LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 5 October 1982

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act Amendment,

Racing Act Amendment,

Statutes Amendment (Enforcement of Contracts),

Supreme Court Act Amendment.

DEATH OF THE HON. G. J. GILFILLAN

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): By leave, I move:

That the Legislative Council express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. G. J. Gilfillan, former member of the Legislative Council, and place on record its appreciation of his meritorious public services, and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

The late Hon. Gordon Gilfillan was a member of this Council from 3 March 1962 to 11 July 1975. He represented what was then the Northern District of the Legislative Council at a time when Legislative Council electorates were districts and did not cover the whole of the State as they do now. During his Parliamentary career the Hon. Mr Gilfillan served on a number of committees: he was a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation from 26 February 1964 to 16 April 1968 and a member of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works from 24 April 1968 to 8 August 1975.

Within the Legislative Council Parliamentary Party he held several positions, including that of Parliamentary Party Secretary from 1968 to 1970 and Party Whip from 1968 to 1975. Prior to entering Parliament he served in local government, assuming the position of Mayor of Jamestown for a very long period, from 1959 to 1972. His contribution to both spheres of government was significant and will be remembered by all those who had some association with him during that very long period from 1959 to 1975.

He enjoyed recreation, particularly bowls, and was a member of several bowling clubs. He was born in 1916. He was educated at Jamestown and subsequently at what was then the South Australian School of Mines and Industries. I wish to place on record the appreciation of the people of South Australia for the service of the late Hon. Gordon Gilfillan, both at the local government level and in this Council for such a long period, and I extend to his family the sympathies and condolences of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: On behalf of the Opposition, I support the motion. The Attorney-General has outlined the career of the Hon. Gordon Gilfillan. I am one of the few members of this side who entered the Parliament when Gordon Gilfillan was a member. We all remember his friendliness and his help to us as new members of this Council. He was extremely helpful always, very friendly indeed, and went out of his way to help us as new members of this Council. He had a distinguished career in public office in this State. I am sure that his passing will be regretted by many. I support the motion.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I, too, support the motion. The Hon. Gordon Gilfillan was a member of this Chamber, as pointed out by the Attorney-General, for 13 years, entering the Council in 1962 and being defeated in 1975. He served his local community, his Parliament and this State with a good deal of distinction. At that time there was no member for whom I, as the Leader of the Liberal Party in the Legislative Council, had a higher regard than Gordon Gilfillan. He was an excellent legislator, with an independent streak, which added to his standing in this House of Review. Gordon was able to build a reputation with all members of the Council, irrespective of their Party affiliation.

I will tell one story about Gordon Gilfillan. As Leader, I moved an amendment to a Labor Party Bill and fought that amendment very strongly, only to find in the division that I had only one supporter in the whole Council, and that was Gordon Gilfillan. After the Council adjourned, I said to him, 'Gordon, why did you support me?' He replied, 'Well, you were the only one who was right.' That was Gordon Gilfillan. I extend my sympathy to his wife and family on the passing of a very good legislator.

The PRESIDENT: I, too, would like to add some words of tribute to the late Gordon Gilfillan. I joined Parliament following a by-election and was the fourth member of the Northern Legislative Council team, which at that time comprised the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin (Leader of the Liberal Party in this Chamber), the Hon. Gordon Gilfillan, the Hon. Dick Geddes, and me. For three years the Hon. Mr Geddes, the Hon. Gordon Gilfillan and I shared the same office.

I speak with a good deal of knowledge of Gordon's contribution to this State, his constituents and the Legislature. Gordon was a great worker and would spend hours contemplating the effect of legislation before the Council. He also had a keen sense of humour and, in the three years we spent together in the same office, one could not have wished for a finer comrade. I, too, express my deepest sympathy and condolences to Gordon's family.

Motion carried by honourable members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.27 to 2.39 p.m.]

STATE BANK REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the annual report of the State Bank for the year ended 30 June 1982, together with profit and loss account and balance sheets.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Birdwood High School and Primary School—Consolidation and redevelopment,

Kingston S.E. Community School (Establishment),

Happy Valley Water Filtration Plant, Associated Distribution System Augmentation and South Area Depot Construction.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K. T. Griffin)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act, 1979-1982—Regulations—Parking Offences.

Legal Practitioners Act, 1981-1982—Regulations—Public Notary Forms.
Rules of Court—Local Court—Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1981—Jurisdiction and Fees.
Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report, 1981-82.
Racing Act, 1976-1982—Rules of Trotting.
Stewards.
Fees.
Racecourses Development Board—Report, 1981-82.
Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Parking.
Road Traffic Act, 1961-1982—Regulations—Traffic Prohibition—Balaklava.
Soccer Football Pools Act, 1981—Regulations—Rate of Duty.
State Government Insurance Commission—Report, 1982.
Highways Department—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. C. M. Hill)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Advances to Settlers Act, 1930-1972—Administered by the State Bank of South Australia—Balance Sheet, Revenue Statement and Auditor-General's Report, 1981-82.
Education Act, 1972-1982—Report of the Director-General of Education, 1981.
Fisheries Act, 1971-1980—Regulations—Prawn Authorities Fees.
Further Education Act, 1976-1980—Report of the Director-General of Technical and Further Education, 1981.
Local Government Act, 1934-1982—Regulations—Parking.
Public Examinations Board of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report, 1981-82.
Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Report, 1981-82.
Pastoral Act, 1936-1980—Hundred of Baldina—Resumption of Travelling Stock Reserves 292, 293 and 294.
Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1982—Regulations—Fees. 'Registration of Deeds Act (Fees) Regulations, 1982'.
South Australian Local Government Grants Commission—Report, 1982.
South-Eastern Drainage Board—Report, 1981-82.
The Parks Community Centre—Report, 1981-82.
West Beach Trust—Report, 1982.
City of Noarlunga—By-law No. 11—Bathing and Controlling the Beach and Foreshore.

By the Minister of Arts (Hon. C. M. Hill)—
Pursuant to Statute—
The State Opera of South Australia—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. J. C. Burdett)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Hospitals Act, 1934-1971—Regulations—Compensable Patients Charges.
Industrial and Commercial Training Act, 1981—Regulations—Rural Industries Machine Safety.
Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Rural Industries (Machine Safety).
Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, 1975-1982—Regulations—Contribution Rate.
Long Service Leave (Casual Employment) Board—Report, 1981-82.
South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1981—Regulations—Compensable Patients Charges.
South Australian Urban Land Trust—Report, 1982.

By the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Hon. J. C. Burdett)—
Pursuant to Statute—
Building Societies Act, 1975-1982—Regulations—Investments.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOUSING

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refer to an article that appeared in this morning's edition of the *Australian* (5 October) entitled 'State Housing Trust Could Face Bankruptcy'. The article, written by Peter Ward, suggests that the South Australian Housing Trust may not be able to continue to carry out its functions if it continues to rely heavily on semi-governmental borrowings to finance its programmes.

I think that the article really means to say that the trust's published income and expenditure statements are likely to show increasing deficits if current trends in interest payable and rental rebates continue and that this will present a problem for Government in determining how the deficit is to be financed. The implication in the article is that, until recently, the Housing Trust has been a self-sufficient, surplus generating operation. That is simply not the case. The Housing Trust has been supported for many years by low interest rate loans from both State and Federal Governments. The two Governments, in providing funds at lower than their cost, in effect have been subsidising the operations of the trust. Indeed, it is at least arguable that, in the interests of better information, those subsidies should be made more explicit by charging a higher rate of interest accompanied by a specific subsidy from the respective Governments' Budgets.

It is true that Commonwealth support for welfare housing has diminished in recent years. The same cannot be said of the State. This Government has made up the short-falls in Commonwealth support by: increased allocations from the Budget which carry the same concessional rate of interest as Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement funds; increased allocations of semi-governmental borrowing authority (within the limits of aggregate imposed by Loan Council); and by searching out sources of funds for arrangements which fall outside Loan Council control.

The Government has initiated a forward projections exercise to determine the extent of the problem facing the trust. From that exercise will flow the information necessary to determine how that problem might best be overcome in terms of both the funds levels required to mount programmes at various levels and the best method or methods of reporting accurately the financial effects of the Government's housing policies on the trust and Government.

There are two key elements in the financing of any operation, including housing. The first is to obtain sufficient funds to carry out the required programmes, and the second is to keep the cost of that finance to a minimum. The South Australian Government Financing Authority is intended to assist in both these areas. It is certainly expected to enable the raising of funds on better terms than could be managed without it, and it is difficult to see the logic in a suggestion that its existence might cause the trust's cost of funds to be higher than they would be otherwise.

Without knowing exactly what documents Mr Ward has in his possession, it is difficult to comment on them in detail. However, it is apparent that they are out of date in at least one major respect. The Government has given approval recently for the trust to seek innovative arrangements which would give it access to additional houses for its rental assistance programme. Overseas borrowings do not represent a practicable course to follow because they are subject to Loan Council constraints which effectively preclude their use in the welfare housing area.

In conclusion, may I return to the central problem which is that, unless the Commonwealth is prepared to provide substantial increases in concessional rate funds (in which case the subsidy burden falls on the Commonwealth taxpayer), the State will have to attract increasing amounts of funds for housing unless it is prepared to see the rate of delivery of the housing programmes drop. Funds in the quantities required are simply not available at rates of interest

which are substantially below market rates. Since the Housing Trust's rental assistance programme is such that it cannot cover its full costs, including debt servicing at commercial rates of interest, one way or another a subsidy will be required. As I have said, the Government is working on that problem, and the South Australian Government Financing Authority is part of that work.

One thing is certain: this Government will continue to support welfare housing activity, including the activity of the Housing Trust. The Government's record to date leaves no room for doubt as to the extent of its commitment. The word 'bankruptcy' implies that the trust could be left to flounder in a financial morass from which there is no escape. This is so patently at odds with the record as to deserve no credibility at all.

QUESTIONS

NORTH HAVEN TRUST

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question asked by the Hon. Mr Sumner on 1 September about the North Haven Trust?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The North Haven Trust Act, 1979, enables the trust to dispose of real property in order to carry out its functions. As its functions are to permit residential, recreational, commercial, marine and associated industrial development, and the sale is designed to permit those functions, it is within the powers of the trust to sell. With regard to disposal of the marina to private developers, there is no restriction in the Act as to who may be the purchaser of the property. No amendment to the Act will be necessary to enable this procedure to go ahead because the trust will be operating in accordance with the Act.

