better for that report to have been brought down by the Migrant Womens Committee of the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the Minister the fact that many of the voluntary services to migrant welfare are not even identified by the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission, so how are the grants referred to in the article to be distributed, and by whom? When will the committee on migrants make a report? According to the article, the Federal Attorney-General will give his report in six months.

Further, in the article the Minister is reported as saying:

> . . . the State Government would attempt to establish a film-making role for the South Australian Film Corporation in the proposed ethnic television channel.

Will the Minister give some information about this? Will he also consider the amount of research work that has been undertaken by the commissioned film maker, Mario Andreacchio, for the South Australian Film Corporation, and when he will propose the establishment of a film-making role for the South Australian Film Corporation?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** The first question the honourable member dealt with was in relation to the priority fixed by the Federal Government for the extension of ethnic television to the various cities which do not enjoy that service at present, and it is fair to assume that Canberra will be the first extension because, no doubt, it will be less costly to serve than will be either Brisbane or Adelaide. That decision has been made entirely by the Commonwealth Government. Adelaide, according to the article, will have its extension completed in 1983-84.

I understand that it is not simply a matter of finance as far as the extension of these services is concerned. There are other serious problems in relation to Adelaide, since much of the transmission apparatus between the Eastern

States and Adelaide is overloaded to a point of some danger now of our commercial stations losing their programmes during transmission. There must be a great deal of planning and capital equipment installed to ensure that new programmes can be beamed, particularly from Melbourne, although I think a similar situation applies to programmes beamed from Sydney. It is a big and difficult job to implement the service here. I understand that that is one reason why the ethnic population here and other viewers as well will have to wait a year longer than all of us would have liked to wait for this extension.

The honourable member then referred to the fact that we have been pushing for a multicultural television channel in Adelaide for the past 12 months. Of course, we had been mentioning it for some time before that, but our endeavours to encourage the Commonwealth to provide Adelaide with this service have certainly increased in the past 12 months. I am pleased to see that those endeavours have come to some fruition with this announcement.

The honourable member then mentioned the added expenditure that the Commonwealth proposed to allocate to South Australia for translation and interpreting services, and that announcement is part of the overall package of $21 000 000 referred to in the article. In regard to the Film Corporation, in the article I said that I hoped that the South Australian Film Corporation would be able to expand its activities by the production of films suitable for ethnic television. I assure the honourable member that the matter of Mario Andreacchio, the Director/Writer of feature films, is well in hand at the Film Corporation's offices. The corporation has already agreed to the development of a script. If that script is approved, it is possible that production might begin in the middle of next year with a film along the lines that the honourable member has in mind.

The corporation has already allocated the Executive Producer role to Jock Blair, who is one of the senior producers in Australia, and Mr Bruce Moir has been named by the corporation as a possible producer. In fact, 60 per cent of the film will be in the Italian language, and I am sure that that will please the honourable member.

It may be of interest to the honourable member and other honourable members that the film is based on a love story. It involves human conflict, and touches on the relationships between Italians and Australians. It deals also with family pressures, so it should be a great success when ultimately it is produced.

I quote those details merely to assure the honourable member that the Film Corporation is right on the ball, so to speak, in regard to fulfilling some of the hopes that I expressed in the *Advertiser* article of 26 June, when I said that I expected the South Australian industry to expand its operations as a result of the Commonwealth decision to bring ethnic television to this State.

## LANGUAGE PROGRAMMES

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a question regarding language programmes.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** In recent years, there has been an increasing diversification of South Australian interests in the fields of trade, tourism and international co-operation. We have contact with a number of countries, many of which are not English speaking and, as most Australians are mono-lingual, this obviously creates difficulties for Australian business people and Government officials who must deal with people in these nations.

To quote one example, it was recently claimed that the South Australian business community is losing millions of dollars of Japanese investment annually, primarily because of the problem of language and communication. I understand that the languages that are of increasing importance nationally in this regard include Japanese, Indonesian, Chinese, and Arabic, and I think it follows that, if we could solve these language difficulties, South Australian business interests could be much more effectively pursued.

At the moment in this State very few opportunities are available for people in business and Government circles to learn appropriate languages or at least to learn to understand how their partners conduct business.

Does the Minister agree that such language courses would be useful, and will he consider setting up for business people, in conjunction with, say, the Chamber of Commerce, specific courses in the Department of Technical and Further Education or in appropriate departments and institutions?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Education and bring back a reply.

## DROUGHT

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about his Ministerial statement regarding drought.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** In his statement on drought, the Minister said that the assistance that is provided by the State to primary producers is, first of all, paid from State Treasury up to a limit of $3 000 000, beyond which the Commonwealth Government will provide $3 for every $1 that is provided by the State. The Minister did not say, however, that such expenditure by the State on drought relief measures must be approved by the Commonwealth Government before that Government will consider it as being expenditure that is eligible for the filling of the initial $3 000 000 and, later, the payment of $3 for each $1 raised.

As the State is already involved in some drought assistance to people in the northern areas for the transport of livestock and fodder, I ask the Minister whether that scheme of assistance for northern primary producers has been submitted to the Commonwealth Government for approval so that it can begin to build up the initial base amount of $3 000 000.

I am well aware that the scheme involved in the North of the State would never come near that amount, but it could, of course, provide some of the total required if other schemes were involved later. Has the Minister had discussions with the Commonwealth and received its approval that this is an eligible scheme?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Agriculture and bring back a reply.

## HOME BUILDING COSTS

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Housing a question regarding home building costs.

**The PRESIDENT:** Is leave granted?

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** No, not for the use of—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Leave is not granted.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Does the Minister believe that the Hon. Mr Foster is not interested in the matter of home building costs?

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I rise on a point of order. Sit down, Sumner; I am on my feet. Sit down, Attorney. I take exception to the Leader's remark. It does not indicate that I have withdrawn the opportunity to question from the incompetent Leader. It can be on his colleague, Dr Cornwall, to decide—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! That is not a point of order.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Thank you, Mr President. You are quite right: it was not a point of order, of course. The question was asked quite jocularly. I am surprised that the Council is so sensitive about the matter. Nevertheless, that is a matter for the Council. Is the Minister aware that the Australian Bureau of Statistics has released information showing a 13.7 per cent rise in the cost of home building materials in Adelaide in the 12 months to June 1982, and that that was the highest increase in home building costs in any State capital and, indeed, that it was over 2 per cent higher than the average for all capital cities, namely, 11.6 per cent?

Secondly, does the Minister agree that having the most rapid increase in home building costs is the opposite of what would be expected in the most depressed market? Thirdly, does he agree that this sharp increase in the cost of building a home comes at a time when home buyers are faced with a further rise in home mortgage interest rates charged by building societies, which rise could possibly be 1.5 per cent?

Fourthly, does the Minister agree that the increased cost of a home and the higher mortgage repayments at the higher interest rate will stretch the deposit gap even further? Fifthly, why are prospective home buyers in Adelaide having to face the largest increase of any capital city? Sixthly, is the rapid rise in Adelaide home building costs one important reason why, according to information released recently, South Australian home building approvals fell 10 per cent in the June quarter compared to the June quarter last year?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** As the honourable member said, it is true that these statistics were issued, and it is a great pity that the cost of building materials has risen to this extent in South Australia. I have asked the Housing Advisory Council to look at these figures at its next meeting and give me its views on the reasons for this escalation in comparison with the position in other States; and to advise me, as a body representing the whole industry, about any remedial action that the Government should consider when trying to solve this problem.

It is a pity that this increase is occurring when the home building market is depressed. I noticed with some interest that, while the honourable member quoted figures for a particular quarter and provided some statistics to paint a fairly gloomy picture, in April this year the number of building approvals was the highest for any month during the term of this Government. Anyone who wishes to build their case can play around with statistics, as the Hon. Mr Sumner said yesterday many times.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** What was the figure in April this year, compared with April last year?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** The April figure was the highest for any month since about mid-1979, when the previous Government was in office. I do not know, if this increase in building material costs remains at that level, whether it will adversely affect the actual number of new home buyers and therefore increase the deposit gap, as suggested by the Hon. Mr Sumner. It is of interest to note that the average mortgage taken out with the State Bank is not up to the limit that can be borrowed from the State Bank at the present time. I think the approximate average figure borrowed is now about $31 000, whereas this Government has extended the loan ceiling to $33 000. Therefore, there is a certain amount of money to play with which will perhaps meet a buyer's need to find an increased amount. I mention that because of the honourable member's question about the deposit gap.

In general terms, I emphasise my concern and the concern of the Government that material costs in this State have risen in this way. As I have said, we are keeping the question of the availability of loans closely in mind. It may be that the increase will not affect the actual volume of sales, and I certainly hope that that is the case. The Government has been doing everything it possibly can to assist the building industry and new home buyers in this State. In view of this new report, I am sure the Government will continue to do that in the future.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** Will the Minister give the percentage difference of land costs in South Australia compared with those costs in other States, including conveyancing fees? What is the cost of transporting building material from interstate to South Australia? What is the cost of a completed home, including furnishing it with white goods? What is the interest paid on a first mortgage, a second mortgage and on bridging finance, where required? What percentage of the total price of a home does this amount to in relation to the finance required on 25-year, 35-year and 45-year home loans?

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Did you understand all that, Murray?

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** It'll be in *Hansard* tomorrow, you dumbcluck.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** It will take me a little while to obtain those answers, but I will do my best to obtain that information for the honourable member.

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON PASTORAL LANDS

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I move:

That a select committee be appointed to investigate the pastoral lands with particular reference to:

1. The present condition of the pastoral lands and the means employed by pastoralists, scientific agencies and the Department of Lands, Department of Agriculture and Department of Environment and Planning to assess and monitor their condition.
2. The control and management of the pastoral land and, in particular, the operation of the Pastoral Board, the staffing resource it has at its disposal, the forms of tenure currently applying, and the rights of public access.
3. Possible conflicts between pastoral use of the land and Aboriginal land claims, mining and tourism.
4. Amendments to the Pastoral Act needed to implement any recommendations of the select committee.

I will speak to this motion only very briefly because the issues have been canvassed in this Council before. During the last session we debated a Bill to amend the Pastoral Act. Therefore, it would be quite pointless to go over that same ground, including the questions of management of pastoral land and the problems that are being faced by the pastoral industry.

In moving this motion, I will give three brief reasons why I think it is important that this Council establishes a select committee. First, I will deal with the Vickery Committee which was established by the Government to look into pastoral lands in this State. The Vickery Report mentions how the committee was not allowed to advertise its terms of reference, and was therefore not allowed to involve large sections of the community, people who were not aware of the committee's existence and who were not able to give evidence to that committee. That inquiry was very defective.

The Vickery Report points out that its hearings were undertaken fairly rapidly during the Christmas holidays, and therefore the committee did not have adequate time to

deliberate on this very important question. I believe it is thus necessary for the Council to undertake this further investigation. The subsequent actions of the Government following the completion of the Vickery Report did not involve many sections of the community that are interested in this question.

The Vickery Report recommended that nothing should be done for at least five years. Many interest groups in the community felt that they need not worry, because they believed the Government had accepted this recommendation. However, they were very surprised when a Bill was introduced into Parliament that went against the recommendations of the Vickery Committee, because they had not been involved in any discussions with the Government. Many interest groups in the community are very angry at this approach and believe that their views should have been taken into account before any amendments to the Pastoral Act were drawn up and introduced into Parliament. The establishment of a select committee of this Council would give those groups an opportunity to put forward their views, an opportunity they have not had so far.

The third reason why a select committee is an appropriate body to carry out this investigation is that one of the issues that was raised during the debate on the Pastoral Act Amendment Bill was the inadequacy of the Department of Lands administration over the last many decades. It seems to me to be inappropriate that this matter should be investigated by the Vickery Committee, which really grew out of the Department of Lands. The issue of the administration by the Department of Lands has become a major question in this whole debate. Therefore, it is appropriate that some committee should look at the question that is not a committee of the Department of Lands or dominated by the Department of Lands. Briefly, those are the reasons why I believe a select committee is an appropriate means of looking at this question and resolving the matter of the management of pastoral lands.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 27 July. Page 153.)

