

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 15 March 1983

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

DEATH OF Mr J.W.H. COUMBE

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council express its deep regret at the death of Mr J.W.H. Coumbe, former Minister of the Crown and member of the House of Assembly, 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.

Mr J.W.H. Coumbe was born at West Croydon on 28 September 1916 and died in Adelaide during the last Parliamentary recess on 9 February 1983. He was a member of the House of Assembly and represented the District of Torrens from 3 March 1956 to 16 September 1977, a period of 21 years. During his Parliamentary career Mr Coumbe was Minister of Works, Marine, and Labour and Industry from 17 April 1968 to 2 March 1970. He was Minister of Education in the same Government from 3 March 1970 until 1 June 1970.

In Opposition he was the Deputy Leader of the Opposition from 19 March 1973 until 24 July 1975. He was a member of the Public Works Committee from 25 June 1958 until 16 April 1968, and from 7 August 1975 until 30 November 1977. Also, he was a member of the Industries Development Committee from 2 July 1970 until 2 May 1973. Mr Coumbe was made a member of the Order of Australia (A.M.) on 3 June 1978.

The district represented by Mr Coumbe in this Parliament changed several times in the years that John Coumbe sat in the House of Assembly. However, the areas of North Adelaide, Prospect and parts of Walkerville were always areas within John Coumbe's district. For most of my period in Adelaide, when I came here as a student, I was a constituent of John Coumbe. Certainly, there is no question that John Coumbe built up a strong electorate for his Party which indeed it still has today. Also, there is no question that John Coumbe was well regarded in his district. Indeed, he was an electorate man and built up a strong personal following in his seat until he retired from politics.

I had the privilege of an electoral contest with John Coumbe in 1973, and it was then that I came to appreciate the qualities of compassion and integrity which marked John Coumbe's Parliamentary career. These qualities of leadership with dignity won him acclaim beyond his district. He served his Party in senior positions and was a senior Minister in the Hall Government. John Coumbe made a significant contribution to the institution of Parliament as Chairman of a number of Parliamentary committees. I am sure that all members will join with me in extending our sympathies to the family of John Coumbe.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): I second this motion with some regret. The late John Coumbe was a friend to many people in this Parliament, and many other people remember him as a personal friend. As the Attorney-General has indicated, he was a long-serving member of the House of Assembly (21 years) during which time he served this Parliament well. As has been indicated, Mr Coumbe held four portfolios in the Hall Government between 1968 and 1970: Minister of Works; Minister of Marine; Minister of Labour and Industry; and Minister of Education.

There is nobody in this Parliament who would not say this one thing about John Coumbe—he was a man of great

integrity whose service to this community was long and wide ranging. John Coumbe was a Councillor of the City of Prospect from 1948 to 1959, Director of the South Australian Gas Company from 1960 to 1968, and a student, councillor, Vice-President and finally President of the South Australian Institute of Technology. He started there as a student and went on to become chairman of the institution at which he attained some of his academic skills.

John Coumbe was a member of the Northern Community Hospital Board and Chairman of the A.B.C. Advisory Board for South Australia. Further, he served during the war from 1940 to 1943 in the Second A.I.F. He was President of the Royal Association of Justices from 1965 to 1967 and, as the Leader indicated, Director of ETSA since 1978. John Coumbe served well the Party that he represented in the House of Assembly on many committees, and continued to serve in one area until his death. He was married for a second time and had three children from his first marriage. He was a man for whom I had high regard. As a young member of this Parliament, when I first came here, he gave me great support and I am certain that there are many members who would have these same words to say about him, because he was always ready to give advice and information to new members about the way in which the Parliament operated. I certainly appreciated his doing that. I second the motion and am sure that all honourable members will join in expressing regret to his wife and family.

The Hon. K.L. MILNE: I sincerely support what the Attorney-General and the Hon. Mr Cameron have said—it is all true. John Coumbe deserved to have recorded the remarks that have been made about him today. I had cause to be grateful to John Coumbe, who was the local member when I lived in Walkerville. I was connected with local government in Walkerville and he was a great help to me, the council and to local people. He was highly regarded there. I, too, extend my sympathy to his family.

The PRESIDENT: I concur with the remarks of the previous speakers by saying that integrity and compassion were two qualities which were referred to today and which could be closely linked with the character of John Coumbe. I join with all other honourable members in expressing my sympathy to his wife and family and ask members to stand and to carry this motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.25 to 2.40 p.m.]

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:

Re-equipment of Mount Gambier Dry Mill.
Victor Harbor High School Redevelopment—Stage 1.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Pursuant to Statute—

Architects Act, 1939-1981—By-laws—

Seek to Supplant.

Subscriptions.