RIVERLAND CANNERY

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Is the Government currently negotiating the sale of the Riverland Cannery and, if so, to whom and when does the Government expect the sale to be completed?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The receivers and managers have, on a number of occasions, sought indications of interest in the cannery and advertised, I think on two occasions, for expressions of interest in acquiring the cannery. However, as I have indicated in this Council previously, little or no interest was displayed, even at the value of the cannery's disposable assets. I am not aware of any negotiations by the receivers and managers regarding disposal of the cannery, but, if any persons have an interest in acquiring the operation, certainly both the Government and the receivers and managers will be delighted to discuss it with them.

CEREAL CROP DISEASES

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to the question asked by the Hon. Mr Dawkins on 2 September about cereal crop diseases?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Powdery mildew disease of barley (caused by a fungus erysiphe gramanis) occurs regularly on Yorke Peninsula due to relatively humid conditions. In other countries, fungicides are the main means of controlling this disease. New fungicides and application methods were assessed by the Department of Agriculture in visits to research centres and chemical companies in New Zealand in 1977 and Europe in 1978. In addition, the department has tested many fungicides for control of powdery mildew of barley in field trials on Yorke Peninsula.

Seed treatment with particular systemic fungicides has given good control of the disease at relatively low cost. One of these fungicides, triadimefon, is now available commercially and is marketed as 'Erex'. Crop sprays were also effective in controlling the disease, but uneconomic because of their relatively high cost. The department is also assisting the barley breeder at the Waite Institute (Dr David Sparrow) in a new research programme to identify sources of resistance to be used in future barley cultivars.

BLUE TONGUE

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to the question asked by the Hon. Mr Dawkins on 10 August about blue tongue?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The similarity between the two countries (United Kingdom and Australia) lies in the consideration of the disease status of a country. When a disease such as blue tongue occurs in a country the whole country is considered infected. This is because movement of susceptible animals within the country is not under strict control and therefore actual movement is not known. However, movement of animals from one country to another is under very strict control.

The blue tongue virus is transmitted by various species of culciocoides midges. In Australia culicoides brevitarsis is widespread and a vector for the virus. The virus multiplies in the insects following feeding on viraemic animals and they remain able to infect susceptible animals, during biting to obtain further blood meals, for the rest of their lives, which may last 70 days.

The activities of the midge, flight, feeding and oviposition are influenced by temperature, and the optimum condition lies between 13 degrees and 35 degrees C. Below and above this temperature they hibernate or aestivate either as adult or as larvae. In Northern Australia the midges are active during most parts of the year. In South Australia they are active during the warm months. The opportunity for the spread of blue tongue is much more than in the United Kingdom or East Germany, where the long cold winter and short summer are not conducive to the activities of the midges. Because of the foregoing reasons, an outbreak of blue tongue in East Germany is most unlikely to spread to the United Kingdom. However, an outbreak in the top end of Australia may spread to southern Australia.

BRIGADIER GREVILLE

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question concerning Brigadier Greville.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The entire South Australian Italian community has been incensed by the recently published remarks of Brigadier Greville that have reflected badly and very unfairly on the entire Italian community, many of whom have lived in Australia for more than 50 years. Today I was contacted by a constituent and a good friend, Mr Reno Minuzzo, who asked me to complain publicly on his behalf in the South Australian Parliament. Reno Minuzzo and his brother, Max, came to Australia as young boys in the early 1930s. Both of them joined the A.I.F. early in the Second World War and saw active service for their country of Australia. Max Minuzzo was later President of St Peters R.S.L. Both Minuzzos always retained their ties and connections with the Italian community. They regard themselves, rightly, as members of the Italian community,

but they also are distinguished and prominent citizens of South Australia and Australia. On behalf of all decent people in South Australia, I ask whether the Premier will apologise publicly to the South Australian Italian community for the way in which it has been insulted so grossly?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Hon. Mr Feleppa has raised this matter on several occasions in the Council, and the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs (Hon. C. M. Hill) has responded with an explicit dissociation of the Government from those views.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Let's hear it from his boss.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I understand that the Premier was at the Italian social club on Saturday night and that he again dissociated the Government from those remarks.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: But he says it only when he goes to Italian clubs. Why doesn't he say it publicly?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It would be a very sad day for democracy if Governments had the ability to muzzle—

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I am not suggesting 'muzzle'. I am saying that he should apologise.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Governments do not have to apologise for what other people say. Otherwise, we would be apologising all the time for what the Opposition says. Goodness help us if it came to that. In our society, within the limits of the law relating to defamation, people have the right to express their points of view publicly. If we disagree with them, we are entitled to express that. The Premier has as recently as last Saturday night dissociated himself to the people who are most affected by this. I believe that that dissociation is particularly significant, but I will refer the question to the Premier and, if it needs any further attention, I have no doubt that the Premier will give it.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I ask a supplementary question. Is the Attorney-General aware that some Italian migrants have been in this country much more than 50 years? Was not the first Medical Director of the Australian Armed Forces a person with the name of Matra, from whom the suburb of Matraville takes its name? Secondly, was not the second-in-command of the battle of Sovereign Hill, as it has become known, rather than Eureka, one Lalor, also an Italian? To insult these people by saying that they have been here only 50 years is a bit much. That is the reason for the question.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Hon. Mr Foster is much better acquainted with some of that early history than I am, so I am not able to answer 'Yes' or 'No' to whether I know those facts. Certainly, it is clear from Australian history that the citizens of Australia, in the very early days of its settlement, comprised among others citizens of Italian background. They have made significant contributions to Australian society throughout that very long period—longer, as the honourable member indicates, than 50 years.

BREAD AND CIRCUSES

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question on the subject of *Bread and Circuses*.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: *Bread and Circuses* is the title of a newsheet that is published by students at the University of Adelaide. I am in receipt of complaints from constituents concerning an issue several weeks ago that had as its main cover a picture which caused great offence to a number of students and which was regarded by many as pornographic. I will protect honourable members from the worst features of this work of art.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Get it incorporated. Let's know what we're deliberating on. We can stand it.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: Very well. The honourable member is asking for it.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think that that is necessary. I think that the honourable member was only joking.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: No, I was not. Incorporate it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: The picture is of a man who is partly dressed as a motor mechanic and who is possessed of the most pathologically enormous genitalia that I have ever seen.

An honourable member: You should have been in the Army.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I was in the Navy. In this picture the man is using an oil can on another man in preparation for sodomy. It is a black-and-white photo copy of part of a panel of artwork which was exhibited in New South Wales and seized by the police there and which was restored to the exhibition subject to restricted viewing and public warnings. Any artistic merit that may have existed in the original, either in terms of a brilliant blending of colours or technically exciting brushwork, has been stripped from it by the limitations of the photo-copying machine at the university, and all that remains is a vulgarity. My constituent pointed out to me that there are probably 1 000 or more university students of 18 years and under, and that very much younger schoolchildren use the campus by virtue of their attendance at the Conservatorium.

I am not asking the Attorney-General to descend on the university with the full weight of the law, nor am I standing here in judgment over people's sexual feelings. I have practised medicine for far too long not to be sensitive to the complexity and the wide variety of human sexual feelings. Because I am sensitive to the wide range of human sexual feelings, I believe that the students who published this so-called work of art have behaved very immaturely and have, thereby, deeply offended a number of people on the campus.

I also noticed in the press that the Attorney-General had referred this matter to the Classification of Publications Board. Can the Attorney-General say whether the board considered that it was unlawful for this so-called work of art to be circulated in this manner, without classification? If it was not, having viewed a copy of the picture, is the Attorney-General satisfied with the state of the law which permits unrestricted circulation of this material? If he is not, perhaps short of sending the police down there, would he be prepared to make a public statement of disapproval concerning this immature action on the part of these students who, hopefully, one day will grow up?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: This particular publication was drawn to my attention by a person who was complaining about it. I regard it as offensive. I sent it to the Classification of Publications Board, which generally has the responsibility for classifying that sort of material and recommending any other action that ought to be taken. My recollection is that the board decided that no action should be taken and that it should not recommend any action for a number of reasons: first, the editor had given an undertaking in the *On Dit* edition of 20 September 1982 that in future he would edit issues of this particular supplement; secondly, there was little that could be done about the particular issue because it was already in circulation and the illustration was not a

photograph and could not be treated as such, but was rather a photocopy of a depiction which the honourable member has just indicated was of something purporting to be in the line of a work of art.

So, the Classification of Publications Board suggested that no further action ought to be taken in this particular instance, in the light of those circumstances. As I say, I think that the publication was offensive. Certainly it demonstrated immaturity but, on the basis of the editor's undertaking to edit future issues, I doubt whether the matter ought to be taken any further.

TRANSLATING AND INTERPRETING SERVICES

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs and also representing the Minister of Education a question about interpreting and translating in the South Australian College of Advanced Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: A press statement was made on 10 September 1982 by the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs, as follows:

> There has been an urgent need to provide more interpreting and translating services through the Ethnic Affairs Commission and now we will be able to satisfy the demand.

In view of the above and also in view of a statement made by the Minister of Education on 19 November 1981 (*Hansard*, page 2093) concerning section 14 (2) and (3) of the South Australian College of Advanced Education Act, 1982 (then clauses 12 and 13 of the Bill), and in view of the fact that termination of contract notices have been served on four lecturing and one general staff in the S.A.C.A.E.'s School of Community Languages, four of whom are exclusively involved in interpreting and translating, will the Minister answer the following questions?

First, what was the import and meaning of the answer given by the Minister of Education in reply to a question from the member for Salisbury during the Budget Estimates Committees when he said:

> I am not sure what the inference was in that last comment—that I was anxious to get the powers originally—but I do recall taking some unusual steps without power early in the piece, but that was quite a different matter . . . I have asked the Chairman of TEASA and the Director of the South Australian College of Advanced Education (Dr Ramsey) to re-examine any potential action and to report back to me as a matter of urgency, particularly with regard to the alleged recommendations in the migrant service, the interpreter course.