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition):** I must confess to some considerable wonderment at the Government's taking up the time of Parliament with this Bill. To say the least, I am somewhat bemused by the whole procedure. The Minister's second reading explanation tells us absolutely nothing, and the Bill seems to be quite unnecessary. There is no explanation why such a Bill is needed. As the Licensing Act stands now an acting judge can be appointed. In fact, I understand that an acting judge has been appointed and has been in office for some weeks, or possibly months, and has made decisions on at least one important matter that I can recall.

Ostensibly, the reason for the Bill is to provide for the appointment of an acting judge. There does not seem to be any other reason for the introduction of the Bill. The second reading explanation states that the amendment is designed to make clear that a person appointed under the section which already says that an acting judge can be appointed is an acting judge. That is absolute gobbledegook.

It may be that the Minister has a better explanation. Perhaps the Attorney-General, who must take some responsibility for advising the Government in this area, has a better explanation. After all, the Attorney is responsible for giving opinions to the Government about these important matters that from time to time we have to consider in Parliament. I would like the Attorney to give the Council the benefit of his views or those of the Crown Solicitor or the Solicitor-General. I imagine this matter has been doing the rounds of legal opinions within the Government for some weeks now and occupying much valuable time of bureaucrats and people employed by taxpayers when they could obviously be doing something much more useful.

**The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw:** The same applies to us here.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I agree, and the Government is clearly wasting our time by bringing in this unnecessary Bill. Even the Hon. Mr Laidlaw has a legal qualification and, if he reads the Bill, he, too, will see that it is completely unnecessary. I am sure that the Attorney is of that view. I would be surprised if he was not, being a man as learned in the law as he is. The fact is that section 5 (6) of the Licensing Act—

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** The Act has been amended.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** The Minister says that the Act has been amended, but I understand that the Act still provides for the appointment of an acting judge. The Minister shakes his head, but that makes his second reading explanation even more curious than it already is. The explanation has provided the Council with absolutely no information at all. In that case, if the Act does not provide for the appointment of an acting judge, what has the Government done over the past six weeks? Does that mean that every decision by the person who was supposed to be the acting judge is of no validity? Perhaps that is the position that the Minister has found himself in and, if that is the case, should the Bill be retrospective in order to correct any deficiencies in regard to the person who has had that power? The explanation is totally inadequate.

Secondly, the acting judge has been appointed and has apparently sat on cases and made decisions. Now we are being asked to consider legislation which provides for the appointment of an acting judge. The whole situation is a little too much for me.

I know it is too much for the Attorney-General, too, because he has had to spend hours and hours of his time and his Crown Law advisers' time trying to work out how to resolve this extremely difficult problem. If it makes the Government feel happier to waste the Parliament's time and to allow this legislation to be passed, I really do not see that it is my position to oppose the Bill. Nevertheless, I quite frankly find it difficult to see the reason for this legislation. I ask the Minister in charge of the Bill what is the status and position of decisions taken by the person appointed as the acting judge some several weeks ago?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare):** I thank the honourable member for his contribution. The second reading explanation was quite adequate because its basis was to say that minor difficulties have arisen relating to the manner in which a person appointed under this section should be addressed in court and the title which might be used in signing court documents. The position is that the Act, before it was amended in the previous session of Parliament, in section 5 referred to an 'acting judge'.

When the Act was amended in the previous session the term used was as follows:

> A person appointed by the Governor to exercise the powers and functions conferred on the Licensing Court judge.

That is how the law now stands in section 5; there is no reference to an acting judge. The person appointed is a person to exercise the powers and functions conferred on the Licensing Court judge. I can understand the Leader's bewilderment because, in all conscience, surely he is an acting judge. If he is a person appointed by the Governor to exercise the powers and functions conferred by the Gov-

ernment on the Licensing Court judge he is, in fact, an acting judge.

When one refers to the section, which as it now stands still refers to an acting judge, one finds that there is no other power of appointment of such a person, except in section 5, as a person to exercise the powers and functions conferred on the Licensing Court judge. I think that the Government is quite correct in clarifying the matter which had properly been resolved before, that the person appointed to exercise the powers and functions conferred on the Licensing Court judge was, in fact, an acting judge. What else was he? And, otherwise, what else did the reference in section 6 mean? However, the matter has been correctly explained.

In answer to the question asked by the Leader, I point out that the decisions given by the person appointed to exercise the powers and functions conferred on the Licensing Court judge are valid decisions. There is no question about the validity of his appointment, and that has never been questioned. The only question has concerned the manner in which he ought to be addressed. Should he be addressed as Mr X, a person appointed to exercise the powers and functions conferred on the Licensing Court judge, or should he be referred to as 'acting judge X'? Those are minor matters which have arisen. I said they were minor matters in my explanation, and they are indeed.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** The world is falling about us and you are worried about that.

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** The world is not falling about us and it is not a major problem. Persons who need to be addressed under some title or other are entitled to an assurance that they will be so addressed, and that is what this Bill seeks to do.

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

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 27 July. Page 152.)

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I support the motion that the Address in Reply as read be adopted. In so doing I reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, the Queen of Australia, and to her representative in South Australia, His Excellency, Sir Donald Dunstan. I join with all honourable members in recalling with deep regret the deaths of a number of people associated with Parliaments both in this State and in Australia. We recall the deaths of Sir John McLeay, Sir Philip McBride and, more recently, Norman Makin, a member of the Australian War Cabinet and former Speaker, and close to home we were all shocked and saddened by the loss of the Hon. Jim Dunford and Mr Ted Dawes. I join with other members in offering my sincere condolences and sympathy to the friends and loved ones of those people who have served the Parliament and Australia so well. The occasion of the Address in Reply is one on which we are free to do all manner of things. We are free to praise the Party of our preference, to expound our political philosophy, or to seize upon any particular issue which we wish to deal with in detail. Today I propose to have three grizzles, two minor and a major one.

I want to talk a little about the document which the President tabled in the Parliament yesterday. I want to talk a little about the demise of the Statutory Authorities Review Bill and then I am going to have a major grizzle about the political threat which hangs over the St John Ambulance Brigade service in South Australia.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** So!

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I will get a few more interjections before I am finished.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** I hope you tell the truth. There is no threat at all, and it is a bloody lie to say there is.

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. M. B. Dawkins):** Order!

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I have hardly said anything yet.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** Perhaps you had better deal with the third one first.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I will leave it to fester for a few minutes.

**The Hon. M. B. Cameron:** He is leaving the Chamber.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** Only to ring St John.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I do not know why the honourable member became so upset the moment I indicated the subject. What was it that the Australian Democrats used to say to me? It was something about 'a man does not scratch where he does not itch'.

The document tabled in this Chamber dealing with the services available to members of Parliament contained in its latter part the remark that members of the South Australian Parliament, particularly members of the Legislative Council, were poorly served with support services and, by and large, fared substantially worse than do public servants or middle-order management. I place on record the whimsical question as to whether the 18 members of the back-bench in this Chamber would be the only members of any Parliament in Australia, out of the several hundred of us, who do not get an office of our own, a typist or secretary, and have paucity of office equipment. The general public may think that this is a good thing.

Perhaps it is an effective way of keeping the back-bench quiet. It certainly ensures that it takes one all day to write and post two letters, to lick three envelopes and find something in the files. Maybe the public thinks that that is the way it should be.

My second grizzle concerns the fate of the Statutory Authorities Review Bill. That Bill was opposed in this Council, was amended in a way unacceptable to the Government, and has gone into limbo. Primarily, the Bill sought to provide for an investigation of the sub-system, the fourth branch of Government, that is, those particular statutory authorities which in some way may have escaped the normal controls of the Parliament, the Ministry or the courts. Whilst there were several areas of disagreement, most of those do not present insurmountable obstacles. The amendment made in this Council to introduce a provision and power for a committee to require and seize Ministerial documents was, I believe, the rock upon which the legislation foundered. I express my regrets—

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** What power was in it to seize documents?

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** It had a similar power, to require documents under pain of penalty.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** The Crown privilege principle would still apply.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** We are not certain of this; perhaps the Leader could enlighten me. The principle of Crown privilege seems to have been fairly well developed as between the Crown and the courts. I do not know how applicable that would be in relation to the Parliament or Parliamentary committees. The point I want to make is that it was never necessary to argue that in order to investigate the sub-system, because, by definition (for people who read those political textbooks on the subject), one is looking specifically at those areas which do not have Ministerial control. There would have been plenty for the committee to do in many areas such as that if it had been up and running. It is a great pity that it became a political football

and the people of South Australia have lost something democratic in losing the Bill.

I now move to the matter of the St John Ambulance. This matter was elevated to the level of public debate by the Hon. Dr Cornwall, who apparently is about his master's business at the moment. The matter was initially a Labor Party resolution at its last State convention in which a resolution was put up to the effect that the ambulance service should be, amongst other things, entirely run by paid officers. I believe a later amendment was moved by the Hon. Dr Cornwall and the Hon. Miss Levy which watered that down. I will deal with the amendment in due course.

Following the State convention there were statements in the press. The *Advertiser* of 14 June 1982 reported the resolution proposed by the Hon. Dr Cornwall at the A.L.P. State convention, which was reproduced verbatim in the article. Later in the article there are some extraordinary, ignorant and insulting remarks. The article says:

Dr Cornwall said he was concerned at the professionals versus volunteers staffing situation in the service.

He wondered how many people realised that in Adelaide after 5 p.m. each day and for 48 hours over the weekend, people in accidents would be attended by St John volunteers, who, in many cases, had minimal training.

There was no doubt South Australia needed a free ambulance service, but an inquiry would give a State Government a basis to improve the State ambulance service.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I rise on a point of order. Not only did I not say that there was no doubt that South Australia needed a free ambulance service but also I did not make the other remark that the Hon. Dr Ritson attributed to me, and I ask that he withdraw those remarks. If the honourable member takes the trouble to look at the article he will see that those remarks were made by another person.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I am confused by the point of order, as I am simply reading from the press report. Is the Hon. Dr Cornwall claiming to be misreported and asking me to accept that, or does he think I have misread the article, in which case I will read the article slowly and carefully?

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. M. B. Dawkins):** The honourable member may read the report in the paper and quote that as a report as he so desires. That does not necessarily mean that the report is correct.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** The report in the *Advertiser* is headed 'Plan to look at ambulance service', and says:

A State Labor Government would establish a public inquiry into the St John Ambulance Service.

This was decided at the convention on Saturday.

The inquiry, put forward by the Opposition spokesman on health, Dr Cornwall, would pay particular attention to:

The organisation's business management and finances of the State ambulance service.

Legitimate career aspirations of professional staff.

Standards of training and service.

The extension of advanced casualty-care ambulance services, particularly to country areas.

Dr Cornwall said he was concerned at the professionals versus volunteers staffing situation in the service.

He wondered how many people realised that in Adelaide after 5 p.m. each day and for 48 hours over the weekend, people in accidents would be attended by St John volunteers, who, in many cases, had minimal training.

There was no doubt South Australia needed a free ambulance service, but an inquiry would give a State Government a basis to improve the State ambulance service.

Regarding the point of order, is there anything that you, Mr Acting President, direct me to withdraw?

**The ACTING PRESIDENT:** I think that you have just read what is recorded in the newspaper article.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** If the Hon. Dr Cornwall was misreported, he can interject and tell me. That report in the *Advertiser* caused certain alarm amongst people interested in the ambulance service and, indeed, the matter was dealt with on a *Nationwide* programme, the transcript of which I have here.

However, it is very important to understand the insidious industrial pressures that exist and the political encouragement that those pressures are receiving from the A.L.P. I want clearly to refer to the history of St John because it explains the nature of the problems and conflict involved.

The Order of St John is an old order, and had its origin in a religious order that was founded to care for the wounds of the soldiers who went to the Crusades. Since then, in the various forms, it has persisted in many parts of the world as a charitable organisation that is dedicated to the care of the sick and injured. In South Australia about 30 years ago the order received Government blessing and a charter to organise ambulance services in South Australia.

Initially, the organisation was essentially that of a volunteer charitable organisation but, like many other charitable organisations, the time came to employ people, first in the professional management positions and increasingly as ambulance crew, to assist the organisation in its work, particularly as the volunteers had regular jobs and the demand for increased services during the day expanded.

I think that it is absolutely essential to understand that the salaried ambulance crews arose as a response to the need for increased manpower during the day time. The nights and the weekends were adequately covered by the very dedicated volunteers. Since then, industrial pressures have built up amongst some of the salaried officers to press for the abolition of the volunteers.