Industrial and Commercial Training Act, 1981—Regulations—Hairdressers Hours of Attendance.

Rules of Court—Industrial Court—Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1981—Worker's Compensation Rules—Call-over Procedure.
 Legal Practitioners Act, 1981-1982—Rules—Legal Practitioners' Disciplinary Tribunal.
 Listening Devices—Report on Use of, 1980-81 and 1981-82.
 Rules of Court—Local Court, Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1981—Planning—Civil Enforcement.
 Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal—Report and Determination.
 Planning Act, 1982—Rules—Planning Appeal Tribunal—Conference Dispensation.
 Correctional Services Advisory Council—Report, 1982.
 Savings Bank of South Australia Act, 1929-1981—Regulations—Trustee Fees.
 Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Service and Execution of Process Act, 1901-1979—Supreme Court—Service and Execution Costs.
 South Australian Film Corporation—Report, 1981-82.
 Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1982—Regulations—Credit and Rental Duty.
 Rules of Court—Supreme Court—Supreme Court Act, 1935-1982—
 Admission of Practitioners.
 Admission Rules (Amendment).
 Registration of Judgment Costs.
 Commissioner of Police—Report, 1981-82.

By the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

By Command—
 Registrar of Credit Unions—Report, 1981-82.
Pursuant to Statute—
 Registrar of Building Societies—Report, 1981-82.
 Regulations—Prescribed Banks.
 Hairdressers Registration Act, 1939-1981—Regulations.
 Fees—Board Fees.
 Land and Business Agents Act, 1973-1982—Regulations—
 Land and Business Agents.
 Land Brokers.
 Ramsay Trust.
 Licensing Act, 1967-1982—Regulations—*Bona Fide* Travellers.
 Residential Tenancies Act, 1978-1981—Regulations—Ramsay Trust.
 Trade Standards Act, 1979—Regulations—
 Toxic Substances.
 Puller Winches (Amendment).

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. B.A. Chatterton):

By Command—
 South Australian Uranium Enrichment Committee—Report, 1980-81.
Pursuant to Statute—
 Adelaide College of the Arts and Education—Report, 1981.
 River Murray Commission—Report, 1982.
 The University of Adelaide—Report and Legislation, 1981.
 Boating Act, 1974-1980—Regulations—
 Moana Swimming Zone.
 Semaphore Zoning.
 Tumby Bay Zoning.
 Education Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—
 Remuneration for Members of Ministerial Committees.
 Harbors Act, 1936-1981—Regulations—Pilots, Diver Down Flags and Speed Limits.
 Marine Act, 1936-1976—Regulations—
 Examination for Certificates of Competency and Safety Manning Regulations.
 Navigation Pass under Kingston Bridge.
 Meat Hygiene Act, 1980—Regulations—Sale of Slaughterhouse Meat.
 Metropolitan Milk Board—Report, 1982.
 Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956-1978—Regulations—
 Age of Vehicle.
 Fees.
 Appeal Committee.
 Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—
 Vehicle Emission Control.
 Traffic Prohibition—Enfield.
 Advisory Committee on Soil Conservation—Report, 1981-82.

Stony Point (Liquids Project) Ratification Act, 1981—Port Rules.
 Veterinary Surgeons Act, 1935-1975—Regulations—Registration Fee.
 Water Resources Act, 1976-1981—Regulations—Transfer of Licensed Water Allotment.
 Road Traffic Act, 1961-1982—Report on the operation of random breath tests in South Australia.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall):