Was the Minister mistaken as to decisions taken, or was he misleading this Parliament since, clearly, interpreting and translating at this point in time goes into the 1983 academic year, with one member of the teaching staff who I must assume can carry a full-time teaching load of approximately 60 contact hours per week and in three languages?

Secondly, has the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs a different opinion from that of his colleague, the Minister of Education, in respect of matters affecting the provision of interpreting and translating services in South Australia, given that the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs sees an urgent need for interpreters and translators and the Minister of Education sees the dessimation of the only professionalising course for interpreters and translators in South Australia as no decision at all and, consequently, leading to the only possible conclusion open, that no need exists for these people in South Australia?

Thirdly, is the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs, by his statement of 10 September, saying that the provision of interpreters and translators is a matter of public interest and will he agree that by the Minister of Education's answer of 24 September (to which I referred before) that the Minister is saying that it is not so? If that is not the case, why has the Minister of Education not acted to ensure that section 14 (2) and (3) of the South Australian College of Advanced Education Act, 1982, is enforced in respect of the matter, whereas he clearly says that he has acted in respect of other matters?

Fourthly, will the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs tell this Council what the outcome was of letters sent by the Chairman of the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission to the Principal of the S.A.C.A.E.? The Minister will recall previous questions of mine which I asked on 1 September and 14 September, and his answers to them.

Fifthly, will the Minister of Education inform the Council as to the truth of advertisements placed in the weekend newspapers, the *Advertiser* and the *Sunday Mail*, by the S.A.C.A.E., that certain courses would be full offerings in 1983—notably interpreting and translating, which I am to assume will be staffed by one member of the teaching staff, who will maintain a teaching load of about 60 contact hours per week in no less than three languages? The Divine Trinity may be in all places at all times, but not a human being.

Finally, will the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs intervene directly with the Minister of Education and seek special funding for the whole community languages area at S.A.C.A.E., so as to ensure that his statement of 10 September does not prove to be another hollow gesture?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In answer to the honourable member, I must emphasise that his many questions which were directed to the Minister of Education should be answered by that Minister through me. I will refer those questions to the Minister of Education and bring back his answers. In regard to the questions which the honourable member directed to me, as Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs, they dealt with the point I made recently that there was a need for more interpreting and translating services to be available in this State.

These services are made available, as far as the State is concerned, through the Ethnic Affairs Commission and, further to the information that I made public, I can tell the honourable member that only yesterday Cabinet agreed that a further sum of $26 000 was to be used by the commission for interpreting and translating work. I do not want it thought that this State is not now providing enough funds for these purposes. It is of interest to know that the commission is spending now, or will be spending when that $26 000 is used, an aggregate sum of $466 420 on interpreting and translating activities. This sum can be divided under four general headings, information services, $165 514; health purposes, $137 237; legal and other matters, $62 669; and contract interpreting activity, $101 000.

It is that latter sum which is now being increased by $26 000. As well, the Commonwealth has advised us that it is willing to increase its allocation for both permanently employed staff and contract staff in the interpreting area from $80 000 to a sum up to $120 000. So, Governments are mindful of the need to provide ethnic people in this State with adequate interpreting and translating services. The State Government, having acknowledged that need, has done something about it. I think that its funding is to be commended and certainly not to be criticised. That deals with the funding of providing those services to citizens and migrants in South Australia in need of those services.

The other question, which is one of staffing at the C.A.E. and the fears that C.A.E. students have in regard to their future, is a different matter entirely and falls within the area

of Commonwealth funding. It is a matter about which the State Minister of Education is very concerned. I know, too, that the Ethnic Affairs Commission, as the Hon. Mr Feleppa stated a few moments ago, is concerned, and communication has been taking place between the commission and Dr Ramsey on this subject. Also, it is fair to say that the authorities within the C.A.E. and within our own Education Department are doing, and are wanting to do, all that they can to assist in regard to this problem. The specific answer to the question relating to that area must come from the Minister of Education, and I will refer the question to him so that I can obtain information for the honourable member.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: I desire to ask a supplementary question. As I understood what the Minister said, the funding for the maintenance of staff (I am talking about four lecturers)—

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr President. You were kind enough previously to explain Standing Orders to the Hon. Mr Feleppa as to the custom, when asking a supplementary question, of not seeking to explain the question.

The PRESIDENT: I did explain that, and I hope that the honourable member will ask his question.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: Can the Minister tell me how it can be justified that a senior co-ordinator and lecturer has been appointed while at the same time notices of discontinuance of services have been issued to four lecturers under whom the senior co-ordinator should be serving?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Those matters fall within the area of the Minister of Education. I have no direct information coming into my office about senior lecturers being appointed or not being appointed, about other lecturers being appointed or not being appointed, or even contract lecturers having their contract arrangements terminated, and so forth. It is quite proper for me to obtain that information from the Minister of Education. I will obtain that information as quickly as I can.

SECONDARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a reply to my question of 2 September about secondary school education?

The Hon C. M. HILL: The honourable member has asked a number of questions relating to a broadening of the secondary curriculum to prepare students more adequately for life and work. Work experience, school-to-work and vocational awareness programmes have been a feature of secondary education in more recent times. However, the Education Department has been attempting for many years to provide a wider range of options for the increasing number of students staying at school beyond the compulsory age. In 1969, the secondary school certificate was established to provide an alternative year 12 curriculum for those not wishing to pursue a tertiary education career. This has expanded into more than 40 subjects spread across the State and although actual numbers are small in relation to Matriculation students, the growth in status and acceptability of the s.s.c. has been considerable. The Commonwealth Public Service now accepts s.s.c. as an entrance qualification, thus equating it with Matriculation.

It is expected that the establishment of the Public Examinations Authority of South Australia will have a significant impact on curriculum flexibility in the senior secondary school, following and extending proposals in both the Jones Committee Report and the Keeves' committee recommendations.

The desire to expand curriculum areas relating to legal studies and knowledge of the Australian economy and society is reflected in initiatives taken by the Education Department officers to develop curricula in legal studies for the secondary school certificate now offered at year 12 in five high schools and in over 30 high schools at year 11 as an individual subject or an integral part of other subjects. In addition, curriculum writers are preparing the most recent of several submissions to the Public Examinations Board for a Matriculation legal studies subject.

Technology, science, mathematics and technical studies are already receiving considerable emphasis in the secondary curriculum. There is an increasing number of girls undertaking courses in these areas, leading to greater female participation in non-traditional occupations and training programmes. Partly as a result of the Keeves Committee's Report, but essentially as a further step in the Education Department's attempts to broaden the senior secondary curriculum, a working party was established in March 1982 to explore and make recommendations on future directions in post-compulsory education. The report of the working party, 'Beyond Compulsion', is being considered by the Education Department's policy committee.

Present initiatives of the Education Department in the production of the curriculum policy document 'Our Schools and Their Purposes', in the area of transition education and in the review of post-compulsory education are aimed at providing a more relevant curriculum across five years of secondary schooling. The school leaving age can only be seen in the context of a total youth policy, and this is a broader concept than secondary education. This matter is currently under review.

DECENTRALISATION

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: Has the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, a reply to the question I asked on 25 August about decentralisation?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It is not considered appropriate to provide details of financial assistance provided to individual companies. I can, however, supply a summary statement showing the type and amount of rebate for each region, should the honourable member desire it.

NUCLEAR ATTACK

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about nuclear attack.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: In 1980, I asked the Attorney-General about emergency plans that the Government would institute to protect the people of South Australia in the event of a nuclear attack on the US installation at

Narrungar, in the event of a nuclear war. In his reply, the Attorney-General agreed that, in the event of such an attack, the State Government would have a role to play in the emergency operations that would follow. He advised that emergency plans for natural disasters as embodied in State disasters legislation might come into play. The Attorney also advised that the Government was considering the construction of an emergency operations centre which would operate in the event of fall-out occurring after a nuclear strike.

The Attorney said that, although the possibility of building fall-out shelters had been considered, no Australian Government had thought it necessary to construct such shelters. New information has come to light, since I asked that question two years ago, about the likely effects on the South Australian population if a nuclear attack should occur. I refer to a report by the Swedish Academy of Sciences, published in a journal known as *Ambio,* which argues that, in the event of an 'all out' nuclear war between the super powers, major Australian cities could be targeted. However, as I said in my question in 1980, a more likely scenario is that United States installations in Australia would be the most likely targets.

Dr Desmond Ball, who is Australia's leading expert in this area, recently published a paper which estimates the number of people in South Australia who would be affected if the Nurrungar installation were hit. This is the first time that such an estimate has been published. Dr Ball's paper states:

> Adelaide's winds during the winter are frequently from the north and north-west, so that it could well receive fall-out from explosions at Pine Gap or Nurrungar during that season. The worst case situation for Adelaide would be an attack against Nurrungar which involved a ground burst at a time when the winds were north-westerly and blowing at more than 30 kph (which is quite common in winter), in which case the radiation level in Adelaide would be about 50 to 100 REMs—sufficient to cause nausea and lower resistance to other diseases, and to cause some long-term damage, but medical treatment would probably not be required. Under the same conditions, however, (i.e. a 1-Mt ground burst at a time of north-westerly winds), the radiation level over such cities as Port Augusta (population 16 000), Whyalla (32 000), Port Pirie (15 000) and surrounding areas would be about 300 REMs which would kill about 10 per cent of those exposed, that is, perhaps more than 10 000 people.

I think that all honourable members would agree that if that happened the situation would be very serious indeed.

Is the Attorney-General aware of the information contained in Dr Ball's paper 'Limiting damage from nuclear attack'? Has the Government's view changed in relation to emergency planning in the event of a nuclear strike, since I asked my previous question in 1980? If not, will the Government now undertake a re-examination of its position in light of Dr Ball's new study?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will have the honourable member's questions examined and bring down a reply.

BLUE ASBESTOS

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: My questions are directed to the Attorney-General. Are the press statements reporting that blue asbestos was recently thrown into the House of Assembly Chamber correct? If so, by what authority can Parliament accept responsibility for the serious health risks imposed on members of the Parliamentary staff and members of the House of Assembly? Do members of Parliament receive better compensation coverage with more benefits than the compensation coverage for staff? Will the Attorney-General have all necessary inquiries made of Parliament to ensure that, if blue asbestos was cast into the House of Assembly Chamber, and if any health defect is detected (such as asbestosis or related diseases) affecting members of the Parliamentary staff, it be declared as *prima facie* evidence in the event of any claims arising from that incident?