The difficulty here is that it is the very presence of these volunteers that has led to the uniquely excellent standard of ambulance services in South Australia. I have practised medicine in four States of Australia and in the Australian Capital Territory, and I have seen the long delays, fragmented organisation, heartless strikes, and high charges, and there is absolutely no doubt that in South Australia our ambulance service is excellent. It is well managed, and its crews are all highly qualified. Also, its costs are very much lower than those of the services in other States.

What would happen if the volunteer component was removed from the service? I suppose the first thing to say about that is that it is approximately a $5 000 000 decision. That is a reasonable estimate of the cost of replacing those volunteer crews with salaried people. We will have a look at the $20 000 000 and $30 000 000 options as well if we are to consider the proposal put forward by the Hon. Dr Cornwall.

The question of training is critical, because it has been argued that, because volunteers are volunteers, they are somehow less professional than are the salaried people. Certainly, there is a very strong implication (it is an incorrect and insulting one) in the remarks attributed to the Hon. Dr Cornwall that volunteers have, in many cases, had minimal training.

The whole history of the society is that there are 1 600 volunteers and 200 salaried crew, and all the skill and expertise arose from the existence of the volunteers, who are in many cases senior medical specialists and senior nursing staff with intensive care training. Male nurses with intensive care training are driving ambulances, and these people, who are trained each week, are the source of the expertise for which St John is renowned.

The fully-salaried ambulance crews are merely people who, having been volunteers, decided for one reason or another to accept a full-time position instead of a part-time position with the ambulance service. Indeed, they have expressed concern about their own training, and I will refer here to the transcript of a *Nationwide* interview on this subject with a number of people, particularly with Mr Doyle,

Secretary of the newly-formed Ambulance Employees Association. On this question, Mr Doyle said:

The St John Brigade, the volunteer section, claim that they're better trained than we are, and to some degree that's correct. They're receiving weekly training. The professionals on the other hand are receiving four days training per annum, and I think if you compare that with the other States, it's not sufficient for the type of work that they are required to do.

So, the real professional expertise arises out of the voluntary work and the professional skills of the volunteers. If any people with that training wish to work in a full-time capacity as ambulance crews, they take a full-time job. They are kept fairly busy with the routine transportation of people and inter-hospital transfers, and, according to Mr Doyle, because they receive only four days training a year, their training virtually ceases once they become full-time officers.

If the union had its way and got rid of all volunteers (and there are indications that it would like that), we would abolish the great reservoir of professional expertise and kill the altruism and spirit of community service which is the principal reason for the St John service being so excellent. We would have fully-paid ambulance crews on around the clock, with their four days, perhaps a few more days, training a year, and the costs would soar. As I said, that is about a $5 000 000 option.

It would be said, of course, that the Labor Party and the union do not want to push things in that direction. However, perhaps as a result of that sort of pressure, the St John Council, with Government blessing, has introduced a policy that it calls integration, the idea of which is to mix some voluntary crews and some salaried crews together in the same shift. In many ways that is a very fine policy. Perhaps it is seen by some as a two way give or take. However, it is not happening that way. Let me demonstrate by reading from a St John Council policy document a brief description of what is meant by 'integration', as follows:

Integration means that the clear delineation of hours in which career and volunteer officers work. [That means having rigid hours for salaried officers only in the day time and the volunteers only at night], that clear delineation of hours would be 'relaxed to the benefit of both parties and the service that they provide'.

That sounds fine, and the first exercise has been the introduction of two salaried crews into the night-time roster.

What about the daylight hours? The question arises as to whether integration means a two-way crossing over that formerly rigid boundary as implied in the policy document, or whether it means driving in the thin end of the wedge in the direction of the abolition of voluntary services. I have received representations from a number of volunteers and I have heard anecdotes which indicate that the boundary can be crossed in only one direction, that is, more salaried services after hours. It is very difficult for volunteers to do anything in the daylight hours.

I have heard stories of offers by volunteers to take over a shift for an hour or two on Christmas day to allow a salaried officer to have dinner with his family—that was refused. There was also the question of the charity use of an ambulance to take Neil Hawke to the Adelaide Oval; that was blackbanned because it involved volunteer labour in ordinary working hours. There is also the story about the ban on vehicle 121 which appeared in the Bulletin of the Ambulance Employees Association of South Australia, dated 19 October 1981, as follows:

On Monday 19 October 1981 vehicle 121 was dispatched to attend with a volunteer crew to a training demonstration at Banksia Park school. As such functions are in contravention of association policy, management have been notified that vehicle 121 has been banned until further notice. The only exception to the above will be that 121 can be dispatched to an emergency call, that is, priority 1 or 2, when no other vehicles are available at Hindmarsh Centre. It is intended that the ban on vehicle 121 will impress on management the concern that A.E.A. members have for job opportunities.

That certainly impresses on me the concern of A.E.A. members for their jobs. The article continues:

As an ambulance is used by regular crews during weekday periods, it is our argument that where any training demonstrations are to be performed, clearly they should be performed by full-time ambulance officers.

Of course, they are intruding into the area of training and teaching, which is an area where the volunteers perform with excellence and have so much to offer.

Honourable members may be aware that Dr Bob Edwards, Director of Anaesthesia and Intensive Care at Modbury Hospital, has been able to mobilise forces in an operation known as 'Operation Four Minutes'. It is aimed to teach large numbers of ordinary people in the community the techniques of cardio-pulmonary resuscitation. St John has been very helpful in providing volunteers for that operation. Not only is the union anxious to replace volunteers with salaried officers, with job opportunities in mind rather than altruism, but also the union has made a clear statement of its intention to use its industrial muscle in that other area of community first aid instruction, that other area which has very little to do with emergency services and everything to do with the very valuable contributions made to society by St John for many years.

If there is any doubt about the industrial intentions of some members of the ambulance officers union, I refer honourable members to the transcript of evidence from a certain industrial hearing. I will not mention details that will identify the case. The Secretary of the A.G.W.A., prior to the recent formation of the Ambulance Employees Association, was asked about his work and the nature of many industrial disputes involving ambulance officers. The transcript reads:

Yes, just go back a minute there. On that point you raised, what was the nub of that 24 hours dispute in 1978? Answer: Well, the dispute was, the members or employees of St John, who were also members of the St John Branch of the A.G.W.A. and had taken up with the union for them to pursue elimination of the volunteers on the ambulances in the metropolitan area.

Later in this sworn evidence the same witness claims substantial credit for having achieved the policy of integration, which is meant to be a relaxing of the rigid guidelines as to times, so that boundaries can be crossed from either direction for the benefit of the community. That is being used to viciously attack the very excellent service provided by volunteers. What if they succeed?

I have mentioned that the cost of replacing volunteers by salaried officers would amount to $4 000 000 or $5 000 000. Another cost would probably be the eventual loss of a number of country depots. St John maintains about 80 country depots; about 13 of those have paid staff and the remainder are staffed entirely by volunteers. When the cost of staffing country depots with full salaried officers is estimated I believe that some will be so cost ineffective that they will disappear and the services available to the rural sector will diminish.

I now turn to the Hon. Dr Cornwall's free ambulances. I suppose that, if there was no increase in utilisation, that would perhaps be a $20 000 000 option and we would have the bizarre circumstance in which a Labor Government would spend a lot more money to make something appear to be free. However, Labor has been doing that in many fields for years, so it is no surprise. Free services tend to be over-utilised. At the moment St John officers are able to control this. I believe that about six-sevenths of its daytime work does not involve the urgent transportation of patients, but the transportation of patients between hospitals or from home to outpatient clinics. There have been a few cases which have rather saddened ambulance officers because

they are incensed at examples of the over-use of the system. It is not uncommon for an ambulance to take a patient from home to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for an outpatient consultation on the grounds that the patient is too infirm to use public transport.

When the ambulance comes to pick someone up and take them home, they have sometimes had an armful of parcels that they bought while walking and shopping in Rundle Mall. The brigade can control it. I shudder at the thought of a free ambulance service *a la* a welfare State where such transport of convenience becomes abused by wealthy people with access to free service. Perhaps the Hon. Dr Cornwall meant only free emergency service, but in the newspaper report he did not appear to say so. I suspect that the cost of such a service would go straight through the ceiling.

The real political connivance that I see in this whole situation is the Labor Party's decision to encourage industrial activity by promoting a State Government inquiry. When one reads the *Advertiser* report of 14 June one can see that, whilst proposing the inquiry, the honourable member pre-empts a little bit by having no doubt at all that a free ambulance service is needed. That is before the inquiry is established. I refer to the words, 'but an inquiry would give a State Government a basis to improve the State ambulance service'. That is almost as if it is going to be an inquiry designed to reinforce a position that is already held.

I have seen first hand what public inquiries can do to good organisations. I would like to illustrate by drawing from the only public inquiry of which I have had intimate experience, that is, the Voyager Royal Commission. I have seen the destruction that that commission caused in relation to people and institutions. Some examples of what inquiries can do include—

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** You know the history of Mr St John.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I know something of it. For example, I refer to the captain of the *Melbourne*. Much evidence was led during the course of the inquiry to suggest that he was in some way negligent.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** Was that the first or second inquiry?

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** The second inquiry. The evidence was plastered all over Sydney newspapers. The man's reputation was impugned. His career was hindered. He is now deceased, but all that anyone remembers of him is that he left the service under a cloud. If honourable members read the report they will find in the conclusion of Mr Justice Spicer the statement that Captain Robertson's actions were those of a reasonable and competent naval officer when faced with a disaster not of his own making. That conclusion was not published in the newspapers and the man was destroyed.

The reputation of the commanding officer of the destroyer was damaged by the public inquiry. Much evidence was led describing his drinking habits, and his family had to live with the anguish that followed publication of that. What was never published, to my knowledge, was that Captain Duncan's body was recovered. An autopsy was held and no trace of alcohol was found. The public inquiry had done its damage.

A young sub-lieutenant was alleged to have torn out and disposed of a relevant page in a notebook. His reputation was destroyed by the press, yet about a month later he found a crumpled bit of paper in a uniform that he was preparing for the dry cleaners—the missing page. The material on that page was irrelevant: there had been no cover up, but that was not publicised. I have seen public inquiries do much damage.

Similar anxiety comes through from a letter of the General Manager (Mr D. W. Jellis) of St John in a letter to the Editor that he wrote to the *Advertiser* on 11 June 1982. I will not read out that letter, but basically it is a gentle defence, and a statement that any information that anyone wants can be obtained at any time by walking in. Certainly, I found that to be so. The letter is in effect a gentle plea to Dr Cornwall saying, 'Please do not do that to us; please come and talk to us and find out anything you want. Please do not push an organisation like this through the trauma of a political public inquiry', which is what is proposed. A political public inquiry, moved by resolution of a State convention of a political Party, would be as destructive as most other political public inquiries are.

I want to make a public plea to unions and to the Opposition in regard to St John: I ask them to consider the organisation as a charitable one, which it always has been. It has 1 600 volunteers and they are not ill-trained. Indeed, they are at least as well trained as the salaried people, and that is on the admission of the union secretary. St John needs to employ full-time people just as does any other charitable organisation, but volunteers are the key to its success. Volunteers are the source of the respect in which it is held, and the source of recruiting expertise. My plea is that, if the unions want to flex their muscles or if the Labor Party wants to stir the pot just to get a bit of pre-election publicity, will they please start on something a bit less vital and sensitive than this marvellous St John organisation?

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ST JOHN AMBULANCE

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I have been severely misrepresented in some of the remarks that have just been made by the Hon. Dr Ritson. I wish to read to the Council the letter that I wrote to Dr Ancell, Commissioner, St John Ambulance, on 28 June 1982 which will correct many of the wrongs that have just been done. The letter states:

Dear Dr Ancell,

Thank you for your letter of 18 June 1982. I am well acquainted with most of the points which you raise because I visited the St John headquarters quite recently with John Bannon. I am saddened and rather disappointed with the reaction to my amendment at the A.L.P. State convention. I know that in the past the St John organisation has been supported by A.L.P. Governments. I have not the slightest doubt that this support will continue in the future. Perhaps you are not aware of what actually happened at the convention.

And neither is the Hon. Dr Ritson. The letter continues:

A motion came forward from one of our sub-branches which read:

That the State Government run a fully professional ambulance service funded out of a comprehensive National Health Scheme.