Pursuant to Statute—
 Board of the Botanic Gardens—Report, 1981-82.
 Aboriginal Lands Trust—Report, 1981-82.
 Alsatian Dogs Act, 1934-1980—Regulations—Exemption for Bookaloo Station.
 Building Act, 1970-1982—Regulations—Fees for Building Approvals.
 Chiropractors Act, 1979—Regulations—Chiropractors Board Election Procedure.
 City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976-1982—General Regulations.
 Coober Pedy (Local Government Extension) Act, 1981—Regulations—Licensing of Hire Vehicles.
 Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1981—Regulations—Prescribed Hospitals.
 Environmental Protection Council—Report, 1981-82.
 Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1981—Regulations—
 Therapeutic Substances. Food Additives. Child Resistant Containers. Poisons. Advertising Drugs.
 Hospitals Act, 1934-1971—Regulations—
 Long-stay Patient Fees.
 Hospital Charges.
 Hospitals Compensable Patients Charges.
 Libraries Act, 1982—Regulations—Conduct on Premises and Institutes.
 Mental Health Act, 1976-1979—Regulations—Mental Health Review Tribunal Summons.
 South Australian Planning Commission—Crown Development Reports on—
 Proposed development at Redwood Park School.
 Proposal to upgrade and extend existing Centenary Building, Penola Primary School.
 Proposed development at Marion High School.
 Proposed acquisition and transfer of land by the Commissioner of Highways (5).
 Proposed acquisition of land, Raglan Avenue, Edwardstown.
 Proposed division of land and erection of 275/132 kV Substation by the Electricity Trust of South Australia.
 Proposed land division of Irrigation Perpetual Lease 61.
 Proposed land acquisition for Golden Grove Road.
 Proposed division of land in Irrigation Perpetual Lease 12.
 Proposed new Police residence at Bordertown.
 Proposed transportable classroom, Stirling North, City of Port Augusta.
 Proposed redevelopment of Pinnaroo Area School.
 Proposed division of land in Irrigation Perpetual Leases 446A and 638.
 Proposed development of the Murray Bridge High School.
 Proposed land acquisition for Diagonal Road.
 Proposed division of land and erection of a 33/11kV Substation and 33 kV Transmission Line by the Electricity Trust of South Australia.
 Proposed construction of a Low Energy Display Home.
 Proposed division of land and erection of a Gas Turbine Generating Plant by the Electricity Trust of South Australia.
 Proposed division of land in Perpetual Lease 8669H.
 Proposed temporary use of motor showroom for Technical Education.
 Proposed erection of classrooms at Direk Primary School.
 Regulations—
 Metropolitan Development Plan District Council of Willunga—Reservation of Land for Acquisition for Education Purposes.
 Development Control—North Haven Marina.
 Racing Act, 1976-1982—Rules of Trotting—
 Fees.
 Definition.
 Flashing Light Start.
 Sires Stake Programme.
 'Studmaster' Definitions.

South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975-1981—
 By-laws—Flinders Medical Centre Parking.
 Regulations—
 Long-Stay Patient Fees.
 Incorporated Hospitals Compensable Patients
 Charges.
 Incorporated Hospital Charges.
 Tea Tree Gully Health Centre.
 South Australian Waste Management Commission Act,
 1979-1980—Regulations—Fees.
 District Council of Kimba—By-law No. 23—Repeal of
 By-laws.
 District Council of Lacedpede—By-law No. 22—Traffic.
 District Council of Loxton—By-law No. 35—Poultry.
 District Council of Mount Barker—
 By-law No. 3—Petrol Pumps.
 By-law No. 4—Proceedings of Council.
 By-law No. 9—Bees.
 By-law No. 10—Cattle and Horses.
 By-law No. 13—Inflammable Undergrowth.
 By-law No. 14—Meetings of Electors.
 By-law No. 16—Tents.
 By-law No. 18—Water Reserves.
 By-law No. 19—Stands and Sales in Streets.
 By-law No. 27—One-Way Streets.
 By-law No. 29—Repeal of By-laws.
 City of Elizabeth—By-law No. 29—Dogs.
 City of Glenelg—By-law No. 1—Bathing and Controlling
 the Foreshore.
 City of Mitcham—By-law No. 34—Traffic.
 City of Port Augusta—By-law No. 39—Licensing and
 Operation of Motor Vehicles, Drivers and Conductors.

services to each individual. For example, the broad grouping of young patients was seen as desirable. Similarly, it was felt that patients suffering similar illnesses could benefit and that services would be more efficient if they were located in the same general area. I am assured that all patients were assessed by an assessment panel under the Acting Medical Officer of the centre before decisions were taken on individual placements.

However, the planning for this major reorganisation within the centre completely ignored the need for consultation with those involved and affected. The authorities at Julia Farr intended to effect the relocation—with all its wide-reaching implications—without properly advising and consulting residents, their relatives or the centre's staff. In a letter dated 2 March the board advised patients, relatives and staff that the total move would take place, but did not specify a date. In fact, a decision had been made to move all the patients involved on 8 March.

Not surprisingly, the news of the decision produced a number of angry complaints from residents, relatives and staff, some of which were made direct to my office. There were aggrieved responses from unions representing some of the staff at Julia Farr. I immediately arranged for senior officers of the Health Commission to go to the centre to meet with representatives of the board, senior staff and union officials. After confirming that the relocation was to be started and completed on 8 March, those officers organised a series of meetings to take place on the weekend of 5 and 6 March to gauge the extent of concern and to give those involved an opportunity to voice their objections.

The most explicit expressions of disapproval came at an open forum on Monday 7 March, when a significant number of residents, relatives and staff indicated that they were deeply concerned about the lack of consultation, the speed with which the moves were to take place and the impact upon individual patients.