If the Speaker of the House of Assembly has not already made a statement in relation to this matter, will the Attorney-General ensure that a report on the incident is made available to both Houses of Parliament? Will that report include a statement about the security measures to be adopted, particularly in relation to whether or not members of the Police Force have any jurisdiction within the Houses of Parliament in relation to incidents of this type?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The authority to deal with that particular disturbance rests with the Speaker. I understand that the Speaker has been making inquiries in relation to that occurrence and the sorts of matters raised in the honourable member's subsequent questions. I am not aware what statement, if any, the Speaker has made in relation to that incident: I will have inquiries made and I will bring down a reply.

In relation to the question of compensation, again, I will seek some advice and bring down a reply. In relation to the honourable member's other questions, some research is obviously required, particularly in relation to the question of security and the authority of police officers, and I will have inquiries made and bring down a response. Essentially, the question of security is a matter for the Presiding Officers. The authority of police officers is essentially that which is allowed to them by the Presiding Officers. It is a complex question which necessarily involves the question of Parliamentary privilege. I will have inquiries made and I will bring down replies.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the Attorney-General elaborate on the matter of so-called 'Parliamentary privilege' in respect of this incident?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It is difficult to do that off the cuff because it is a complex question. I will certainly examine the matter and bring back a reply.

The PRESIDENT: For the information of the Hon. Mr Foster, I have a copy of the statement made about this matter by the Speaker in another place.

UNSWEETENED DRINKS

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Has the Minister of Consumer Affairs a reply to the question I asked on 12 August about unsweetened drinks?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The regulations requiring the labelling of unsweetened drinks with an ingredient statement are made under the Food and Drugs Act. South Australia was the first State to adopt ingredient labelling regulations. They were promulgated in December 1978. Experience has shown that these regulations need review, and this is now taking place. Many ingredients have three names: their generic name, their specific technical name and their common name. The problem is which one should the regulations require to be used in ingredient labelling. The National Health and Medical Research Council Food Standard Committee is presently considering submissions from manufacturers, consumers and academics as to which name should be required in future. My department's interest in matters such as these relates to whether or not the information is accurate, or whether it is misleading. The honourable member will appreciate that it is possible for a statement to be

technically accurate but misleading. In the case in point the statement is accurate and not technically misleading, although some people would argue that it was.

BAIL ON MURDER CHARGE

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 16 September about bail on a murder charge?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It is not properly within my power to suggest guidelines to the judiciary for the exercise of their discretion on matters such as bail. In this particular case, I provided the honourable member with information to this effect on 2 September. As the honourable member is aware, the defendant Hughes was remanded to appear in the Whyalla Court on 7 September last. He has been committed for trial at the November sitting of the Supreme Court at Port Augusta.

TRADE

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Attorney-General a reply to a question I asked on 15 September about trade?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The short answer to the honourable member's question as to whether the State Government is aware of any negotiations between the Soviet Union or any authorities in Australia which would have benefited the Australian fruitgrowing industry is 'No'. My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, has advised me that during a recent visit to the U.S.S.R. by Mr David Trebeck, the Deputy Director of the National Farmers Federation, many aspects of rural trade were discussed. Mr Trebeck reported that, although there were opportunities to sell more rural goods to the U.S.S.R., that Government was not prepared to buy products such as canned fruit with 'hard' currency. It was, however, prepared to negotiate barter-type deals. The Minister believes that it is not an attractive proposition for South Australia to 'swap' canned fruit for timber, seafood or other products surplus to the U.S.S.R.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES TRIBUNAL

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on 31 August about the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The legislation is already before the Parliament. The measure only applies to the salaries of members of Parliament. It is not the Government's intention to introduce legislation restricting wage movement in other areas. The remainder of the question is therefore not relevant.

ADELAIDE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to the question I asked on 19 August about the Adelaide Children's Hospital?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The reply is as follows:

(1) The ducting used to air condition the Adelaide Children's Hospital is not lined with asbestos. However the ceilings of the hospital's Rieger Building (on the corner of Kermode Street and Sir Edwin Smith Avenue) are lined with asbestos, and one of the ventilation ducts in the Samuel Way Building (fronting Brougham Place) contains asbestos.

(2) The hospital and the South Australian Health Commission became aware of the asbestos problem at the Adelaide Children's Hospital in the late 1970s. This has caused considerable difficulty in planning, because the removal of asbestos in many of the buildings entails a large increase in capital expenditure (estimated to be in excess of $2 000 000 at present day costs) and modern procedure requires that the area to be denuded of asbestos should be completely vacated and sealed off from the remainder of the building.

(3) The Board of Management of the hospital and the S.A. Health Commission have been intensively studying the problem and the action already taken and the proposed future action is as follows:

In July 1979, a contract was let with Marshall and Brougham for the sum of $27 000 to remove or surface treat asbestos in the following areas:

- Ninth and tenth floor plant rooms in the Clarence Rieger Building;
- Ceiling space above audiometric suite on the 3rd floor of the Clarence Rieger Building;
- Ventilation duct in Samuel Way Building.

In December 1981 a contract with Bestabell Insulation was let for the sum of $26 000 to remove or surface treat asbestos in various small plant rooms in the older buildings.

The Government has provided a 100 per cent subsidy for both of these contracts.

There are still three small plant rooms in the Samuel Way Building, where it is intended to seal the asbestos-lined walls. This is expected to be carried out this year.

The major problem is the asbestos lining of the ceiling in the Clarence Rieger Building, as this was a pivotal structure in the rebuilding plans for the hospital. In order to overcome the problem, the commission appointed consultants to reassess the space requirements of the hospital and to take account of the requirement for extensive asbestos treatment in the Clarence Rieger Building. A discussion paper has been produced, and a functional brief for new hospital construction is now being prepared. It is expected that this will be completed by mid-November 1982. Approval will then be sought from the Health Commission to proceed with the architectural design.

LEARNER DRIVERS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (on notice) asked the Attorney-General: For the most recently available 12-month period:

1. What is the joint age and sex distribution of the holders of P plates issued in South Australia?
2. What is the joint age and sex distribution of the holders of L plates issued in South Australia?
3. How many P and L plates have been cancelled as a result of all offences?
4. How many P and L plates have been cancelled as a result of alcohol-related offences?
5. What is the joint age and sex distribution of the people who experienced the cancellations referred to in questions Nos 3 and 4?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The answers to Part 1 and Part 2 of the question are in statistical form and I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

1. PROBATIONARY LICENCES ON REGISTER AS AT 31 AUGUST 1982

Age	Male	Female	Total
16	3 883	1 730	5 613
17	4 323	3 083	7 406
18	1 837	1 617	3 454
19	845	1 084	1 929
20	451	775	1 226
21	305	509	814
22	226	374	600
23	199	340	539
24	175	276	451
25	151	224	375
26	140	212	352
27	117	197	314
28	111	147	258
29	74	131	205
30	68	136	204
31	60	109	169
32	55	100	155
33	50	111	161
34	50	77	127
35	38	90	128
36	32	66	98
37	25	53	78
38	28	47	75
39	29	42	71
40	18	36	54
41	19	33	52
42	22	38	60
43	18	36	54
44	15	16	31
45	11	33	44
46	15	28	43
47	10	31	41
48	14	17	31
49	10	30	40
50	15	20	35
51	14	22	36
52	8	17	25
53	12	17	29
54	7	19	26
55	4	7	11
56	5	16	21
57	6	11	17
58	5	22	27
59	6	10	16
60	4	14	18
61	2	7	9
62	4	5	9
63	2	6	8
64	4	6	10
65	2	4	6
66	1	7	8
67	2	3	5
68	1	5	6
69	1	4	5
70	—	2	2
71	1	2	3
72	—	1	1
73	—	—	—
74	1	—	1
75	—	—	—
76	—	1	1
77	—	1	1
78	—	1	1
79	—	—	—
80	—	—	—
81	—	—	—
82	—	—	—
83	—	1	1
Total	13 531	12 059	25 590

2. LEARNER'S PERMITS ON REGISTER AS AT 1 JULY 1982

Age	Male	Female	Total
16	3 412	2 724	6 136
17	1 054	1 499	2 553
18	546	1 067	1 613
19	310	670	980
20	183	462	645
21	126	370	496
22	117	270	387
23	87	244	331
24	78	195	273
25	63	164	227
26	63	163	226
27	45	122	167
28	42	107	149
29	26	100	126
30	31	76	107
31	24	76	100
32	24	76	100
33	17	61	78
34	17	56	73
35	13	54	67
36	12	58	70
37	13	35	48
38	20	36	56
39	17	27	44
40	8	33	41
41	15	27	42
42	8	33	41
43	7	25	32
44	9	19	28
45	2	19	21
46	6	24	30
47	5	18	23
48	13	14	27
49	6	14	20
50	3	13	16
51	4	16	20
52	3	23	26
53	9	24	33
54	4	21	25
55	3	13	16
56	2	19	21
57	4	22	26
58	3	9	12
59	6	11	17
60	2	11	13
61	—	7	7
62	3	4	7
63	—	6	6
64	—	3	3
65	1	2	3
66	—	5	5
67	—	1	1
68	2	4	6
69	—	—	—
70	—	1	1
71	—	1	1
72	1	3	4
73	—	1	1
74	—	—	—
75	—	—	—
76	—	1	1
77	—	—	—
78	1	1	2
79	—	1	1
Total	6 470	9 161	15 631

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The remainder of the replies are as follows:

3. For the 12 months ended 31 August 1982, 2 723 licences endorsed with probationary conditions were cancelled and 488 learners permits were cancelled.

4. For the 12 months ended 31 August 1982, 329 licences endorsed with probationary conditions and learners permits

were cancelled as a result of conviction for alcohol related offences.

5. Statistics have not been kept for age and sex distribution of persons whose licence or permit has been cancelled.

BUDGET PAPERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. K. T. Griffin:

That the Council take note of the papers relating to the Estimates of Payments and Receipts, 1982-83.