The South Australian Branch of the A.L.P. has 350 affiliates. You would realise that it is not within my power (nor should it be) to control all the motions which come forward in the health area. However I can seek to amend them in a way which is acceptable to both the convention and the public.

I considered the original motion would have been disastrous both politically and financially. I therefore moved a successful amendment which deleted the original motion completely and read:

That a State Labor Government will establish a public inquiry into the St John Ambulance Service. The inquiry should have particular regard to:

The organisation, business management and financing of the State's ambulance services.

The legitimate career aspirations of professional staff.

Standards of training and service.

The extension of advanced casualty care ambulance services, particularly in strategic country areas.

**The Hon. R. J. Ritson:** That is just a fence to sit on until after the election.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! This is a personal explanation.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** The letter continues:

I would have hoped that such a move would be considered unexceptional by a service which receives $5 000 000 annual funding from the Government. Had the original motion been passed I could well have understood the consternation. Three things are very clear in my mind:

*(a)* The Ambulance Service in South Australia will continue to be run by St John under a Labor Government. I am sure St John will still be thriving long after I have been interred, either politically or physically.

*(b)* The 'feeling' between professional and volunteer ambulance officers must be resolved.

*(c)* It is essential that we continue communications in an amicable way, preferably by personal communication rather than by correspondence.

I would be delighted to discuss any or all of these matters with you at any time.

Yours sincerely,
John Cornwall, M.L.C.

Following that letter, Dr Brian Ansell and Mr Jellis came to see me last week by appointment. We had a long, frank and amicable discussion about the St John Ambulance Service, about my personal attitude toward it and about the official attitude of the Party and what that would be when we are in Government.

I repeat to those trying to beat up a bit of political mileage about this matter that it was a free, frank and amicable discussion. At the time Dr Ansell and Mr Jellis left my office there was complete understanding between us as to what the position would be under a Labor Government. Subsequently, I had discussions with Mr Mick Doyle, who is the State Ambulance Employees Association representative. As a result of those discussions I believe—

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:** I rise on a point of order. As I understand personal explanations, they are used to explain a situation where a member has been misquoted. In this case, I believe the honourable member is debating the issue. If he wishes to do that, I believe that there is an appropriate time at a future stage to do that.

**The PRESIDENT:** I would not agree that the honourable member was debating the matter. Leave was granted for him to make a personal explanation. However, I think the latter part of the explanation may be wandering from the point.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** With respect, I think it is pertinent, because I have been grossly misrepresented by the Hon. Dr Ritson. As a result of the discussions I had with Mr Doyle, I am now using my good offices, albeit in an informal way, to move the officials of the union closer to the management of St John. Indeed, in my understanding that has been going quite nicely in recent days.

When the Hon. Dr Ritson stood on his feet in an attempt to make some cheap and destructive political capital out of the St John issue, I immediately left the Chamber and spoke to Mr Don Jellis on the phone. Mr Jellis tells me that Dr Ritson went to see him earlier this week. He implored Dr Ritson not to raise this matter in the Parliament, because it could do some harm—

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I rise on a point of order. This is not part on any personal explanation.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** It is a very good personal explanation, one of the best I have ever heard.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Having not heard what the Hon. Dr Ritson said, I find it difficult to take the point whether what the Hon. Dr Cornwall is explaining is on the subject or not. However, the Standing Order is quite definite and says that a member, having asked for leave and being granted it, may be heard but must restrain himself to some material part of his speech on which he was misquoted or misunderstood. Was this a part of the honourable member's speech on which he was misunderstood?

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** Remarks were made about me, my Party and our attitude to St John. I want to make very clear—

**The PRESIDENT:** That is not what a personal explanation is for. It is only for cases in which he believes he has been misquoted or that what he has said has been misrepresented.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I was certainly grossly misrepresented. I conclude by saying that Mr Jellis was absolutely furious—

**The Hon. M. B. CAMERON:** I rise on a point of order. The honourable member is now raising a point that was certainly never introduced in this Chamber. The man he now mentions was not mentioned in the speech objected to. He has now introduced new material. Surely that is debating the matter. He is probably misrepresenting that person.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** What is your ruling? I have not finished, Mr President.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I thought that the honourable member had finished. Has the Hon. Dr Cornwall concluded his remarks?

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** Almost. I want to make the point that at this very moment Mr Jellis, who is infuriated by the action of Dr Ritson, is drafting a letter of protest to the Minister of Health in the strongest possible terms.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** Mr President, the Hon. Dr Cornwall left the Chamber—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Does the Hon. Dr Ritson seek leave to make a personal explanation?

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** Yes, I do.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** The Hon. Dr Cornwall has referred to the manager, whom I did not wish to bring into this debate except by way of referring to his letter to the Editor. He was informed by me that I was going to use the subject in the Address in Reply debate.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** What did he say?

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** He certainly did not object.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** You have to be joking. That is a lie!

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** I did say that I would not be attacking St John in any way. I certainly would not use this Chamber to give distorted versions—

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** He implored you not to play politics with the issue when he talked to you on Sunday and Monday.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** No, he did not.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** You're a liar.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Dr Cornwall will withdraw that remark. I will give the Hon. Dr Cornwall the opportunity to withdraw.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I am unable to do so.

**The PRESIDENT:** I have no option, then, but to ask the honourable member to either withdraw the allegation that the honourable member is a liar or I shall name him. I name the Hon. Dr Cornwall.

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I have no alternative but to move:

That, pursuant to Standing Orders, the honourable member be suspended.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Before we get to that stage—

**The PRESIDENT:** We are already at that stage.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** There is, traditionally, a preliminary procedure which involves the President's asking

the member whether he can explain the words used to the satisfaction of the Chair. I think that opportunity contained in Standing Orders should be given.

**The PRESIDENT:** I thank the honourable Leader for that, but I am sure there was no confusion in the Hon. Dr Cornwall's mind as to his obligation to the Council. It has given me no pleasure to take this action, but I really had no alternative. The Hon. Dr Cornwall has been named.

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** To make the matter quite clear, pursuant to Standing Order No. 210, I move:

That the Hon. Dr Cornwall be suspended from the service of the Council.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (10)—The Hons J. C. Burdett (teller), M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, L. H. Davis, M. B. Dawkins, N. K. Foster, K. T. Griffin, C. M. Hill, D. H. Laidlaw, and R. J. Ritson.

Noes (8)—The Hons Frank Blevins, G. L. Bruce, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, M. S. Feleppa, Anne Levy, C. J. Sumner (teller), and Barbara Wiese.

Pair—Aye—The Hon. R. C. DeGaris. No—The Hon. C. W. Creedon.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

*The Hon. Dr Cornwall withdrew from the Chamber.*

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I support the motion. Hopefully what I have to say will not be as controversial as some of the remarks made in this Chamber this afternoon. First, I wish to take up the matter of Parliamentary questions. Questions are an important part of our democratic process and a means by which individuals or groups within the community are able, through their member of Parliament, to question the actions and policies of the Government. The record of the Tonkin Government in answering questions, let alone answering them honestly, is appalling.

Inconsistencies in answers abound. On several occasions I have received answers from the Minister of Agriculture swearing one thing, and an answer from the Premier definitely stating another. There have also been many recorded instances when departmental officers have written one thing (often noted in handwriting by the Minister) and the official answer tendered to me or my colleagues has said something completely different.

Constituents who have been given this evidence of the Government's duplicity have been shocked that such an attitude to an important form of democracy can be so blatantly displayed. I am surprised at the lengthy delays and sloppy performance in the matter of Parliamentary questions that emanate from the office of the Minister of Agriculture.

It is public knowledge that the Minister has one of the largest personal staff complements of any Minister (I think that the Deputy Premier is the only one to outstaff him, other than the Premier). I am informed that the Minister of Agriculture has established a special group within his office, under the control of C. C. Kennedy, to handle Parliamentary questions. The burden of preparing the factual basis for such answers still rests within the Department of Agriculture; it is only the editing or manipulation of those facts that is required to be done by the special unit in the Minister's office under the control of Colonel Kennedy. It is somewhat surprising that, since this special unit has been given the task of rewriting and processing answers to Parliamentary questions, the response time has lengthened and, in many cases, to such an extent that no answer is ever given.

It seems that the tactic of letting questions rest until the end of a Parliamentary session when they lapse has been used and this can only be deplored as an abrogation of responsibility on the part of the Government. Let me set out a few examples of the state of Parliamentary questions that are directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Many months ago the Local Government Association wrote an angry letter to the Minister of Agriculture. The association explained that, in spite of assurances by the Minister, it would be involved in the administration of meat hygiene in this State; the warnings issued by the Labor Opposition that the Liberal Government had taken this requirement from the Act were being proven. Local government was resentful that it had little say in decisions being made. Many members on this side of the Chamber had warned that this would be the case when the Bill was before the Council. The Local Government Association letter was circulated to a number of members of Parliament and I raised its concerns in a question to the Minister. There has never been an answer—only total silence.

The matter has continued to cause unease. Many small business men involved in meat slaughtering have come to me complaining that the regulations and provisions under the Act designed to prevent the wholesaling of meat slaughtered in uninspected and unimproved slaughterhouses in certain country areas have been ignored—often to the cost of the small business men concerned. The only response the association has received to its complaints, and complaints put before the Minister on its behalf, is an occasional press release claiming that something is being done. This State should not be run by press releases. Often, when members on this side of the Chamber ask what has happened to their questions, they are given a surly answer from the Liberal Government claiming that a press release exists containing relevant information.

In the area of overseas projects, the Minister of Agriculture has been particularly secretive and loath to reply, and has often exhibited duplicity in answers, which is reprehensible. The fiasco of the Minister's attempts to develop medic farming in Zambia is well known, but his embarrassment over the matter should not preclude his answering legitimate questions directed to him on the matter in this Parliament.

There are many groups in the South Australian community, not only in the agricultural sector, that are deeply interested in the involvement of SAGRIC (the company used by the South Australian Government for overseas projects) in the development of large sheep feedlot complexes in Saudi Arabia. These groups, including meatworkers and farmers, are curious to know whether these large feedlot complexes are to grow out lambs produced in Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Sudan and if this increased production—on the spot, so to speak—replaces some of the existing imports of mature live sheep from Australia.

These people are also curious to know whether SAGRIC, on behalf of the Tonkin Government, will be investing in the feedlot operation on a joint venture basis, as has been requested by the Saudi Arabian Government, and what funds, if any, will be involved. These are all legitimate concerns of an Opposition representing the community's desire and right to know. But, again, the Minister has totally ignored the question and no answer has been given.

Certainly the Minister of Agriculture is not alone in this refusal to meet the obligations of Government to respond to community requests for information. The Attorney-General has also failed to account for many Government actions or inactions. One in particular is the question relating to the Minister of Agriculture publicly acting as promoter of funds for the Kangaroo Island abattoir company well after several Government reports and consultants studies had shown such a venture to be uneconomic and after the Tonkin Government had refused to contribute State funds to the venture on the basis of these reports.

When asked in this Council whether such action was in breach of the law, the Attorney promised to investigate and bring back a report. Like so many of the investigations of

the activities of the Minister of Agriculture, the matter obviously proved too embarrassing to bring before this Council, so the results have never been revealed, and no answer has been given to this question. In the meantime, many people on Kangaroo Island are still unsure whether the promotion of the abattoir company by the Minister was an indication of official support by the Government or some personal conviction of the Minister.

Having discussed in some detail the record of this Government with regard to Parliamentary questions, I now want to make some points regarding the administration of Government departments under the Tonkin Government, and, in particular, the administration of the Department of Agriculture. The lack of involvement by the Minister in the guidance of the department has become increasingly evident as jargon and theory have emerged as more important within the department than the clear objectives of increasing productivity and profitability in South Australia's rural sector.

The Economics Branch has been turned into a model playground, the Marketing Section (surely the most important in these days of reconstruction and redirection of production) has been disbanded, and the Extension Branch is suffering from an endemic shortage of staff and no real attempt to fill vacant positions. Many departmental officers have told me that they know they have a Minister only when he wants a few expedient tasks performed for a few favored constituents. Apart from that, the Minister is quite content to leave to someone else the larger questions of how the department can assist the farming sector effectively and efficiently.