At this stage I spoke directly with the President of the board, Mr R. Ringwood, both to express my concern and to obtain an assurance that the whole process would be halted pending full opportunities for consultation. Mr Ringwood gave me an undertaking that Julia Farr would not proceed until proper consultation had, indeed, taken place. He also understood that the board would consult me before making a final decision on whether or not to go ahead with the relocation. That should have been enough to defuse the dispute and ensure that further decisions were made only in the best interests of the patients.

I regret to say that that has not been the case. I am deeply concerned about the continuing failure of the board and some of those in positions of authority at Julia Farr to appreciate the significance of the undertakings given to me. The subsequent actions of the board and some of those persons in authority have not reassured residents, relatives or staff. On the contrary, statements have been made and positions taken which indicate a refusal to acknowledge the advice from me and from Health Commission officers. My apprehension has been heightened by discussions with officials of the Royal Australian Nursing Federation today.

My concern for the patients and for the need to ensure that this proposed relocation is properly considered and evaluated is such that I have decided on these measures: first, an administrator will be sent to Julia Farr immediately to take over the day-to-day management, including the consultative process with regard to the proposed relocation of residents. Secondly, I will recommend to Cabinet a set of detailed guidelines as conditions of State Government subsidy to the Julia Farr Centre for 1983-84. Thirdly, the role and functions of the Julia Farr Centre, including its management and administration, will be referred to the Sax

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: JULIA FARR CENTRE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: A series of events at the Julia Farr Centre, Fullarton, last week compelled me to intervene to ensure that the best interests of the residents were being protected. Unfortunately, there have been further developments which necessitate additional urgent action on my part. I propose to inform the Council about the circumstances which led to this regrettable position and the steps which I intend to take.

Honourable members will be aware that serious deficiencies in the administration and management of the Julia Farr Centre were identified in a cost allocation study completed last year. Following that study, the Board of Management of the Julia Farr Centre agreed to a restructuring of the administration, a process which was to be implemented in consultation with the South Australian Health Commission. The agreed measures included the appointment of a new chief executive officer who is due to begin duties on 11 April 1983. In addition, Health Commission officers operating with my knowledge and approval have been negotiating with the Julia Farr Centre Board of Management to improve accounting methods and to increase the degree of financial control at the centre.

Although these changes were under way and the Health Commission was assisting the board to improve its efficiency, it now emerges that the board has not been able to come to grips with its responsibilities for good management and patient care. I should say at this point that this may be partly due to the lack of a chief executive officer able to effectively advise the board on the implementation of its decisions.

Lack of foresight and a sound management technique is illustrated by the events of the past fortnight. Since early last year the Board of Management has been considering a major relocation of accommodation affecting most of the centre's 600 residents. The rationale behind this proposal was improved patient care and the grouping of residents in a manner designed to provide better nursing and health

Committee of Inquiry into South Australian hospitals for urgent consideration and report.

By way of further explanation, I indicate that we are now exploring the possibility that the appointment of Mr David Coombe as Chief Executive Officer at Julia Farr can be brought forward from 11 April.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: David Combe. Is it the same one?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: David Coombe was formerly the administrator—and a very wellknown administrator in medical circles—of the Modbury Hospital. He is not in any way related to my very good friend and colleague, David Combe, former general secretary of the great Australian Labor Party.

Notwithstanding that arrangement, it is my intention to second a senior officer of the South Australian Health Commission to act as Chief Executive Officer pending the arrival of Mr Coombe. Health Commission officials are now drawing up the guidelines which it is intended should govern the operations of the Board of Management pending receipt of the Sax Inquiry report and recommendations. I will take those guidelines to Cabinet next week.

May I say in closing that I have been forced to take these actions to deal with a situation which is intolerable. Our first concern must be the welfare of the residents of Julia Farr. I deplore the fact that certain actions taken by authoritarian elements within the management structure at Julia Farr have exacerbated the problems. Those elements have been insensitive and obstructive in seeking to press on with the relocation of residents despite the legitimate concerns, not only of many of those affected, but of the Health Commission officers and myself.

It is not my intention that the Government of South Australia should continue to provide millions of dollars to support institutions like Julia Farr without some control over the use of those funds and assurances that such institutions are properly managed and administered. Those who preach the virtue of autonomy within health institutions must recognise that the right and privilege of making decisions does not constitute the right to operate irresponsibly. Autonomy does not mean anarchy. I regret the need for the actions that I have outlined to the Council, but I have no alternative if I am to do my duty to the people of South Australia and, in particular, to those concerned with the Julia Farr Centre.