(Continued from 16 September. Page 1112.)

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I support the motion. In so doing, I will be brief because of the rather generous provision of time afforded to the Opposition by way of the Budget Estimates Committees for examination of the Budget and for expression of their views which have occupied the past two weeks. The detailed examination of the Budget now lies in *Hansard* for anyone brave enough to read the proceedings of those Committees. I will spend a short time on three issues and in making some passing comments. I will be speaking about education, compulsory unionism and union ballots—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That is provided for in Government legislation.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: We will see about that.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It is federally.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: And, finally, I will make a few remarks about some of the political/industrial activity still yapping at heels of the St John Ambulance Brigade organisation. Over the past three years South Australia has had an enviable record in the provision of increasing amounts of money to the field of education, yet we have heard the Institute of Teachers, and in particular those activists belonging to the left-wing group known as the TAS group within the executive of the Institute of Teachers, repeat time and time again the untruth that there have been education cuts.

I am surprised that people such as Miss Ebert appear so unable to interpret statistics. The institute repeatedly resorts to devious little subterfuges such as comparing the estimate of one year with the expenditure of another, refusing to compare like with like, and producing false statements about education cuts. There is nothing that anybody can do about this. It is the Hitlerian-type propaganda of the big lie: if you say it often enough and produce enough bumper stickers with things like 'Education cuts won't heal' on them, enough people will believe it.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: There is nothing positive at all.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: That is so. I was going through the 130 questions to which the institute asked the politicians to respond; it is a great sheet of 130 very complicated questions. One question, concerning class sizes, would involve $20 000 000 if each class was reduced in size by one child. Another, namely, the provision of 33 per cent non-contact time (which, in essence, means one-third of teachers time at school spent not teaching), would do nothing about class sizes. If anything, it would increase class sizes by reducing the availability of teachers in classrooms, but that is a somewhat selfish question about industrial conditions which contributes nothing to the education of children. That has been costed at about $40 000 000, I understand, and the whole package of the 130 points raised can be costed at between $200 000 000 and $400 000 000. So, it is a completely unreal proposition that the Teachers Institute has put up in that questionnaire. It postulates pouring massive resources into education without any evidence that it will do very much for children.

I remind the Council of where South Australia stands compared to the national averages of an important number of indices relating to standards of education. If one looks at the ratios of students to classroom teachers in primary schools, one sees that in South Australia the figure is 24, whereas the Australian average is 28.7. For secondary schools, the South Australian figure is 16.4, compared to an Australian average of 17.6. The ratio of students to ancillary staff, primary, is 108 for South Australia and 150 for Australia; for secondary, South Australia's figure is 87 compared to an Australian average of 90. Just because we have, for example, a secondary student-teacher ratio of 16.4 does not mean that all the classes have 16.4 students. A number of classes would be bigger than that.

The figures that I have here go on to look at the percentage of total classes that are above a certain figure. I refer to class sizes of more than 30 students. For junior primary, the figure is 20, equalling 1.4 per cent of the total classes in South Australia. For Australia as a whole, the figure is 2 457—an average of 14.1 per cent of the total classes being bigger than 30 students. For primary classes, we have 172 or 5.3 per cent, in South Australia. The Australian average is 8 220 or 27.7 per cent. These figures go on and on. In nearly every case, South Australia is significantly better than the Australian average.

These are not figures cooked up by someone in the Education Department or in the Liberal Party. I have been reading from the survey which is published by the Australian Teachers Federation. They are the teachers own figures. Some members of the executive of the Australian Teachers Federation have been very careful not to publicise those figures when they have criticised the Government. They have kept those buried away in the bottom of the drawer. They did not even have all the raw material of the A.T.F. survey. I remind them that the original data of the A.T.F. survey is available from the office of the Minister of Education in microfiche form. If they want to continue their propaganda, they might at least obtain the data before they continue to carry on in the way in which they have carried on. There is little likelihood that we will be able to convince them that what we say is true, because the whole history of the executive of that union has been to ignore these truths and not to seek the data.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I must have used that word. Professor Campbell, from Queensland, has visited South Australia at the invitation of the Institute of Teachers. We hear on radio, especially SAFM and stations such as that, that he has been able to quantify the number of days education that a pupil loses for every child in a class above 25 students. This enables him to come to the extraordinary conclusion that a child who is in a class of 35 will lose just over 24 days of school each year.

It is important for members to look at the methodology that Professor Campbell employed in that study on class size, to look at whatever studies have been done in relation to class sizes and to look at some of Professor Campbell's other findings that have not been publicised. His technique was to select a handful of students (about three or four students in a class) as the subjects, to observe them during the teaching of a lesson, and to measure the percentage of the duration of that lesson for which they appear to be concentrating and the percentage of the time for which they appear to be inattentive. Professor Campbell sampled about 100 classes and found that the three or four subject students in each class had a variable amount of attention-paying time according to the class size, but the variations were fairly small. For example, nobody ever concentrates 100 per cent of the time. About all that could be expected is 90 per cent. The variations were between 75 and 90 per cent, but

there was no factor in the study that standardised teacher quality and its effect on the attention of the pupils.

When the qualities of the teacher were made the subject of studies, there were enormous variations. What Professor Campbell has not said, and what the Institute of Teachers has not incorporated in its advertisement (but which is a fact that emerges from the study) is that, regardless of class size, the quality of teachers (the teachers ability, skill and training in holding the attention of that class) is more important in determining the quality of education than the sorts of effects that varied with class size.

Incidentally, there have been approximately 100 different studies on class size and its effect on education. Of these 100 studies, approximately one-third indicate that, within certain limits, the larger the class the less effective the education. Approximately one-third indicates that an increase in class size improved education, and approximately one-third demonstrated that class size makes no difference. To have the Institute of Teachers campaigning on class size and ignoring the more important factor of teacher quality, and to have it referring to only one of the 100 studies that have been run overall, is inconclusive and is a singularly unscientific and is, I believe, politically biased argument for the institute to use.

However, as I say, I despair that the institute will cease that argument, because I am sure that its motives are political rather than academic, and I think that we will see this State moving towards the Victorian situation where the teachers union makes or breaks a Government and fills the Parliament with activists from the teachers union. I fear that, but to me it seems that that is its motivation.

The question of compulsory unionism and of controls of union ballots is one which will soon be debated in this Parliament. I do not seek to anticipate that debate and the Bill which is before the other place. I want to draw to the attention of the Council one particular area of union activity that we ought to consider, namely, the question of students unions: the campus politics of universities.

These young men pay a compulsory statutory fee, and a moiety of that statutory fee in many cases, but not in all, where the student union is affiliated with the Australian Union of Students, is transferred to the A.U.S. All members know that the A.U.S. is not a trade union in the sense that most unions are: it is a political organisation. More often than not it is under communist control and its finances are, in many cases, suspect, to say the least. One hears stories of large sums of money either unaccounted for or being donated to radical Marxist extremist movements, and the like.

Many students object, as a matter of principle, to the fact that their money is statutorily taken from them and given to this organisation. I will not attack the A.U.S. I believe that political activity is legitimate, as long as it is voluntarily entered into and voluntarily supported by whoever wishes to adopt those beliefs and preach them. But, a very large number of students object, as a matter of principle, to the fact that their money is removed from them statutorily and given to a political organisation with which they violently disagree. I hope that one day Governments in Australia grasp the nettle and enshrine in legislation a defence of students freedom not to contribute to political organisations that they do not wish to support.

I also want to raise another matter, which is perhaps related to the legislation that we are expecting to see in this Chamber, regarding the control of ballots. The history of the control of balloting on university campuses for positions such as delegacy to the A.U.S. is not a very proud one. We all know that several years ago there was some substantial malpractice involving students on the Liberal side of politics concerning the ballot. More recently, I received complaints about the most recent A.U.S. elections at the Adelaide University. In the recent elections the ballot ticket at the Adelaide University had 12 names on it. For the past eight years, names have been placed on the ballot paper in alphabetical order, but on this occasion the returning officer decided, of his own volition, to conduct a ballot to determine the order of listing of the names.

It is wonderful to relate that the four non-communist individuals standing for those positions came out in the bottom five places on the ticket. The probability of this happening has been calculated by one person as being seven chances out of 99. Even more wonderful to relate is that at Flinders University a ballot was held for positions on the ballot paper, and again the names of non-communist candidates tumbled down by ballot to fill the bottom places. The possibility of this happening was calculated at one chance in 126 chances. When one multiplies the two and works out the probability of the same thing happening consistently in both universities, it makes it appear that all is not well. That can never be said absolutely, because there is always a slight chance that the ballot turned out that way. However, the appearances of fair play must be upheld and, unfortunately, there are some other indicators that tarnish the appearance of impartiality in this matter.

The returning officer for the election at the Adelaide University was a prominent lecturer in politics who has written papers which indicate his left wing views—to which he is perfectly entitled, of course. I wonder about the wisdom of having so-called impartial returning officers with those professional political connections. Perhaps it would have looked better if the Professor of Physics or the Professor of Engineering had been the returning officer.

Furthermore, it is a little disturbing to notice that one candidate asked whether he could have scrutineers at the count. He was told that he could not and that the computer would do the count. After persisting, he was told that he could have scrutineers but that he should not worry about it because it would be several weeks before the counting was undertaken. However, within the week he was told the result, the count having occurred without his having an opportunity to have his scrutineer present.

I am not suggesting that anyone has rigged any ballots; I am not necessarily alleging that, even if there had been these little biases in positions on the ballot paper, or even if the candidates had scrutineers, the result would have been any different. Certainly, I am not saying that the right-wing side of campus politics is any purer than the left-wing side: I am saying that here we have a situation where students are compelled to contribute to a political organisation in which they do not necessarily believe, and this is the situation surrounding an election for delegates who will determine the disposal of large sums of money. There was the sudden unilateral decision of a returning officer to depart from the alphabetical listing and, lo and behold, against all probabilities, the non-communist members filled the bottom half of the ballot paper. There was then the question of the scrutineers that were not present.