Combined with this lack of leadership, we have seen over the past three years a substantial increase in the use of managerial theory and jargon in every level of the department's operations. This is distancing the department from farmers, not bringing it closer.

When the Liberal Government came to power, it told us that the bureaucracy was riddled with waste and inefficiency which could be rooted out by the application of management theory. The result within the Department of Agriculture has been the proliferation of management jargon unaccompanied by any improved effectiveness.

The department is now buried under paper requirements for preschedules, planning and pre-planning stages, approvals, registers of projects, and the like. Managers do not spend their time 'doing': they sit down and monitor and review endlessly. Committees are established to 'exercise oversighting and co-ordinating roles'. The management theorists are delighted but the reaction of the departmental officer who knows his or her job should be actually to do something is now despairingly opting out. These effective people have always had a healthy contempt for the paper war conducted by head office, and the steady intensification of hostilities over the past three years has left them shellshocked.

While the effective officers of the Department of Agriculture have been sent into their bunkers by a barrage of management gobbledegook, they are kept there by the Minister's totally subservient attitude to pressure groups that he believes will support his political Party. If an officer emerges to express a professional opinion on anything, whether it is the feed value of salvation jane or the price of peas on Fridays, and the pressure group mouthpiece resents it, the Minister demands that the officer should retract that professional opinion and, even in some cases, apologise to the complainant. There is no question of evidence or research substantiating the officer's professional opinion. It is sufficient that the pressure group has expressed displeasure. If that has occurred, the officer must be wrong and be made to admit it.

For a Minister who constantly parades in public his concern to defend public servants when his own policies are criticised by the Opposition, this is a turn-about indeed. Little wonder that the officers remain in their bunkers and rarely venture out to talk to farmers. Little wonder that they hedge their statements and professional opinions with so many prevarications that they become totally meaningless.

While the decline in effectiveness of the department has little impact on the profitability of the rural industries in the short term, the research and extension programmes co-ordinated by the department have an important long-term effect on productivity and profitability. Even though the decline is slow in its effect, it is just as insidious. The waste of public funds that is now taking place as a large department is turned into a paper-producing, jargon-dominated operation is disgraceful, when the economic decline now taking place in this State demands more efficient use of public funds and a determined effort to support those industries (such as farming) that can contribute a positive balance to a sadly-declining profit and loss account.

The other matter on which I wish to touch concerns the attitude and actions of the Tonkin Government to overseas visits by members of the Opposition. Many people in the community will remember the visits of Mr Tonkin (when he was Leader of the Opposition) to Japan and the United Kingdom, where he took every opportunity to disparage the Dunstan Government and its policies. Many people considered such actions to be uncouth on the part of a member of Parliament, and many still do.

The Opposition has a formal place in government in Australia, and it has always been the convention that members of that Opposition should act with some dignity when they travel overseas as representatives of the Australian community. Traducing fellow members of Parliament for political purposes to foreign Government officials is bad enough when members are in Opposition—when it is seen as smallminded and petty—but for members of a Government to seek to undermine members of the Opposition to foreign Governments is the epitome of bad taste. Not only does it embarrass the foreign Government concerned, but also it displays yet again a complete lack of awareness of the dignity of government, together with an ignorance of the legitimate place of Opposition in a democratic society.

My remarks on this matter are sparked by an extraordinary sequence of events perpetrated by the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier during my private study tours over the past three years. Members know of my long interest in the transfer of the South Australian dryland farming system to Arab countries. In my study tours during the past three years, I have spent many hours discussing with Ministers and senior officials overseas the use of South Australian agricultural technology and the advantages to the countries concerned to adopt it. I have praised the activities of the South Australian department and the South Australian companies and co-operatives that can benefit from the transfer system, and I have written a number of reports to Governments reinforcing this and recommending expansion of development projects.

While I have been doing this I have been astounded that the Minister of Agriculture (far from reinforcing the message I have continued to carry—or attempting to mobilise South Australian interests to take advantage of initiatives held out by overseas Governments) has acted in a most paranoid fashion and spent as much time trying to undermine my study tours, both in South Australia and in the countries concerned, as he has spent on his own activities in this area.

Letters have been sent to Governments in these areas claiming that I have no official standing in South Australia (this after I have been asked by the Minister himself to get him off the hook following clumsy negotiations and problems in transactions), and I have been told of many bad things said by him and his representatives about me to visiting

officials. The latest smear which I have had to disprove was contained in a letter from the Premier which claimed that I had borrowed money extensively from Foreign Affairs officials and not repaid these debts. Certainly, I have made known to the Premier in no uncertain terms that this smear is entirely without foundation, and I have also pointed out to the Premier that the correspondence initiated by the Minister of Agriculture to discredit me with overseas Governments has rebounded on the Tonkin Government because of the lack of honour it has displayed to overseas officials who know me and my work well.

The harm in such extraordinary actions by a Government to this State's image was well summed up by the *National Times* when reporting the Minister of Agriculture's gaffe to the Mexican delegation. The 'hillbilly' image is widespread and the undermining of legitimate study tours by members of the Opposition has reinforced it in countries where we cannot afford to have such an image. With rural industries in this State facing such a serious situation of season and markets, the Government should work constructively to improve its economic position and not get bogged down with such trivial spite. I support the motion.

**The Hon. C. W. CREEDON:** In speaking to the Address in Reply, I express my disappointment at the lack of initiatives offered in the Governor's Speech to aid employment and assist the unemployed. I am fully aware that the Government stated that present and future construction programmes by the Public Buildings Department will support and stimulate the building industry in this State. I am also aware that many of the programmes mentioned by the Government have been around for a long time, probably five years in some cases, and that they keep being shelved. I refer to projects such as the Automatic Data Processing Centre and the cultural centres at Whyalla and Renmark which appear regularly like continuing sagas. The positive action that would make them going concerns seems to be lacking.

Much the same can be said about the water filtration programme. Had a Labor Government been in office much greater headway would have been noticeable. In fact, the plans for filtering South Australian water by the Dunstan and Whitlam Governments were brought about because South Australia did not need the large amount of financial assistance required by the Eastern States to sewer populated areas. South Australia was way ahead of the other States in the construction of this essential service, so we were offered Federal financial assistance to filter the State's water supply including the water supply to northern towns, which had high priority.

On coming to power the Federal Liberal Party immediately cut off those promised funds. The South Australian Labor Government decided that filtration was necessary anyway and pursued the matter. When the present State Government came to office three years ago it immediately suspended all action relating to water filtration of the northern towns. In fact, I think it is fair to say that all of the northern towns and most of Adelaide's citizens would have had the benefits of filtered water by now if a Federal Labor Government was still in power. As it is, it will be three or four years before Adelaide gains the benefits of the money already spent.

The present Government's lack of enthusiasm for the vast expense of filtering water to country areas made it hesitate. In fact, the Government made a statement a couple of years ago that it would not filter country water. I believe country people should be thankful for the diligence of my colleague, the Hon. Dr Cornwall, and the Labor Party for their determined efforts to convince the Government and the Minister of Health of the high risk of water-borne diseases if positive action is not taken to clean up our water.

I must admit that I am pleased for the northern towns that at last the Government has promised them clean water and that construction will begin on the first of two filtration plants this year. However, the project has not been referred to the Public Works Committee yet. I am sure all members know how long it takes to get these projects underway. It is not uncommon for it to take 10 to 12 months before work is started after it has been given the 'go ahead' by the Public Works Committee. It is almost like an election gimmick.

There will be an election before the end of this financial year and this Government will certainly be expected to be seen to be doing something positive. If by some mishap this Government is re-elected it will be able to stall the people of the area for several more years by using the same method of staying the work at a certain point until the following financial year or by not commencing the work at all until the following financial year, despite promises made to complete jobs expeditiously.

It is this lack of drive and forcefulness by the Government in its shelving and slowing of projects which need manpower to complete and manpower to operate after completion that is a contributory cause of our rising unemployment rate. This Government complacently sits back and says that it is the responsibility of private employers to create jobs for people, while Government departments are retrenching skilled, long-term employees. I believe that our way of life demands that Governments share employment responsibilities with the private sector. Of course, the public pays the private sector for services rendered. One expects value for money and, of course, one does not purchase or pay if one does not require the services of the private sector. On the other hand, we probably lose about half our wages in taxes, and they are compulsory. One does not have a choice.

Income tax is mandatory and water and sewerage rates are mandatory. If E. & W.S. Department pipes run adjacent to one's property one pays a rate whether the service is used or not. Local government rates are also mandatory. In fact, the only tax that possibly allows one a choice of paying is sales tax. Then, as is the case with private sector services, if one wants a service badly enough there is no doubt that sales tax must be paid. Where Governments take money in the form of compulsory taxes they have an obligation to the community. There is one important thing that we should all remember. Under the present Government the tax revenue has continued to increase year by year, but the Government workforce and Government services have continued to decrease. Last year the Auditor-General reported that in the Engineering and Water Supply and Public Buildings Departments there had been a decrease of about 1 350 people. When the Premier tells us that, in the case of Roxby Downs, employment in one field creates employment in others, it must also be true that the sacking of people in one field also creates sackings in others.

The wages saved from those no longer on the pay-roll are more than sufficient to meet the wage increases of those still in jobs. One wonders when excuses for not getting on with the job will cease. When will this Government cease its delaying tactics with projects that are important to the welfare of the community and certainly important to the welfare of those presently unemployed? Despite Government denials, the numbers of unemployed are growing: the cruel, cold, heartless attitude of an interstate company to its Mount Barker employees is just one example, yet there was not one word of condemnation from the Government. The Atco Company at Elizabeth retrenched over 100 workers (105 to be exact) because of lack of orders for its transportable buildings, and a number of engineering firms have dispensed

with the services of 12 or 14 of their skilled workers. With people of this calibre in the employment market it becomes an impossible prospect for young inexperienced people looking for a first job to obtain one.

In the past six weeks or so the number of known retrenchments is about 446, so I found surprising the Government's announcement at the weekend that it had found a company (did the Premier find the company?) willing to take the risk of establishing in South Australia at this time. The Minister of Industrial Affairs said it was the most significant development in South Australia for 15 years. He said it would provide 100 jobs in the next 18 months, and about 300 jobs when the project is in full swing. However, I noted that the company is going to build machinery that is plentiful in South Australia and even built in South Australia.

I only hope that the confidence of Horwood Bagshaw, which is apparently the agent of that company, is justified. Certainly, I hope that it is not just another promise that will not be fulfilled. Even if it is fulfilled, the intended employment is only small. Even if Roxby Downs gets going in a few years it will not help much. Employment needs a much greater fillip than anything that has been dreamed up by the present Administration. The new company that has been talked about and the Roxby Downs project will not even be able to employ the number of people coming on to the job market. We are unable to find employment for people between the present time and when these projects come into force.

It will need more jobs than they can give to make an appreciable difference to the number of people employed. In his speech the Hon. Mr Laidlaw said yesterday that in times like these unions should not be fighting for shorter hours or better wages and that workers should want to stick to their jobs at any price. Many of them are trying to do just that, just as they did during the terrible depression of the 1920s and 1930s, but even that did not save their jobs.

The failure of workers to keep their wages at real levels will not save their jobs when the time comes for management to dispose of workers. It will not stop manufacturers from increasing the prices of their products, and I am not talking about increases of a few cents. It is quite common to have increases in price of the basic necessities of life well above the so-called inflation rate. Earlier today in this Council I indicated that milk has increased by 5c for 600 ml over the last six months. I am curious to know how much producers receive of that sum. I know that the Milk Board maintains that children should drink 600 ml a day and adults 300 ml. How are the workers supposed to pay for that?

I assume that the Government believes that people on unemployment benefits are not entitled to it. Positive action is needed to remove the gloom that hangs over this State: it is gloom in large part related to the sacking of 3 500 Government employees, and, taking into account the multiplier effects and the withholding of contracts from the private sector, that 3 500 jobs escalates to about 10 000 jobs. This Government, which uses words freely to lay the blame for the State's ills on everyone else, has been in Government for three years, and it is time that it took some responsibility for its actions. I support the motion.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** I support the motion. I join with the Governor in expressing my sympathy to the families of Sir John McLeay and the Hon. Jim Dunford. It was a sad occasion for me when the Hon. Jim Dunford passed away during the last session. It was also with a deep sense of shock that I heard of the death of Mr Ted Dawes, Head Messenger of the Legislative Council. I had been unaware that he had been away sick during the recess and was quite unprepared for the news of his death. I always found Ted conscientious and courteous, and I express my sympathy to his family.