QUESTIONS

RAMSAY TRUST

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, and also in his capacity as Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, a question about the Ramsay Trust.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Honourable members will be aware of the controversy surrounding the Ramsay Trust. This concept of inflation index-linked debentures for low-cost housing was first raised in South Australia at least four years ago. It is a matter of public record that the Liberal Government rejected that scheme. In the *Advertiser* of 25 October 1982 the then Minister of Housing (Hon. C.M. Hill) was quoted as saying that State Cabinet had rejected the proposal in July 1980 and that the State Treasury and the South Australian Development Corporation had raised significant doubts on whether the A.L.P. housing proposal, styled the Ramsay Trust, would work.

The Liberal Party view has been that, although welfare housing has a high priority, the Ramsay Trust, while a nice idea, simply would not work. Government members will uncomfortably recollect that the Ramsay Trust was the cornerstone of the Labor Party's housing policy. Of the 12 or so pages of that election policy, two pages were devoted to the Ramsay Trust. It was again referred to in the policy speech.

After its election to office, the Labor Party moved quickly to support the Ramsay Trust. Meetings of the Industries Development Committee were called with what some may describe as indecent haste to secure the necessary approval for a Government guarantee. For example, meetings were convened on 24 and 29 December, and on 4 and 7 January. The evidence of the Industries Development Committee invariably remains confidential because applications for State Government guarantees come from the private sector, and sensitive information regarding finance, markets and products should be protected.

As a member of the Industries Development Committee, I respect that well established bi-partisan approach. However, yesterday the Premier issued a press statement about the Ramsay Trust in which, referring to the Liberal Party, he stated, 'Not one word of criticism was uttered about the Trust or the Government's provision of a Treasury Guarantee.' That is not true. I have today written and delivered to the Premier the following letter:

Dear Premier,

In your press release on the Ramsay Trust issued yesterday you inferred there was no criticism of the trust.

You will remember that on 11 January 1983 I wrote to you expressing my concern on the Ramsay Trust following evidence presented to the Industries Development Committee of which I am a member. You will remember also that I did not sign the committee report because, as my report clearly indicated, I firmly believed the trust would not work.

Now this has become a matter of public concern I request your immediate approval to release my report on this matter.

A few minutes ago I received a letter in which the Premier said he would not agree to my reasonable request to release that report.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Why don't you read all his letter?

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The honourable member must know what is in it.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: She must have read it.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I have been told about it.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I am pleased that the honourable member has been told about it. All I can say is that the Premier has refused my reasonable request to release my self-compiled report of about eight pages. My questions are as follows.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: First, given that the Treasury advised the previous Liberal Government against the Ramsay Trust, will the Government advise this Council whether the Treasury and Public Actuary recommended a Government guarantee for the Ramsay Trust, and will the advice from Treasury and the Public Actuary be made public? If not, why not?

Secondly, is the Leader aware of any instance in Australia where a public loan guaranteed by a Federal or State Government has failed, and moneys have been returned, as was the case with the Ramsay Trust? Thirdly, does he agree that the loss of \$100 000 to \$110 000 to taxpayers in advertising and other expenses to raise a paltry \$192 500 from South Australia and Victoria (this is little more than 10 per cent of the minimum amount sought) represents an indictment of the financial management and acumen of the Premier and Treasurer and his Labor Government and underlines the financial naivety of the Treasurer in rejecting the well-

based advice of senior public servants and financial experts from the private sector?