I suggest to the Council that when the questions of electoral control and Government control of balloting of unions and the question of freedom not to join unions in general arise, we should also consider the same question in relation to university students. Perhaps the issues are not as earth shattering as those in the big world of industrial relationships, but the principles are the same: the principles of the rights and liberties of individuals are the same, and I hope that this Council will consider this matter.

Finally, I want to add another small paragraph in what will be the continuing saga of the St John Ambulance question. The Council will remember during the last episode that I asked a question about the involvement of the Fire

Brigade in accident rescue, and suggested that ultimately we would see pressures brought to bear to give a paramedical role to fire fighters. Within a few days we saw in the August issue of the fire fighters journal the production of an article headed 'Paramedics for South Australia . . . Yes or No'. The article deals with the history of the introduction of paramedics in New South Wales and Victoria, and I point out to the Council that what is meant by the term 'paramedic' is much more than what is meant by the term 'advanced care ambulance crew', which we already have in South Australia at present, and much less than what is meant by 'medical retrieval teams'. The retrieval teams that we have in South Australia are teams comprised of senior anaesthetists, surgeons and nursing staff who travel with the ambulance to the scene of a major accident and give expert professional medical care there.

In addition, our crews (both salaried and volunteer) who conduct the general business of the St John Ambulance Brigade are well trained in first aid and their skills are constantly upgraded. The concept of paramedics is that of training certain individuals to perform tasks that are undertaken normally only by doctors, tasks that involve invasive procedures on the body such as intubation of the trachea (putting a tube down the windpipe), intravenous transfusions and various other things like that.

In this article the author concludes that we should follow some other States in developing paramedics in our ambulance service, that they should all be salaried, that no volunteer should be attached to that function and that eventually fire fighters should become involved in that function. This is going to be an on-going saga, because the article is full of technical inaccuracies and avoids completely reference to some of the terrible troubles that have been encountered in the Eastern States, particularly Victoria, where the paramedics have been causing significant damage to patients in their enthusiasm to behave like doctors.

I did hear an anecdotal story of a patient who was the victim of a traffic accident outside a large public hospital. The paramedics came along and treated that victim on the roadway for about 20 minutes until the patient died. The paramedics did that without bothering to call a doctor from the hospital to give assistance. I believe that if this limited *quasi* doctor training extension is introduced, it may give these people an idea that they are much better than they are, encouraging them to go beyond their capabilities, and causing them to resent encroachment by trained medical personnel. That is not just my opinion because, when one looks at this article, one finds reference to the South Australian retrieval team set up. The article states:

> Upon receiving a call, an ambulance would be despatched to pick up the retrieval team and convey them to the patient requiring pre-hospital emergency care.

This next bit is the pivot:

> Whilst it was conceded that the retrieval team system worked well in many instances, it did not cater for the aspirations of professional officers in so far as to extend their skills. Moreover it was viewed by many as an encroachment.

One can start to see the industrial nub to the question. The article states:

> Whilst it was conceded that the retrieval team system worked well in many instances, it did not cater for the aspirations of [ambulance officers, the paramedics]—

It did not give them the thrill of having their skill extended because there were all these clever doctors around. It was viewed by the author as an encroachment. One starts to see that the author is primarily concerned not with the best treatment for the patient but with pride and the industrial situation of ambulance officers. Under the heading 'Advanced Casualty Care', the following statement is made:

> Mid 1980 saw the introduction of an advanced casualty care course for ambulance officers. This course, whilst not as intense as that of MICA, was seen—

again this is crucial—

> as a major breakthrough in so far as the career opportunities for professional officers were concerned.

It is my firm belief that whilst 90 per cent of salaried ambulance officers would have nothing to do with that sort of 'wolf in sheep's clothing' attitude, which is the argument of the paramedics as reprinted in the *Fire Fighter,* and whilst St John is the most excellent ambulance and casualty service in Australia, this pressure will nevertheless continue insiduously at levels beneath the surface, at levels that may not be noticed by the body politic from time to time, or by management and council in St John. However, in the past two years it has progressed continuously in that direction.

If there is any doubt at all about whether the author of this article cares more for the safety of the human beings under his care or for the aspirations of professional officers and their career opportunities, I can only point out that this man is a former ambulance officer who was dismissed from the ambulance service after a number of misdemeanours which culminated in his refusal to attend an emergency call for reasons based on industrial activity. I leave that episode at that point.

I believe that there will be more episodes. I recognise the Hon. Dr Cornwall's sincerity and goodwill in relation to this matter. He has assured many people that he will not in any way compromise the excellence of St John, or permit the erosion of its voluntary component. Unfortunately, because of the nature of the organisation of the Australian Labor Party, his assurances, whilst sincere and well-meaning, are not worth anything. People such as Mr Mick Doyle and Mr Geoffrey Roberts have to do only a little bit of lobbying to get the numbers on the floor of A.L.P. State conventions and the Hon. Dr Cornwall is bound and his reassurances count for nought. I believe that pressure will be applied. This action is more likely to succeed under a Labor Government than it is under a Liberal Government. If a Liberal Government is returned at the next election, I hope that it will see this action for what it really is, and that it will resist it. I support the motion.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 September. Page 1113.)

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: This Bill recognises the move away from traditional borrowings undertaken by semi-governmental authorities into new areas, some of which are not covered by the existing provisions of the Public Finance Act. For example, in the past decade leverage leasing, bills of exchange, letters of credit, and promissory notes have become much more common methods of borrowing and lending. The Minister's second reading explanation noted another transaction, namely, that the Housing Trust, through a management contract can obtain the use of dwellings financed by the Superannuation Investment Trust and the State Government Insurance Commission. Those dwellings remain in the ownership of those two statutory bodies.

The Bill ensures that other methods of financing statutory bodies programmes, other than conventional borrowings, will require the Treasurer's approval where a statutory body is declared by proclamation to be a prescribed authority.

Another clause brings these more recent forms of financing under the same umbrella as traditional borrowing methods in relation to a Treasurer's guarantee or indemnity. Other amendments provide a fee for the Treasurer's guarantee or indemnity to be charged by the Treasurer. Some questions have been raised about the propriety of charging this type of fee. I see nothing wrong with this proposal at all because it brings the public sector into line with the private sector, where such fees are traditionally charged for guarantees or indemnities. For example, a letter of credit issued by an overseas bank in favour of an Australian lender is often guaranteed by an Australian trading bank for a fee ranging between 0.25 per cent up to 1 per cent.

I think that to impute a fee to Government transactions is important when looking at the financial performances of statutory authorities. I understand that the proposed amendments simply mean that statutory authorities may have to impute a fee for any guarantee or indemnity that has been given by the Treasurer.

Mention has also been made of leverage leasing, which is not presently covered by this Act. Leverage leasing is a technique of business financing whereby a statutory authority, for example, an electric supply corporation, could lease a new power station, run the power station and purchase electricity. Private enterprise would contribute capital, have equity in the power station and could obtain tax concessions such as depreciation and investment allowances, and other parties would provide long-term secured loans. That was the position until late 1981 when the Federal Treasurer, Mr Howard, ruled out leverage leasing transactions for tax exempt statutory bodies.

Prior to the Federal Treasurer's intervention, the private sector, when entering into leverage leasing arrangements with an electric supply corporation, could obtain tax advantages that otherwise were not obtainable. Honourable members will recall that last year the New South Wales Government intended to use this technique to sell the Eraring Power Station to private enterprise for what was believed to be over $1.5 billion. It is also true that the Electricity Trust of South Australia had been looking at this method to finance the Northern Power Station.

Tax exempt Government authorities made the technique of leverage leasing extraordinarily attractive for big ticket items such as power stations. However, the Federal Treasurer, Mr Howard, introduced legislation to prevent non-tax-paying authorities using leverage leases. The Treasurer saw this technique as a misuse of the tax laws and a form of tax avoidance. I support the Treasurer's actions, notwithstanding that it may have inconvenienced some statutory bodies around Australia that were well advanced in looking at leverage leasing as a possible method of financing capital works programmes.

In her second reading speech, the Hon. Miss Levy stated that the Electricity Trust was disadvantaged by the Federal Treasurer's proposal. I point out that the Hon. Miss Levy did not refer to the compensation that has been received by electric supply authorities in Australia. At the Loan Council meeting in June this year, State electricity authorities were given the authority to borrow domestically free of Loan Council constraints. That is a considerable advantage. In addition, States were given permission to borrow over $500 000 000 overseas in the first quarter of this financial year. In line with the general lessening of restrictions in the capital market, some following recommendations of the Campbell Inquiry, these recent moves confirmed an advantage on semi-governmental authorities such as the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

The Hon. Anne Levy: What about the interest rates?

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: The interest rates are coming down very rapidly. I suspect that some of the financing now being undertaken in South Australia in relation to large capital works programmes will have a reduction in rates of almost 3 per cent in relation to the interest rates that prevailed less than one month ago.

Hopefully, those rates will continue to decrease. I support these proposals. I note that the Attorney has an amendment on file, and I will be interested to hear the background to that amendment. I support the amendments to this Act because they are a sensible way to upgrade the Public Finance Act. In line with continuing developments in the capital market they provide an element of flexibility which is necessary in such financial matters. They are further evidence of this Government's demonstrated intention to upgrade the public sector and to make it comparable in accountability to the private sector and, also, to provide the public sector with the opportunity of taking advantage of the rapid changes occurring in Australia's capital markets.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I appreciate that honourable members have given an indication of support for this Bill. The Hon. Anne Levy asked in her contribution questions which I shall now answer. She asked what costs were incurred by the Electricity Trust of South Australia as a result of special financing arrangements, which were made for the northern power station, not proceeding because of changes in Commonwealth taxation policy and Loan Council arrangements. The agreement between the Electricity Trust and the arranger of the proposed financing of the northern power station was that the Electricity Trust would be liable for out-of-pocket expenses such as legal and printing costs. In addition, a fee was payable by the Electricity Trust in the event that the scheme was not proceeded with. For economic reasons the amount involved should remain confidential. Although the financing proposal did not go ahead, the Electricity Trust, in negotiations with overseas financiers and other parties concerned, was able to build up knowledge and contacts in the international finance markets. It is likely that at some time in the future it will be able to take advantage, with Loan Council approval, of some of the relationships it established through this exercise. It has already undertaken off-shore borrowing with one of the banks involved at that time.