I would like to welcome my new collegue, the Hon. Mario Feleppa to the Council. I am sure that no-one could have foreseen the circumstances that would lead to Mario's entering this Chamber, but now that he is here I am sure that his contribution to this Council will be most interesting and will add another colour and flavour to the diverse mixture that we already have here.

This is the last Address in Reply debate in which we will see at least three familiar faces on the other side of the Council: the Hon. Mr Carnie, the Hon. Mr Laidlaw and the Hon. Mr Dawkins. I wish them all the best in whatever activity they take on in the future. Whilst not endorsing their politics or philosophies, I believe that they have acted in the best interests of their Party, in what they believe in, and at all times I have found them to be helpful and co-operative on any committees or at any functions that have drawn us together.

In his Speech the Governor virtually touched on anything and everything. His general thrust was that South Australia has never been better off. I just cannot accept that. I believe that in three main and vital areas the Government has been found inadequate and lacking, namely, in housing, in unemployment and in education. I do not intend to go into details on these issues, as they are being raised and floated by many concerned people in the community, and not just by politicians.

I would now like to turn my attention to the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill and the Report of the Select Committee on Uranium Resources and the role played by the Hon. Mr Foster. Reference has already been made in this Council by the Hon. Mr Dawkins to the part played by the Hon. Mr Foster. The Hon. Mr Dawkins stated:

> I would particularly commend the Hon. Norman Foster for doing what he conceived to be right, regardless of Party politics. The Hon. Mr Foster has been for a long time a loyal supporter of the Australian Labor Party, and I know that it must have caused him much trauma and concern and that it took much courage to vote against a Party to which he had given so much loyal support over so many years. The Hon. Mr Foster had the courage to do what he saw to be the right thing for the State, and I commend him for that.

On the same matter the Hon. Mr Carnie, when addressing the Chair, stated:

> You, Sir, when you sat on the benches in this Chamber, crossed the floor on several occasions. I have only once seen a member opposite cross the floor, except for conscience issues when a free vote is allowed, and that was the occasion very fresh in all our minds when the Hon. Mr Foster showed his courage and principles and voted for something he knew was in the best interests of South Australia, but which was against current A.L.P. policy. Even then, for him to vote that way, it was necessary for him to resign from the Party he had served so loyally for many years.

I wish that he had displayed that same courage with his former colleagues on this side of the Council. Repeatedly in my Address in Reply speeches I have highlighted what I thought to be the great fault of this Chamber, namely, that it is a rubber stamp for another place. I have repeatedly stated that the one real role that I saw for this Council—a real and vital role in the Parliamentary system—was the committee role of select committees.

I have served on several select committees since coming to this Chamber and, without exception, I have found that they have acted on the highest principles and in the best manner in bringing down recommendations that sought to produce the best possible legislation, taking into consideration all the evidence obtained from witnesses, and also making allowances for the different political and philosophical views represented on them.

All this is recognised by all concerned and every endeavour is made to bring down a consensus final report. Because of

my experience on these committees, and because of the role I believe that this Chamber should play in relation to them, I was prepared to place a lot of faith and credibility on reports of these committees. They have interviewed people and examined the evidence. They are, or should be, in a much better position to express an opinion on the subject than I would be.

Therefore, it was with a great deal of shock and dismay that I saw one of my former colleagues vote against his shared select committee report on uranium resources when he voted for the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill. On page 126 the report, under the heading 'Dissenting statement by two members', states:

In accordance with the Standing Orders of the South Australian Legislative Council two members of the Select Committee (the Hon. John Cornwall and the Hon. Norman Foster) wish to record the following comments, summary and dissent from the report.

In the conduct of its inquiry the select committee took verbal evidence from and examined 69 witnesses. Fifteen additional submissions were received from persons or organisations who did not appear personally. In almost all cases the submissions were lengthy, detailed, carefully prepared and intelligently presented. The people making these submissions spent a great deal of time and effort in preparing their material.

Many of the witnesses travelled from interstate to appear before the committee. Several overseas witnesses also appeared.

In addition members of the committee were accorded excellent co-operation and assistance when visiting Lucas Heights, Mary Kathleen, Nabarlek, Jabiru, Rum Jungle, Darwin and the Olympic Dam site at Roxby Downs.

This continued to page 168 of the report, 42 pages in all. At page 166 the heading 'Conclusions and Recommendations' appears and lists the conclusions reached by the two members concerned, as follows:

1. No demonstrably adequate solutions for the indefinite disposal of high level wastes are yet available. It is possible that technical solutions will be found but they remain unproven at this time.

2. The problems of adequate international safeguards remain unresolved, although some progress is being achieved. The possibility of the proliferation of nuclear weapons arising from a civilian nuclear energy programme is said by some authorities to be peripheral or even irrelevant to our deliberations. However, based on all the evidence we are forced to conclude that, on the balance of probabilities, world-wide expansion of a nuclear energy programme must create inherent and serious risks of misuse for the production of nuclear weapons.

We therefore recommend that uranium mining should not proceed in South Australia at this time.

We have reached the following additional conclusions and make the following recommendations without prejudice to our central decisions:

- Alpha particles in radon and radon daughters constitute a major hazard to the lungs of uranium miners. The current levels of exposure accepted in the Australian Code of Practice for the Mining and Milling of Ores may be up to four times too high. They should be urgently revised, based on the 1980 NIOSH study.

Another conclusion reached is as follows:

- If uranium mining were ever to proceed in South Australia it would be essential that concurrent legislation be introduced for long-term workers' compensation claims relating to genetic damage and long-term cancer risks. Such claims should extend to spouses and children. A long-term indemnity fund should be established through the State Government Insurance Commission.

And, later:

- The Vitrification Process has been criticised because of doubts about long-term stability of the lattices in the borosilicate glasses.
- If a technical solution is to be found for high level waste disposal it will probably come through a system like the SYNROC process.
- Validation of the proposed technology for deep underground repositories necessitate the actual construction and operation of such a repository.
- There has been some slow, necessarily cumbersome and evolutionary progress towards international safeguards since 1977. However, existing safeguard policies by no means constitute a complete and satisfactory non- proliferation remedy.
- The future of nuclear energy is highly speculative at this time.

Later there was a dissenting statement by the Hon. Lance Milne as follows:

At the meeting of the select committee held on 5 November 1981, when the report was officially presented, I supported the resolution that it should be received purely to enable the report to be referred to the Parliament and printed. The report appears to have been written with the underlying assumption that uranium mining in South Australia will proceed or continue, and is attempting to justify it.

All of the things presented to me by my colleagues on this committee have provided me with information and detail which I am prepared to accept and feel concern about. However, evidently this was not the case with everyone, as we had the virtual repudiation of the select committee's report by the Hon. Mr Foster when he voted for the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill. I have not the slightest doubt that, in reply to this statement, the Hon. Mr Foster will say he was not a party to the writing of the dissenting report and, in fact, had no input into it and that it was the work of his colleague the Hon. Dr Cornwall; also, that he does not agree with it. Such an explanation is just not good enough.

If this line is taken (that the honourable member does agree with the report but since then has had a change of heart) that, also, is just not good enough. His colleagues in the Party he belong to, and the people of South Australia whom he represents, deserve better than that from the Hon. Mr Foster. As I recall, when the Select Committee on Uranium Resources was first mooted the Hon. Mr Foster was one of the main instigators of such a committee and, because of his interest, knowledge, concern and integrity, he had no trouble being elected to that committee. I, as one of his colleagues, welcomed his appointment to the committee.

As time progressed and I became involved in the committee system of this Chamber I felt confident about the uranium issue to the extent that at least two of my colleagues were actively involved in examining the issue and would, in due course, report their findings to us. This they did. The Hon. Mr Foster gave no indications to his colleagues through that report, or through his attitude, that he considered that uranium was no longer an issue. Everyone was aware of my Party's policy at that time.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I rise on a point of order, Mr President. My point of order (and you will probably not agree with me, Mr President, because I will be entering this debate later) is that before the committee concluded it was the subject matter of at least two or three Caucus meetings of the Party at which I violently opposed what was being done.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! There is no point of order.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** At no time that I am aware of has the Hon. Mr Foster publicly sought to have that policy changed. He has indicated publicly that he did not think the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill was worth going to the wall for as, quite possibly, it might never eventuate. This, to me, is another issue. As far as I am concerned, the Hon. Mr Foster, by his repudiation of the select committee report on uranium resources in the dissenting repot, has done a disservice to this Parliament, the committee system, his colleagues and people in the community who have supported him. He at least should have made an input into the dissenting report indicating how he saw the evidence and his change in attitude in relation to uranium. If he had, possibly the charade and traumas of the last week of the previous session in this Council could have been avoided. At no time of which I am aware were the Hon. Mr Foster's colleagues aware of any difficulty he was having in relation to Roxby Downs and the uranium issue.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** It was obvious on the committee that he was.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** It was not to us. I would hope that the committee system in this Council is persevered with and developed. I believe that after the charade of this committee the political Parties should discuss and examine the committee system so that a certain amount of flexibility is allowed to members of the various Parties on the committees to give them enough latitude not to be blindly bound by Party policies. If this is not to be the case, then any contentious matter on which Party policy has been laid down will waste the time of any committee of this Council to which it is taken.

While a committee may bring down a report, it does not necessarily mean that such a report has to be adopted by the Government or a Party but it should mean that members of Parliament are able to view that report and make their own assessment of it without having a phony attitude and report from some of the committee members to contend with.

The attitude the Hon. Mr Foster is now adopting to his former colleagues cannot be condoned. The *Advertiser* of 22 July 1982, under the heading, 'M.L.C.'s leave claimed denied', says:

> Mr Foster later refused leave for Mr Sumner and Dr Cornwall to make explanations before asking questions. He told Dr Cornwall that he would grant him leave only when he had 'learnt to behave'.

For the Hon. Mr Foster to lay down the law on how to behave in this Chamber is quite ludicrous. As all members no doubt recall, the most persistent interjector and the person who has most been called to order—at least in my three years in this Chamber—would be the Hon. Mr Foster. Not that I would say that his attitude has been wrong; on many occasions he has added life and colour to the debate. However, for him now to say that one of the honourable members must learn to behave before he will grant leave to make an explanation is hypocritical.

After the report was handed down from the Select Committee on Uranium Resources, I was very critical of this committee not travelling overseas to see at first hand what was happening in the nuclear power process. A significant part of the report of the select committee related to this aspect of uranium. Many countries around the world are now commiting themselves to the nuclear power cycle. We should have been entitled to a first-hand report from this committee on its views as to how it saw the development of uranium use in the rest of the world.

As I said in the initial debate, virtually any factory or business sees nothing wrong with sending one of its staff or an evaluation committee overseas to report back on any developments that are of interest or concern to that particular business. Yet we, as a State Parliament, with one of the biggest issues that has confronted this State, cannot adopt this simple procedure. Because of this shortcoming in the select committee report, my attitude was that much more information and debate on the uranium issue was necessary. The Hon. Mr Foster could, I believe, have done this if he had been more open in his contribution to the dissenting report.

The Hon. Mr Cameron took great delight in ridiculing the A.L.P. on its current uranium policy and seemed to adopt the attitude that anybody who did not follow blindly down the uranium path as laid out by his Party was some kind of nut. What the Hon. Mr Cameron failed to recognise was the deep and genuine concern felt by a large proportion of the population, and this must also include members of his Party, as to whether the uranium cycle is the right path to be following in the world today.

I believe that the policy the A.L.P. has now adopted is right, given the circumstances we now find ourselves in. Renegotiation of the current Roxby Downs indenture Bill should the A.L.P. get into power is only right and proper, and it has been spelled out that this would and could only take place with the agreement of both parties. I see nothing wrong with this attitude. I see the repudiation of the indenture Bill on a State basis as an untenable situation that would, I believe, relegate us to a banana republic State.

I believe that the Hon. Mr Foster had a point when he said that the A.L.P. should not go to the wall over the Roxby Downs indenture Bill, as the mine might never eventuate. The fact that the parties involved are spending $1 000 000 on a feasibility study does not in itself mean that the mine is a goer. It means just what it says—'a feasibility study'. One has only to look across the border to Portland, Victoria, to see what can happen to what seem to be watertight and firm commitments to develop an industry.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** Do you intend to renegotiate the agreement if you get into power?