Finally, does not the Hon. Mr Sumner, in his capacity as Minister of Consumer Affairs, agree that the Labor Party misrepresented the Ramsay Trust to South Australian voters when in its housing policy (page 7) the A.L.P. claimed that 'considerable success in raising funds has been achieved in the United Kingdom and New Zealand through the sale of bonds of a similar type . . . ' when, in fact, income on such bonds issued in the United Kingdom and New Zealand is tax free and because they carry also a 2 per cent to 3 per cent coupon, unlike the Ramsay debentures whose income is neither tax free nor supplemented by a 2 per cent or 3 per cent coupon?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Many issues were raised by the honourable member in the context of the Ramsay Trust. Initially, he referred to controversy surrounding the matter. Really, the issue should be placed in perspective. It was an attempt by a private trust—that should be clearly put.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: It was an election promise of yours.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It was—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: You're trying to blame other people.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not trying to blame anyone else. It was supported by several prominent South Australian businessmen, including Mr Hayes, Mr Wagstaff, and a member of the Housing Trust and prominent academic, Mr Stretton. It was supported, and I believe that it had laudable motives in seeking to provide some recognition of the work that Mr Alex Ramsay did as the General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust over many years. Indeed, Mr Ramsay's widow supported it and made some contribution to the establishment of the trust. The trust was devised some time ago, certainly prior to the last election. Indeed, I understand that the issue was referred to the then Minister of Local Government, or Minister of Housing (Hon. C.M. Hill), who took up the matter with his Government colleagues on a number of occasions. I understand that he was quite favourably disposed to the proposition but that he did not receive any support for the proposition from his Cabinet colleagues. Nevertheless, it is true that the Hon. Mr Hill viewed the proposition with some favour and support and took it up with the previous Government. This private trust sought a Government guarantee to go out into the market place with indexed bonds. As the Hon. Mr Davis said, this method of raising finance has worked to some extent in the United Kingdom and other countries—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: But with some big differences.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Perhaps in different circumstances. Perhaps, too, the Hon. Mr Davis should have approached the Federal Government before the last election to see whether it would be willing to provide similar taxation relief as apparently applies in some other countries.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: You are talking about your policy.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not resile from the policy. The Hon. Mr Davis can read it, I can read it and all honourable members can read it. Indeed, the whole community can read it. I am pointing out that the initiative for this came about as a private venture; it was a private trust. I emphasise that it sought from the Government a guarantee, which was given on the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee but which apparently was not supported by the Hon. Mr Davis. He made that quite clear. Apparently, however, it was supported by Mr Ashenden, a Liberal member on that committee. He may have had some reservations; I do not know.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have no information on that. It is sufficient to say that the Hon. Mr Davis's conscience is clear—he has nothing to worry about. Apparently, he said that it would not work, and he refused to support the guarantee. Nevertheless, the guarantee was given, and that is the extent of the Government's involvement with the trust. Certainly, at some future time the scheme may be successful. It was an unfortunate coincidence of events that occurred when the prospectus was placed before the public, occurring as it did at the time of the announcement of the Federal election.

Everyone, even the Hon. Mr Davis, knows that that causes a degree of uncertainty in the financial community and in share markets, and the like, around the country. I do not think one can say absolutely that the scheme is finished. The trust will continue to exist, and in the future there may be an opportune market in which to attempt to raise funds.

In principle, I think that people (and I would have thought members of this Council) would have sympathy with the sorts of objectives of the Ramsay Trust. The Government was asked to provide a guarantee, and it has provided that guarantee.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Did you put money into it?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Davis has asked his question, and I ask him to cease interjecting.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: However, the money subscribed was not sufficient to bring the guarantee into operation, so for the time being the matter will not proceed. The Hon. Mr Davis has raised the question whether his minority report should be made public. The Premier replied to him about that matter in the following terms:

I acknowledge your letter of 15 March and your request that I approve the release of your report concerning the Ramsay Trust.

As you would be aware, particularly because of the commercial nature of its decisions, the proper functioning of the Industries Development Committee relies on its proceedings being strictly confidential. If companies applying for assistance, or persons wishing to give evidence to the committee, thought that their views may in some way become public through the publication from individual members of separate reports, then the committee would be unable to function effectively.

Consequently, I cannot agree to your request to release your report and in doing so I would remind you that all the deliberations of the committee are strictly confidential. I would have thought that the argument advanced in that letter was fairly persuasive in this delicate area of providing assistance to commercial enterprises in this State. I do not know why the Hon. Mr Davis wants permission to release his report. The honourable member is on record as having opposed it and can bask in that glory if it gives him any satisfaction.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It gives me no satisfaction.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am glad to hear that.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: I cannot understand why, as someone who advocates freedom of information, you run away from it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If honourable members want to get into a discourse on freedom of information, I shall be pleased to oblige them. Prior to the election a working party had almost completed its report on freedom of—

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: How many questions are you answering?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will answer as many questions as members opposite wish to ask. If the honourable member likes, I can keep going all afternoon about freedom of information. In three years of Liberal Government nothing was done in this area. As honourable members would have seen, I recently announced in the press that that working party has been revived and that we will move towards legislation granting freedom of information. Surely the Hon.

Mr Davis realises the commercial and very confidential nature of material placed before the Industries Development Committee. Suffice to say that his position is on record, and I would have thought that the honourable member would be content with that. I think that I have covered the issues raised by the honourable member. However, should honourable members wish to ask any other questions about this matter, I will be only too happy to answer them.

OMBUDSMAN

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Ombudsman.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: There has been considerable speculation about the future of the Ombudsman which has been highlighted by recent media reports that have created considerable concern in the community. Many people place great faith in the Ombudsman's ability to solve important and often personal problems, and it is important that confidence in his position is not undermined.