The Hon. Anne Levy asked which statutory authorities might be charged for guarantees provided by the Treasury. As the second reading explanation points out, the Government believes it is desirable for the Treasurer to have the power to charge fees for guarantees so that, among other things, the extent of hidden subsidies presently given to statutory authorities can be clearly identified. The question of which authorities are to be involved in a fee of this kind is yet to be examined in detail by the Government. Therefore, a precise answer cannot be given in broad terms. However, the Government believes that it would be appropriate to apply such charges quite generally to authorities such as ETSA and the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, which operate on a more or less commercial basis.

There is no reason why their borrowing costs should be artificially lowered by the provision of a guarantee which is not charged for in a manner similar to that which applies in the private sector for authorities subsidised from the Budget. The charging for guarantees would, as the Hon. Anne Levy said, in one sense be a bookkeeping exercise, as the sums involved would go out of one of the Government's pockets and into another. However, in keeping with the Government's programme budget philosophy, it is, in principle, desirable that the extent of subsidies, both direct and indirect, be fairly identified. That is one of the reasons for the provision for charging for guarantees. I believe that that explanation covers the two principal matters raised by the Hon. Anne Levy. I hope that those questions have now been adequately answered. I thank honourable members for their indication of support of this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Insertion of new Part VIC.'

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I move the following suggested amendment:

Page 2, after line 28—Insert subsection as follows:

(5) No consent or approval is required under this section in respect of a credit arrangement entered into by the Savings Bank of South Australia or the State Bank of South Australia.

New section 32*l* deals with the requirement that a prescribed authority may, with the consent of the Treasurer, enter into a credit arrangement on terms and conditions approved by the Treasurer. The two banks are entering into these sorts of arrangements every day. To ensure that they are enabled to retain their independence with respect of their daily banking responsibilities the Government proposes that they should not be subjected to the provisions of 32*l*. It was certainly not intended that they should be subjected to that part of the Bill. However, the Government really sees no reason why the two banks should be excluded from the other two provisions, 32m and 32n, because these two provisions could be used to the mutual advantage of the banks and the Government. New section 32n, for example, provides for the charging of fees where the Treasurer gives a guarantee or indemnity.

The power in new section 32m allows the Treasurer to guarantee or to give indemnities. There is no prejudice to the two banks in allowing the Treasurer to give guarantees and indemnities in respect of arrangements to which the banks are parties. The amendment excludes the banks from new section 32*l* but does not affect their relationship to the Treasurer with respect to guarantees and indemnities under new sections 32m and 32n.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I feel somewhat pressured by the Attorney's circulating this amendment this afternoon. It seems to me, from my brief perusal of the amendment, to be sensible. I hope that I am not overlooking some dastardly motive on the part of the Government.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: There is nothing of that in the amendment at all.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: On the face of it, there does not seem to be any sleight of hand intended. The Attorney's explanation of the amendment seems reasonable. In fact, one might have expected to see it in the legislation when it was first presented to the Parliament.

It is obviously an oversight that has been rectified at this stage. It seems not only a sensible but also a very necessary part of the legislation, and it seems that someone has slipped rather badly in not having it as part of the Bill when it was first brought before the Parliament. I emphasise that, on the basis of an examination of a very few minutes only, I support the amendment.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I can give an unqualified assurance that there is nothing dastardly, nor any sleight of hand either on the surface or in substance. It is, as I have explained it, to ensure that the banks are not restricted in their operations. It is as simple as that.

Suggested amendment carried; clause, with suggested amendment, passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 September. Page 1066.)

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Opposition supports the measure in principle. It is somewhat ironic that this measure comes before us from a Government which has waxed very eloquent on numerous occasions on the iniquities of having a large number of statutory authorities. The stated aim of the Government has been to abolish statutory authorities and semi-government organisations. Members of the Government have spoken publicly of this on many occasions, yet here the Government is setting up a new statutory authority. This, I am sure, is a matter that the Government needs to square with its own conscience. Sorting out the difference between its own rhetoric and its practice is a matter for the Liberal Party.

On the other hand, the Labor Party never has had any hang-ups about establishing statutory authorities where it is believed that these are desirable and necessary. In this case we believe that the establishment of this statutory authority is a very desirable step that should be taken. As detailed in the Minister's second explanation, the South Australian Government Financing Authority, which no doubt will become known as SAGFA from the acronym of its initials, is to raise loans on behalf of small semi-government authorities. At this stage we do not know which ones are to be proclaimed under the legislation. Generally, it is taken that small statutory authorities are those which have borrowing powers of up to only $1 500 000 a year. Large ones are those that currently borrow beyond that amount. There is no distinction in this legislation between large and small semi-government authorities.

The one exception in the legislation is that councils as defined in the Local Government Act are not to come under the aegis of the new SAGFA. I understand from looking at *Hansard* that in another place it was stated that there was no intention at the moment of bringing ETSA under the aegis of SAGFA, but that this was being left open in case the borrowing ability of the Electricity Trust, as determined by the last Loan Council meeting, should ever disappear, at which time it would be desirable for ETSA to be brought under SAGFA, and that this is why ETSA is not mentioned as an exception in the legislation.

The creation of SAGFA arises from the Campbell Committee Report in the same way as the amendments to the Public Finance Act which we have just considered. The creation of such an authority was recommended in the Campbell Committee Report and the necessity for it is due largely to the implementation of parts of the Campbell Committee Report, particularly those relating to the deregulation of bank deposit rates, which resulted in five specific disadvantages of the present system which were detailed in the Minister's second reading explanation. It is interesting to note that the Campbell Committee Report has never been formally accepted by the Federal Government. As has been documented by the Shadow Treasurer, Mr Willis, about two dozen of the recommendations of the Campbell Committee Report have been implemented so far, but there is no indication of whether or not the remaining recommendations will be implemented.

This Bill establishes the new statutory authority, as I have said, but it cannot be claimed that this is a brand new initiative on the part of the Liberal Government. Western Australia already has a statutory authority established under similar legislation. There are moves towards establishing such a body in Victoria, where it was proposed by the Labor Opposition prior to its election to Government in April of this year.

The Campbell Committee Report records not only that Western Australia has such legislation but also that Victoria is making moves towards it and that New South Wales and Queensland have established similar procedures. Therefore,

only South Australia, of the mainland States, has made no moves.

I am sure that it could be argued that South Australia should have moved earlier in this regard. In fact, such moves were, I understand, being considered by the Labor Government in 1979, and it has taken three years for the proposals to reach fruition. Admittedly, the necessity for such a move has become greater due to the great hikes in interest rates which have occurred in the past 12 months or so and which, despite the optimism of the Hon. Mr Davis, show little sign of falling. All the finance people with whom I have spoken do not expect interest rates to fall, other than trivially, for quite some time to come.

One point which needs noting is that borrowing for many of the smaller semi-government authorities will now be undertaken by SAGFA on their behalf. This will have numerous advantages, as indicated in the Minister's second reading explanation. It will mean that borrowings by SAGFA will come under Loan Council control. To that extent the freedom in borrowing power, which had previously lain under the State sphere, will be lost and there will be further control by Canberra on the borrowing undertaken by State semi-government authorities.

However, I gather, from looking at *Hansard*, that the total amount which SAGFA will be able to borrow on behalf of smaller semi-government authorities will be equal to 1 500 000 times the number of such statutory authorities. So, agreement has already been reached, which means that the total borrowings on existing agreements made at Loan Council meetings will not in any way be reduced as a result of the creation of SAGFA. Figures show that in the current financial year of 1982-83, the larger State semi-government authorities will be borrowing about $30 500 000. This excludes the Electricity Trust, which now has its own borrowing rights. If one ignores the special $4 500 000 borrowings for the Spencer Gulf Cities Water Supply Special Scheme, this leaves close to $30 000 000. The small semi-government authorities would total $20 000 000, making a total of about $46 000 000 in borrowings for the new SAGFA.

Certainly, the Opposition supports this proposal in principle, as it will undoubtedly reduce the cost of borrowings by statutory authorities and will have the added advantage of developing secondary markets and trading in semi-government securities, in the same way as now happens with ETSA. These two aspects of the proposal relate to Labor Party proposals for a South Australian Enterprise Fund, which will operate in the commercial sector of the economy under the next Labor Government. This also will enable the public to invest in the future of South Australia. The two proposals, the South Australian Enterprise Fund (in the commercial sector) and the marketable securities in SAGFA (in the Government sector), obviously go together and are part and parcel of the same sound approach to the development of South Australia.

The Bill before us gives great power to the Treasurer. Under clause 16, the Treasurer will be able to direct that the surplus funds of any semi-government authority are to be deposited with SAGFA. Admittedly, there must be consultation with the semi-government authority and the Minister concerned, but the Treasurer has the final say. I note that the Government has this afternoon circulated an amendment to this clause which will alter the powers of the Treasurer in this regard. I hope that the Minister will allow time for the Opposition to consider the amendment very carefully as there are obvious ramifications flowing from it. The Opposition would certainly wish for sufficient time to examine this proposed amendment and work out its full implications.

Clause 18 indicates that SAGFA will also be able to rearrange the finances of any statutory authority in this State. This is no doubt a desirable measure, but the Opposition hopes that adequate consultation will occur before any such rearrangement is carried out and that the full implications of it are examined all the way down the line. In particular, one would want to know whether the State Transport Authority and authorities such as Samcor and the Housing Trust have been adequately consulted in this regard. Obviously, finance for the Housing Trust is a very ticklish business at the moment, as was indicated in the Ministerial statement this afternoon. Unfortunately, I have not been able to evaluate the full implications as there were no copies available for the Opposition to examine. It is obvious that there are several important statutory authorities in this State which could be affected by this clause and one hopes that there will be full consultation with these authorities before any of them are proclaimed to be semi-government authorities under the legislation.

The Treasurer did indicate that consultations had occurred, but he did not say what was the result: whether the statutory authority concerned was happy with the proposals or whether, in fact, the Government was steamrolling over the wishes of some semi-government authorities. Parliament has a right to know what is the attitude of bodies such as Samcor, the Housing Trust and the State Transport Authority on this Bill.