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** Evidently the honourable member did not hear what I said. I said, 'with the consent of both parties'; it can only be renegotiated in that manner.

**The Hon. M. B. Dawkins:** You intend to do it with the two parties?

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** With the two parties involved. If they do not agree to it, one cannot renegotiate it. I accept that, and that is what I said. The honourable member can read it in *Hansard* tomorrow. As I was saying, one only has to look across the border to Portland in Victoria to see what can happen to what seem to be watertight and firm commitments to develop an industry. I refer to the Alcoa aluminium group's new plant in Portland where Alcoa has stated:

> The downward trends of world markets combined with cost increases in wages, materials and service, continue to shrink margins, particularly in aluminium smelting and fabricating operations. International markets for alumina and aluminium continue to deteriorate and there were no signs of improvement in the immediate future.

This is reported in the *Advertiser* of 15 July 1982. So far, $200 000 000 has been spent on the project and now the project has been put on ice for two years. A State Government commitment for power prices at the smelter was at least one of the problems, but certainly not the major problem, as an article in the *Advertiser* of 19 July 1982 reveals. A report in the *Advertiser* of 20 July 1982 states:

> Sir Arvi Parbo said the decision was taken reluctantly, but the company had no alternative.

This statement follows the inability of the company and the Government to agree on electricity tariffs for the Portland project, Alcoa's liquidity problems and a world slump in aluminium prices.

Therefore, we can see that it does not necessarily follow from the commitment to spend money that the project must take place. A recent A.B.C. television documentary relating to Papua New Guinea's Ok Tedi copper and gold mines was shown and brief reference was made to it in *Newsweek* of 12 July 1982. The article states:

> Still, the mining consortium—made up of the Papua New Guinea Government, Australia's Broken Hill Proprietary Corp., Standard Oil Co. of Indiana and a group of West German firms—believes the Mount Fubilan mine will eventually become lucrative, simply because of its potentially massive output. By 1984 miners expect to be skimming about 7 million ounces of gold off the top of Mount Fubilan—and then continue to mine gold and copper from the rest of the mountain for the next 30 years.

So, it appears that Roxby Downs will not be the only copper mine around in the foreseeable future. Prices, no doubt, will remain competitive in relation to these minerals and there will be a long haul before Roxby Downs is on-stream and is a viable proposition.

Once again, before I conclude, I add my support to other members of this Chamber who call for this Chamber to

play a greater role in the better government of South Australia. I believe that this State does not get value for money out of the Legislative Council, as it could and should if we continue to have a bicameral system of government. I support the motion.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I support the motion. Other people have mentioned the most unfortunate death of our colleague, the Hon. Jim Dunford. Tributes, to which I have been a party, have already been paid to him. I would, again, like to express my sympathy to his family and my regrets that he is not with us. I also would like to express my sympathy to the family of Ted Dawes, a messenger in this Chamber, who unfortunately died shortly before the commencement of this session.

In speaking to the motion today, I have two topics I wish to discuss briefly. A great deal has been said about unemployment in the last few days, both in speeches in this Chamber and in the other place yesterday. The *Hansard* for the House of Assembly yesterday has not yet arrived, so I am unable to comment on anything that may or may not have been said during that debate.

Looking at the contributions which have been made on the topic of unemployment in this Chamber, there is one aspect of it which it seems to me has not been commented on by other members. I refer particularly to the factor of youth unemployment as it currently exists in this State. Youth unemployment is a disaster area in South Australia at present. It is shocking enough throughout the nation, but in South Australia it really is a crisis situation. Data on youth unemployment in South Australia from the time of the change of Government shows a really remarkable situation, and a factor that is hardly ever commented on is the very much higher rate of youth unemployment amongst females.

I have here tables showing the percentage unemployment for young people aged 15 to 19 years, subdivided by sex, and it is really remarkable and tragic to look at those figures. For instance, in May this year the male youth unemployment rate was 15.9 per cent, while that for females was 23.6 per cent. In May 1981, it was 18 per cent for males, and 20.3 per cent for females. In April this year, the figure was 14.2 per cent for males but 21.3 per cent for females. In April last year, it was 15.6 per cent for males and 23.6 per cent for females.

In March this year, the youth unemployment rate was 17.6 per cent for males and 20.6 per cent for females. In March last year, it was 16 per cent for males and 24.6 per cent for females. In February this year, it was 17.6 per cent for males and 23.8 per cent for females. In February last year, the figure was 18.7 per cent for males and 26.1 per cent for females. In January this year, it was 20.5 per cent for males and 24.4 per cent for females. In January last year, the youth unemployment rate was 26.2 per cent for males and 23.3 per cent for females.

The last quoted figure is the only time in the 12 months to which I have referred when the male youth unemployment rate was higher than that for females. In fact, in only five months of the 32 months since the Government changed (and we have data for the 32 months since the change of Government) was male youth unemployment at a higher level than female youth unemployment.

For the remaining 27 months, the female youth unemployment rate has been higher—and often considerably higher—than the male youth unemployment rate. In fact, in the 32 months since the change of Government, the male youth unemployment rate has been greater than 20 per cent in 12 of the 32 months, whereas the female youth unemployment rate has been greater than 20 per cent in 30 out of the past 32 months.

This striking difference between male and female youth unemployment is hardly ever commented on in this Parliament by the Minister, in the press or anywhere else. It seems to me to be callous in the extreme both to ignore the level of youth unemployment and, in particular, to disregard the much greater effect that it is having on females in the community.

Australia-wide figures on youth unemployment show exactly the same situation, although it is not quite as extreme elsewhere, as unemployment is not as bad elsewhere in the country as it is in South Australia. For the same period since the change of Government in this State, Australia-wide data is available for only 31 months. In none of those 31 months did male youth unemployment exceed 20 per cent, although in nine of those 31 months the female youth unemployment rate exceeded 20 per cent, and not once in those 31 months has the male youth unemployment rate exceeded that for females.

Throughout the whole time, unemployment amongst young women has been greater, more severe and more persistent than it has for males. One of the reasons for this is, of course, that women are still stereotyped into traditional areas of employment with a narrow range of training and, hence, jobs available for them. Furthermore, many of the traditional female jobs are being affected by the increasing use of technology to a greater extent than are the jobs taken by men.

So, we have a situation of more and more young women competing for fewer and fewer jobs in the traditional areas. It seems to me that one of the ways of tackling this is to persuade young women to obtain training in a much broader field of endeavour, to encourage them to consider non-traditional areas of employment, and to broaden their educational horizons.

It is essential that women be encouraged into what are, to them, non-traditional areas. It is true that so far women have in general been under-educated in this country. Far fewer of them have received any post-secondary education or training than have males. Consequently, their job options have been restricted.

In our schools and community colleges, changes have been occurring in recent years with the removal of the formal barriers of students to courses on the basis of sex. The fact that all courses are available equally to men and women does not result in women entering a field that was previously prohibited to them.

This illustrates the strength of the informal barriers to the full participation of women in society: barriers that arise from traditional attitudes on the part of parents, teachers and the students themselves. We need special encouragement for educational authorities if this situation is to change and, if such authorities are serious in their statements regarding equal opportunities, this policy must be backed up with funds and considerable support systems to make it effective.

Certainly, figures from the technical and further education area show that women tend to be concentrated in the stream 6 courses, which are enrichment courses only, or in the traditionally female subjects in streams 2 and 4. Despite the rhetoric regarding equal opportunities for women, there is little sign yet of changes in educational choices. The announcement of special funding for transitional education programmes and the vocational school programme certainly provide golden opportunities for special programmes designed to encourage young women into non-traditional areas.

I have been very pleased to see a publicity campaign which is making a serious effort to encourage women into areas such as basic trade courses, business studies and electronics. This has been limited to two courses of 20 students each. A total of 40 is hardly anything to be proud of. There

have also been special provisions for trade awareness courses for women in New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania. I know, too, that special quotas for women students have been reserved in our electric technician certificate courses in 1982. This policy needs to be extended across the full range of technical and vocational courses offered by TAFE.

This is a significant and serious attempt to get women into non-traditional areas, but far more needs to be done. I certainly hope that in all transitional education areas there will be special quotas for women students in these non-traditional areas. I am aware that some people have raised theoretical objections to the quotas, but in the short term I can think of no better way to indicate to female students that they are welcome in such courses and that the educational authorities are genuinely concerned about extending their vocational options.

TAFE may well find that other measures are necessary to overcome the prejudices and attitudes resulting from centuries of neglect. I can well imagine that special link courses will be required, plus bridging courses to make up for poor subject choices at school by girls. Special counselling and support for girls may also be required. I understand that in Victoria some colleges have special co-ordinators for girls in apprenticeship programmes. These co-ordinators supply encouragement and support which these pioneering girls are sure to require if they are not to be discouraged and isolated in the all-male environments that they are entering.

I certainly hope that our Ministers of Education and Industrial Affairs do a lot more than supply rhetoric in this area and that there will be a firm commitment of resources to encourage girls to enter these non-traditional areas. Only in this way can we possibly hope that the far greater unemployment rates for girls diminish and become comparable to those for boys. This does not in any way mean that I support or do other than view with horror the unemployment figures for boys in our community. The far greater unemployment for girls must in all humanity demand special emphasis and special programmes from the Government. I can see no course open other than to encourage girls to consider the same range of careers as boys so that the unemployment rates will at least be comparable between the sexes.

I also wish to deal briefly with corporal punishment in schools. That matter was given a fair degree of publicity recently as a result of an incident at Elizabeth. However, I do not wish to discuss that case. It never ceases to amaze me that, while corporal punishment for adults was abolished in our society some time ago for the most hardened criminals, we nevertheless retain corporal punishment for children. This is a complete reversal of priorities. If we believe that a civilised community should not permit corporal punishment for even the most hardened criminals, we should certainly not permit corporal punishment for children.

Most members may not know that corporal punishment has been abolished in most Western countries. There is no corporal punishment, and there never has been, in Greece or Iceland. Poland abolished corporal punishment in 1783, and next year will celebrate the 200th anniversary of the abolition of corporal punishment in Polish schools. The Netherlands abolished corporal punishment in its schools in the 1820s, Luxembourg in 1825, Italy in 1860, Belgium in 1867, Austria in 1870, France in 1881, and Finland in the 1890s. This all happened in the nineteenth century, which is not necessarily regarded as being a very enlightened time in relation to matters of this type.

Turkey abolished corporal punishment in schools in 1923, Norway in 1936, Rumania in 1948, Portugal in the 1950s, Sweden in 1958, Cyprus, Denmark and Spain in 1967, West Germany in 1970, and Switzerland in the 1970s. The most recent country to abolish corporal punishment in schools is the Republic of Ireland, which prohibited corporal punishment in all its schools as from 1 February this year. The only country in Europe which permits corporal punishment is Great Britain. The only country which has ever reversed a decision to abolish corporal punishment was Nazi Germany, which is hardly a recommendation for corporal punishment. I have numerous reports from teacher organisations in all these European countries. These quotations indicate that these teachers would in no way contemplate the reintroduction of corporal punishment in their schools. The Austrian teachers union states:

> We teachers are absolutely opposed to the reintroduction of corporal punishment.

The French teaching union states:

> Our organisation could not possibly accept the reintroduction of corporal punishment; we are too concerned with respect for the dignity of human beings.

A spokesman for the Swiss union of teachers states:

> Nobody in my country thinks it would be useful to go back to this kind of punishment. We have the normal problems and difficulties in our schools, but we are certainly able to teach without this kind of 'help'.

The major teaching union in West Germany states:

> The issue of corporal punishment of pupils is no longer of any importance within the Federal Republic of Germany, since state laws do not permit any corporal punishment of pupils by teachers; teachers actually can teach very well without any corporal punishment; our organisation is in full agreement with these rules.

The Danish teachers union states:

> The use of corporal punishment has been forbidden in Denmark for a great many years; our members are perfectly able to teach without it, and we would not favour the reintroduction of corporal punishment.

There is unanimity throughout Europe that corporal punishment is anathema in schools. I much appreciate the quotation from Lady Wooton in the English House of Lords, who stated as follows:

> I find it anomalous that a law which forbids adults to assault one another should give less, rather than more, protection to children . . . In this country at the present time, the only people who can wield a cane with impunity, are teachers and prostitutes.