The Ombudsman is appointed for a five-year term and both he and the Government should expect continuity of that appointment for at least that period. Certainly, there should be no covert effort to entice any person holding such important office to leave it. The Ombudsman should be free of pressures from the Government for the duration of his term unless Parliament decides that, in the best interests of the State and the people, the position would be better served by a new office holder. Everybody knows that if such a situation arises a solution can be brought about only by an address to both Houses of this Parliament. We all recognise that the Ombudsman does not always make life easy for an incumbent Government, and I have no doubt that Ministers in the previous Government did, and Ministers in the present Government will, wish him elsewhere on many occasions.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: No, he does a great job.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I am pleased to hear the Attorney-General say that. It is important that this position remain independent. The Ombudsman certainly has an important role to play, and any effort to replace an Ombudsman during his term should be done overtly and be subject to full public scrutiny.

Have any discussions taken place between the Government and the Ombudsman about the Ombudsman's either resigning or accepting another position in lieu of his present one? If so, what is the position involved and when does the Government intend to change the Ombudsman?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have not been party to any discussion with the Ombudsman. I assure members of this Council of that. It could be that the Premier has had such discussions, as he is responsible for the Ombudsman Act. It is quite probable (although I have no direct information on this) that he has had such discussions. I do not have any information about the position of the Ombudsman. However, I should have thought that all honourable members would concede that if the Ombudsman personally wanted to move to another position there could not be any criticism of him in that respect if that desire was acceptable to the Government. So, although I agree with what the Hon. Mr Cameron has said about the Ombudsman's office (although it does seem a little strange coming from him, of course, or from the Hon. Mr Griffin, who was criticised in the previous Ombudsman's Report)—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What about Mr Goldsworthy?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Also, Mr Goldsworthy in the other place apparently tried, at one stage, to heavy the

Ombudsman into doing something that he did not want to do.

Let us get the Ombudsman's position clear. The situation is that, over a period of two or three years (in fact, I think it goes back before that), the Ombudsman requested that amendments be made to his Act relating to the way in which the Ombudsman deals with complaints about administrative actions taken within Government departments. The Liberal Government, year after year, resisted the Ombudsman's recommendations regarding this matter. Those recommendations were that the Ombudsman should not have to give notice to a department before he commenced an inquiry. The Ombudsman felt that he could not carry out his duties unless there was some adjustment to that provision in the Act. The Hon. Mr Griffin somehow ended up with the task. I must confess that I do not know what happened in the previous Government, but the poor Attorney-General seemed to do everything. I do not know whether the former Premier was incapable of making decisions, but most of the matters that one should have thought would be dealt with by him ended up with the Attorney-General. That occurred with matters relating to the Ombudsman, despite the fact that the Ombudsman Act had been committed to the former Premier.

The then Attorney-General resisted the call from the Ombudsman. He was not going to have a bar of it! The Attorney-General and the Government were rightly criticised year after year by the Ombudsman. Last year I gave an undertaking that if a Labor Government was elected the Ombudsman Act would be amended, and the Government intends to introduce amendments to solve the problems which the Ombudsman has seen over the past few years and which arose in his dealings with the previous Government and the Hon. Mr Griffin.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not regret that. It is a policy commitment which we made last year and which I made when a very critical Ombudsman's Report was tabled on the day that the election was announced. That report was critical of the way in which Ministers had misconceived the role and duty of the Ombudsman. I do not think that the previous Government has anything to be particularly proud about in its relationship with the Ombudsman or, indeed, in its attitude to the Ombudsman Act.

We have said that amendments will be made to the clause relating to the sort of notice that has to be given by the Ombudsman before an inquiry can be carried out. I am not in a position to specifically answer the honourable member's question, but I will certainly give him the information of which I am aware.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin interjecting:

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: There may have been discussions (and I suspect that there have been) between the Ombudsman and the Premier. I do not know what the position is in relation to the present Ombudsman's future. However, if the Ombudsman wished to move to another area of Government activity I would not have thought that members opposite would complain.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I desire to ask a supplementary question. The Attorney's answer to my question has probably created more disquiet than was the case before I asked it. The Attorney-General has said that he does not know what is going on in the Government. It is clear that he is not privy to some of the discussions that I would consider to be vital to his portfolio. Will the Attorney-General take the question that I have asked—which he failed to answer—to the Premier and bring back a reply? This is an important matter which affects every person in this State, because many people in this State rely on the Ombudsman. The Attorney-General said that it would be

quite right for the Ombudsman to approach the Government, but I do not agree with that. I think that, if a person takes on the position of Ombudsman for five years, he should stick with it for that period. Certainly, pressure can be applied which we would not know about; it could be done covertly and it would create great disquiet in this community.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will certainly obtain the information for the honourable member. When I began my reply to the Leader's previous question I indicated that I have not had any discussions with the Ombudsman. I do not know personally whether the Premier has had discussions with the Ombudsman, but I will certainly ascertain whether there have been any discussions. I would have expected that there had been discussions, as I indicated in my previous reply.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Why?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Because the Ombudsman Act is administered by the Premier.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: The Ombudsman is an independent person.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: He is, and I imagine that he discussed a number of things with the previous Government. I am sure that the Hon. Mr Griffin would not deny that. I understand that most of those discussions were fairly heated; they were not amicable, and that is certainly apparent in the reports. I will ascertain from the Premier whether anything further can be added, and I will bring down a reply.