I understand that there are other matters in the Bill which are of concern to members of this Council, in particular, which bodies are to be covered and whether the definition of a 'semi-government authority' could sweep in authorities which it would be undesirable to cover by this legislation. I will not say more on that now but, certainly, if there is any doubt as to the coverage of the legislation or any amendments which may be moved on this matter, we would certainly seriously consider the matter in the interests of the statutory authorities which exist often for the benefit of this State and also in the interests of the smooth and efficient running of SAGFA, whose existence we welcome.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I was a bit surprised by the opening remarks of the Hon. Anne Levy, who said that the Liberal Government does not like the idea of establishing statutory authorities. That is not quite true, although the honourable member would admit that the period since 1979 could be described as the glorious years of the statutory authorities when a large number were established. I do not think the Liberal philosophy has ever opposed the establishment of statutory authorities: what we have argued is that there should be a better reporting method on their operations.

The next step, once such an authority is established, is to determine whether it should or should not continue, whether it should be wound up or wound down altogether. It is such points that we have argued in regard to statutory authorities. I support much of what the honourable member said about the Bill, which establishes a corporation to be known as the South Australian Government Financing Authority. In principle, that should be supported by all members of the Council. However, there are one or two points in the Bill which concern me, and the amendment which is on file does indicate that the Government has suddenly become a little concerned with some of the measures in the Bill. First, I refer to clause 4, which defines 'semi-government authority', and that definition does not include a 'council' as defined in the Local Government Act.

That means that any semi-government authority other than a council is totally covered by all the provisions of the Bill. Clause 16 deals with the power of semi-government authorities as referred to by the Hon. Anne Levy. It refers to the power of a semi-government authority to borrow moneys from, or deposit money with, the authority. Clause 16 (1) *(b)* provides that, if the Treasurer so directs, the semi-

government authority shall deposit with or lend to the authority any money of the semi-government authority that is not immediately required for the purposes of the semi-government authority.

This appears to give the Treasurer a power over the surplus funds of all semi-government authorities with the exception of local government authorities, which are excluded in clause 4. I accept the fact that, where the Government provides all the funds to a semi-government authority, it should have the power to ask for deposits from that semi-government authority to the new Government Financing Authority, but I am doubtful whether the Treasurer should have power to direct deposits from all semi-government authorities. If the Bill excludes local government, then there are other authorities that should also be excluded in clause 4.

We have already passed the Public Finance Act Amendment Bill, to which an amendment was moved in relation to the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia, and those two immediately come to mind in respect of this Bill. I also indicate that the Public Trustee is one that should be considered, and possibly the Registrar of the Supreme Court if, in fact, he is a semi-government authority, but I am not sure about that point.

Nevertheless, I am concerned that the Bill, as it is presently drafted, covers semi-government authorities in regard to clause 16, and the Treasurer has the power to direct that semi-government authorities lodge money with the new financing authority. The organisations to which I have referred have a relationship with the public and carry out functions on behalf of the public. Therefore, I think it is unnecessary that the Treasurer have power to direct that deposits from these organisations go to the new financing authority.

There may be some other semi-government authorities that fall into the same category. I considered whether ETSA should be included, and I have also considered S.G.I.C. The four I have mentioned, the Savings Bank, the State Bank, the Public Trustee and the Registrar of the Supreme Court should be excluded in clause 4 along with local government. I believe that a reasonable suggestion should be made to the Council about clause 16, that is, to allow the Treasurer, by regulation, to use his power to insist upon deposits from other semi-government authorities. This would give Parliament the right to examine any semi-government authority that it believed should make a deposit with the authority.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: The amendments on file go further than that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. It is difficult when one looks at the Bill and finds an amendment on file which should be discussed in Committee. What the Attorney says is completely true: the Government's amendment on file goes further than that. I believe there is a case where the Treasurer should have an ability to ask a semi-government authority with surplus funds to lodge those funds with the new lending authority.

The amendment before the Council goes exactly in the opposite direction to the Bill. The correct position is a half-way house on this matter. Perhaps we can argue that, but I believe that the Bill gives the Treasurer too wide a power over semi-government authorities which actually serve the public in a way that the Treasurer should not interfere with.

Secondly, I believe that there are some semi-government authorities which the Treasurer should be able to ask for deposits, particularly where the Treasurer himself provides all the funds for the authority. In that case there may be an argument that can be advanced to say that some money should come back in three months or in six months to the lending authority.

This is an important question that should be considered by the Council. I refer to clause 18, which gives the Treasurer power to rearrange the finances of semi-government authorities. When the rearrangement has been made, the Treasurer may publish in the *Government Gazette* the rearrangement of the finances with the terms and conditions specified in the determination. Will any new determination be on exactly the same terms and conditions with the same interest rate that applied to a loan prior to rearrangement by the Treasurer? As I understand this clause, the Treasurer could take over the loan commitment of a semi-government authority under the South Australian Government Financing Authority. I believe that this clause allows the Treasurer to alter the interest rate arranged by a semi-government authority. I do not believe that that power should be available to the Treasurer. I ask the Attorney to look at this question and advise me whether I am correct. Clause 18 (1) *(c)* provides:

> Where the semi-government authority has received moneys from the Treasurer or the Government of the State by way of a grant for capital purposes, the Treasurer may determine that all or a specified part of the moneys shall be regarded for all purposes as having been provided to the semi-government authority by the authority upon terms and conditions specified in the determination.

I believe that means that, where a semi-government authority has been given a grant for a particular capital project, the Government Financing Authority, once it takes over, can look at that grant, which could have been made some time previously, and say that it is now a loan. A determination could then be made in relation to that loan. I think it is unlikely that a Treasurer would ever do that, but I point out that that possibility exists.

A semi-government authority could be in some difficulty or at loggerheads with a particular Government and could find that a grant given to it to perform a certain function was suddenly not a grant but part of a loan from the new South Australian Government Financing Authority. By and large, the Bill must be supported in principle, because it is a good principle. I do not think that anyone will oppose the Bill, but certain questions must be considered in Committee. I support the Bill.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 15 September. Page 1068.)

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Opposition supports this Bill, which corrects some deficiencies pertaining to the inspection of buses used for public hire. In May 1980 a very tragic disaster occurred at Hay in New South Wales. It was found that the bus involved in that accident was mechanically unsound. The bus had a current certificate of roadworthiness, but it had been obtained some time prior to the accident. On studying the legislation, it was found that there was no statutory obligation for a bus operator to keep his bus in a roadworthy condition between periodic inspections. That is very surprising.

The Road Traffic Act has been before Parliament on many occasions. All honourable members must share the collective blame for this large oversight, which should have been obvious to us all. The Government established the Bus Inspection Committee, which conducted an inquiry and brought down the following recommendation:

> That existing inspection procedures for buses be replaced by a compulsory passenger bus maintenance programme consisting of:
> *(a)* A mandatory maintenance schedule with the requirement to maintain specific records.

(b) Annual inspection of buses by Central Inspection Authority (C.I.A.) or by authorities delegated by C.I.A.
(c) Random inspection of maintenance records by C.I.A.
(d) Random inspection of buses as considered necessary.

No-one can argue with that, because it is an eminently sensible recommendation. The Government is to be commended for introducing this legislation, which gives effect to the recommendations of that committee. As I have said, it is rather silly to have a bus inspection system that requires buses to be roadworthy only at the time of inspection. That system is certainly not in the best interest of bus passengers in this State.

It has also been alleged that fleet owners employ mechanics to make a bus roadworthy for an inspection and then, after the inspection, put back the old parts while making the next bus ready for inspection. Therefore, the buses are technically roadworthy and within the law on the day of inspection. I have no idea how widespread that practice is, but from time to time we hear some horror tales in relation to that practice. Obviously, a random inspection of buses is necessary. I refer to the provision that imposes a statutory obligation on the owner and driver of a bus to have it in a roadworthy condition at all times.

I had some doubts about this provision when I first saw it. I underlined it in the Attorney's second reading speech as something to consider. A bus driver coming to work at 7 o'clock in the morning does not have the facilities (nor, I would argue, the expertise) to know whether or not a bus is of a roadworthy standard. He has neither the time nor the expertise, for example, to dismantle the brakes, to know what is necessary to test the hydraulics, or to do things of that nature. Therefore, it seems particularly harsh to say to the driver that the obligation is on him as well as on the owner to ensure that a vehicle is up to standard. That is obviously totally impracticable.

However, the Transport Workers Union and the M.T.O.A., the two unions primarily concerned with this area, have agreed to that, provided that the obligation on the driver goes only as far as a reasonable visual inspection. Obviously, if a vehicle has bald tyres showing canvass, it is not unreasonable to say that a driver has an obligation, for the safety of the passengers, other road users and himself, not to take that bus on the road with passengers in it.

It is all right if the obligation stops there. However, if it was subsequently found that a bus had a chassis that was rusted through, or that good parts had been taken out of a bus and replaced with other parts after it had been inspected, that would be something of which the driver had no knowledge, and the Opposition would strongly object (as would the unions) to any obligation on the driver going that far. However, the unions are convinced at this stage that the Government does not intend that; that, in effect, some part of the law says that that would be completely unreasonable; and that only a reasonable obligation is being imposed on the driver. Therefore, the Opposition supports the legislation.

The Opposition holds itself to blame, to some degree, for this massive oversight of not having a statutory obligation on people to keep buses in order so that they meet inspection standards. We hope that accidents like the tragic one which occurred a couple of years ago at Hay, in New South Wales, and which involved a South Australian bus, will no longer occur. This is one other measure in this Government's quite good record in attempting to do something about the road toll, and the Opposition generously compliments it on this programme.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I thank the Hon. Frank Blevins for his indication of support for this Bill. I do not think that anyone could be blamed for the deficiency in the present legislation. I am sure that we will from time to time find others in practice in this legislation and in other pieces of legislation. The important thing is that action is taken to remedy this deficiency, and that is what is occurring in this instance. I hope that this Bill will now have a speedy passage.

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

JUDICIAL REMUNERATION BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for payment of allowances, in addition to salary, to judges and masters. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes the appropriate amendment to achieve that end to the Supreme Court Act. Clauses 4 and 5 make corresponding amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and the Local and District Criminal Courts Act.

The Hon B. A. CHATTERTON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 6 October at 2.15 p.m.