The fight against corporal punishment in schools goes back a long way. I even have a quotation from Quintilian, who was a teacher of rhetoric in ancient Rome in the early years of this era and who died in A.D.95. Although I do not have the exact date of the quotation, he stated:

> I am entirely against the practice of corporal punishment in education, although it is widespread, and even Chrysippus—

whoever Chrysippus may have been—

> does not condemn it. In the first place it is a disgusting and slavish treatment, which would certainly be regarded as an insult if it were inflicted on adults.

There are many cases of corporal punishment being used in Australia and, if any honourable members doubt this, I suggest that they make contact with a group known as Parents and Teachers Against Violence in Education. This organisation documents cases of corporal punishment and the damage, both physical and mental, which it is causing to children in Australia. Many of their quoted cases come from New South Wales, doubtless because the organisation is headquartered in New South Wales and is more able to investigate incidents which occur there, but there is no suggestion that New South Wales is in any way abnormal in this matter, and certainly this organisation has documented cases occurring in other States including, to our shame, South Australia.

If any honourable member doubts the effect that corporal punishment can have both on children and on the teacher administering it, I suggest they view a production of the play *Christian Brother*, by Ron Blair, which has been successfully performed throughout Australia on many occasions,

including many productions in schools by the Stage Company of South Australia in a remarkable production which I strongly recommend to any honourable member.

There are many arguments why corporal punishment should be abolished. We may consider why the onus is the other way and that people who favour corporal punishment should justify its use. One should not have to justify not hitting people. Physical or corporal punishment certainly lends official endorsement to the view that problems between people may be resolved by force. This is not a message that we want our children to receive. Physical punishment in schools is always a favourite tool of snobbery and bigotry, which holds that inferior members of society respond to force rather than to reason, that force is all that they can understand and is what they deserve.

Abolition of corporal punishment would have the effect of freeing disadvantaged children from some of the crippling effects of negative schooling. It is true that teaching is currently the only profession in which the person in authority is permitted to physically assault a subordinate. This argument reflects the comment of Lady Wooton to which I have earlier referred.

Children who have been abused by authority figures tend later in life to have difficulties in relating to authority or, if they ascend to positions of authority, they tend to have difficulties in relating to their subordinates. Also, it has been said that acts of violence tend to be self-perpetuating, that youthful victims of punitive violence will often compensate by abusing others or damaging property. It is significant to note that with few exceptions child beaters and wife beaters were themselves beaten when they were children.

It is also frequently claimed by those who attempt to justify corporal punishment that a child who is hit is otherwise unmanageable. However, unless the punishment is inflicted by surprise, it requires the full co-operation of the child, and that is hardly being unmanageable. In fact, it has been suggested that it requires a level of submissiveness which is unequalled by anything that is to be found in normal adult relationships.

It is also claimed sometimes that physical punishment or corporal punishment is used as a last resort. However, there is abundant evidence to show that in schools where children are hit such treatment, or the threat of it, represents a first line of approach. As long as violent options are available, they will be used, and the least competent of teachers will rely on their use. Good teachers do not need corporal punishment to be able to teach children.

It has recently been announced that the Victorian Government is to abolish corporal punishment in its schools. I have information from the *Age* which, interestingly enough, was not given any publicity in our local press and which states that corporal punishment will be abolished in Victorian Government schools by the end of this year. The Minister of Education, Mr Fordham, is reported as saying that he did not think the proposed ban would be opposed. The *Age* quotes him as follows:

> People who regard corporal punishment as the ultimate sanction are kidding themselves. It is the ultimate sign of failure rather than the ultimate sign of success in a teacher/pupil relationship.

Study of the *Age* since that announcement by the Victorian Government does not reveal any flood of complaints or disagreement with the approach taken by the Victorian Minister of Education. On the contrary, the correspondence columns of the *Age* are filled with letters applauding his decision.

We might have a brief look at what is the situation in South Australia at the moment. Corporal punishment here is governed by regulation 123 (3), which provides:

> In addition to any sanction which may be imposed on a student in accordance with school policy, teachers may detain children during the luncheon interval or after school hours. The principal or head teacher or any teacher to whom either may delegate such authority may impose corporal punishment. The said detention and the imposition of corporal punishment shall be governed by such conditions as the Minister may determine.

Until nearly two years ago the Minister had never determined any conditions under that regulation so there was virtually *carte blanche* for corporal punishment in South Australian schools.

In September 1980, the Minister did introduce conditions in the *Education Gazette* under which corporal punishment could be administered in schools. I will not quote them all, but there were seven quite lengthy and detailed points. They certainly did not abide by the principle that corporal punishment was undesirable. However, they did suggest the following things: the principal must keep a punishment book in which the full particulars of each case of corporal punishment shall be immediately recorded; that corporal punishment shall only be inflicted with a light cane on the palm of the hand; in no event is corporal punishment to be administered unless a child is at least nine years of age; and, a very important point:

> If a parent or guardian makes a request in writing that his/her child is not to be caned, the principal, head teacher or delegated teacher as the case may be, must be given to understand that the child is not thereby exempt from the discipline of the school, but is subject to appropriate action, other than corporal punishment, in the event of a serious misdemeanor.

Those regulations remained in force in South Australia for a period of one month and were then withdrawn. They have never been replaced, so we are back in a situation in which corporal punishment may be administered in South Australian schools under such conditions as the Minister may determine. However, he has never determined any conditions, so there are no conditions in operation at the moment.

Members may know that in February this year the European Court of Human Rights ruled that it was a violation of parents' rights for corporal punishment to be used on their children in schools if the parents had requested that it not be so used. That arose from a case in Britain, the last European country to permit corporal punishment in its schools, where a parent had requested that corporal punishment not be used on her child and the education authorities refused to give the undertaking requested. The parent took the matter to the European Court of Human Rights, which ruled that parents did have the right to request that corporal punishment not be used on their children and that the school was bound to reflect that request. It did not go further and rule whether or not corporal punishment *per se* was a violation of children's rights, although in view of the fact that the United Kingdom is the only country left in Europe to bash its children it may well have ruled that it was improper had it given thought to that question.

I know cases here in South Australia where parents have made a request of principals that corporal punishment not be used on their child. I could show members, if they are interested, a reply from a principal in which he stated that he was responsible for discipline and would not necessarily abide by the parents' wishes, but would use his own judgment, although he was prepared to consult with the parent if he thought it was appropriate. He would not give the undertaking that the parent sought.

I have asked numerous questions of the Minister regarding this matter and the latest reply to my questions was received nearly 12 months ago, in August of last year, when he stated that he is not prepared to tell school principals that they should abide by parents' wishes if parents request that corporal punishment not be used on their child. I certainly want to see us join the rest of the world and abolish corporal punishment in our schools completely. I plead with the Minister to take the first step, which surely will be to let

parents opt their children out of corporal punishment, if they wish. I urge the Government to take this tiny, wee step as soon as possible. I guess we will have to wait for a Labor Government before we follow the Victorian Government and abolish corporal punishment.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** Were you asking questions about this of your Minister when in Government?

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** Yes, I was. I am now asking the present Minister of Education to take the first tiny step of agreeing that, if parents request that their children not be subjected to corporal punishment, the Minister will instruct principals that those children are then not to be subjected to corporal punishment so that the parents' wishes can rule in this regard. So far, the Minister has refused to give that undertaking. I would very much like that to apply in this State as a first step towards abolishing corporal punishment in our schools. It is time we joined the rest of the world, and the twentieth century, and stopped permitting officially sanctioned abuse of our children in this way. I support the motion.

**The Hon. K. L. MILNE:** The opening of Parliament was, once again, a pleasant affair and I congratulate all those who organised and took part in it. When discussing these matters—parades, ceremonies and so on—I am always reminded of what Mr Clement Atlee said soon after he became Prime Minister when some of his colleagues wanted to do away with traditional pomp and ceremony. He said, 'For God's sake, don't make government dull'. Many members would agree with Mr Atlee's colleagues, who wanted to make government dull—not only for themselves, but for everyone else. I am against them and for the late Mr Clement Atlee.

I would like to add my personal welcome and thanks to His Excellency the Governor, first, for accepting the appointment of Governor so soon after his retirement, when he would probably have preferred a rest and, secondly, for the dignified, pleasant, friendly and capable way in which he has filled the position from his investiture, his already heavy burden of engagements, and for the way he presided over the opening of Parliament. This welcome and thanks extend to Lady Dunstan also who shares, and will continue to share, the burden and responsibility of office. I sincerely hope that she will enjoy her stay with us. In fact, I think we all hope that both of them will stay with us for a long time. They are obviously very proud and delighted to have come back to serve South Australia and are hoping to make a considerable contribution to the progress of the State. So, of course, are we.

Yesterday I witnessed a minor tragedy in another place when the Opposition moved a censure motion against the Government on its failure to solve the unemployment question. I wish that the Opposition would think more carefully before doing and saying what the Leader in another place said yesterday. In the first place, one could tell, and I and others felt, that his heart was not really in it. Secondly, it was negative and destructive. Thirdly, it was inaccurate or, at best, one sided. Fourthly, he had no remedy. Fifthly, it did a great deal of harm to the State by emphasising to the world at large that South Australia has grave difficulties.

The Leader's only solution was that it would all change if the Government changed. That, of course, is arrant nonsense. If the Government were to be removed on those grounds, it would be a signal for the business world to run for cover. Not one person in a hundred, in his right mind, would believe that a Labor Government right now would change the situation.

The Opposition knows perfectly well that there is a world depression adversely affecting the whole of Australia, which is hardly the fault of little South Australia, and that most of the jobs lost have been because of it. The Government has had little or nothing to do with it. They are not business men either—and let us be frank about that.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Don't you believe in taking the Government's promises seriously?

**The Hon. K. L. MILNE:** What would help is for the State to stop tearing itself apart by negative, thoughtless and Party politically-oriented criticism. There is no need for it. The public are sick and tired of it. It does the Parties involved no good at all. It wastes time and it further destroys the people's confidence in Parliament and Parliamentarians.

The Leader of the Opposition asked me whether I appreciate it when people do not honour their promises. I think that neither side is in a position to throw stones; very often it is not their fault. The Government is far from blameless in all this. Ever since Sir Thomas Playford left the political scene (actually he never left it: he merely ceased to be a member of Parliament), it has been fashionable for successive Premiers to boast about the industry which they have attracted to the State or are going to attract to the State.

On the whole it has been rather a tragic little boast, compared with other States; but that is what has happened. Far too much emphasis has been placed on new industry and has frequently been proved inaccurate, idle boasting—whistling in the dark, in fact—and has infuriated the Opposition while disappointing the public and, very frequently, disappointing the South Australian business world.

The Premier's reply to the Opposition yesterday was predictable and quite impressive. To get to the truth of the matter, both speeches need to be added together. If one did that, the inescapable conclusion is that neither speech was necessary and the whole exercise proved nothing, added little to what we already knew and was a waste of time, except, of course, to some of the media, who seemed to enjoy publicising the Opposition's bad news, while omitting the Government's good news. That is not the sensible way for a small State like ours to behave, particularly when much of our biggest industry, the rural industry, is experiencing the worst drought for some 50 years—not that the city cares, but it will care when it feels it a little more.

That is another thing. The Leader of the Opposition in the other place, or whoever wrote his speech, failed to mention anything about the drought. That, and the world depression, apparently have no effect on South Australia. It is all the Government's fault.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** What drought?

**The Hon. K. L. MILNE:** And what will happen is that, if the Government changes, the Opposition will do it again.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** This hasn't affected the unemployment position at the moment.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. K. L. MILNE:** That will not do. South Australia is not, as some say, the 'central State'. It is, in my opinion, the vacuum State and, seriously, all honourable members know it. Survival is our problem and no other State Government or the Federal Government, be it Liberal or Labor, cares a damn whether we progress or die. Let us get that quite clear.

The Government of the day has produced a programme for this session of Parliament. It is quite comprehensive and positive. Let us get together to implement as much of it as we can, avoid criticism where we can, and oppose it only when we have to: let us leave the major battle to the proper time, which is the next State election. I support the motion.

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## ADJOURNMENT

At 6.18 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 29 July at 2.15 p.m.