RAMSAY TRUST

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, a question about the Ramsay Trust.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I was hoping that, after hearing the Attorney's reply to a question from the Hon. Mr Cameron, my question would not be necessary. Last week I was present, with representatives of the Labor and Liberal Parties, at a meeting to discuss housing in the Salisbury area. I heard some distressing revelations about the real housing situation in South Australia. I believe that we all ought to be applying ourselves more directly to the end result rather than debating who is at fault and the history of the games played in the various point-scoring exercises. I was not satisfied with the Attorney-General's reply when he indicated that the Government has applied itself seriously to a valuable and worthwhile effort to meet some of the need. It is a matter of great regret to the Democrats that the Ramsay Trust has faltered at the first step of what promised to be a durable and effective instrument in providing housing for those who otherwise would not be able to afford it. The funds to be deposited would not earn interest as such but would appreciate by an amount equal to inflation so that the depositor would be assured of holding the value of his deposit over the deposit period, either five or 10 years.

This form of deposit has attractions for individuals and institutions in certain circumstances, and this was recognised in an article which appeared in the *Financial Review* and by other financial commentators, including Mr Bond on the A.B.C. We believe that there are many people who have funds salted away and who could be attracted to the Ramsay Trust because of its worthy intent. They would appreciate depositing funds, which would be guaranteed not to depreciate, in such a worthy cause as the provision of housing for people who otherwise would have no opportunity of ever owning their own homes.

Because we believe that the Ramsay Trust has not had an adequate opportunity to put its appeal before the public, due to unforeseen and overwhelming competitive events

(which the Attorney-General mentioned), such as drought, fire, flood and the Federal election, does the Government intend to take steps to enable the Ramsay Trust to extend the time in which it is to receive its initial capital investment requirement? What are the conditions of the Government guarantee to the Ramsay Trust? Is the Government considering altering these guarantee conditions to enable the Ramsay Trust to become established?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In my earlier answer I said that the fact that only a small amount has been subscribed to the Ramsay Trust does not mean that it will be abolished. It will remain. It may be opportune to proceed at some stage in the future. I cannot specifically answer the honourable member's question, but I will certainly obtain some information from the Treasurer. I understand that the terms of the guarantee were that the debenture issue had to raise more than \$1 500 000 before the guarantee became operative. If it does not raise that much, the guarantee is not operative and, accordingly (as has happened), the money that has been subscribed is to be returned. I do not know, but there may be some scope to look at that guarantee, which was entered into following discussions within the Government and within the Industries Development Committee. In view of the honourable member's concern, I will ascertain whether the Government can do anything in this immediate period. The trust will certainly remain as an enterprise and, if it is appropriate at some future stage, the trust will be ready to use the opportunity to enter the market in relation to capital indexed debentures.

BUSH FIRES

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I direct a question to the Attorney-General. What amounts have been paid out of State revenue in consequence of the recent bush fires and to what specific purposes have they been applied? What further amounts are expected to be paid out of State revenue this financial year in consequence of the recent bush fires, and to what specific purposes is it expected they will be applied?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not have the figures, but I will obtain that information for the honourable member and bring back a reply.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Knowing the degree of concern felt by the Minister of Agriculture about the dramatic effect of bush fires, frost, drought and floods on South Australian primary producers, I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he will inform the Council of the action being taken by the Government to assist farmers who have been affected by the disastrous chain of events?

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: He has the answer, too.

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON: I do have the answer. A number of assistance measures are available to primary producers in this State who have been affected by those natural disasters. I believe that those measures have been well publicised and were recently summarised in a publication, called *State of Agriculture*, that is put out by the Department of Agriculture. I do not intend to go through all of those measures; however, I would like to point out that in some areas we still have to negotiate with the Commonwealth for additional assistance for primary producers.

One of the major areas of concern is the replacement of structures on farms that have been burnt out, and we are trying to obtain Commonwealth assistance in that area, because the carry-on loans that are provided do not cover

adequately the replacement of structures such as shearing sheds, hay sheds, and other major capital items. Another matter of great concern is State forests, in which there has been devastation (particularly in the South-East) that is unequalled in the history of forestry in this State.

We are also seeking from the Commonwealth \$30 000 000 in assistance to undertake salvage operations in those forest areas to try to store logs that can be used by the saw mills in the next few years. We hope that we will be able to obtain assistance for that salvage operation. In addition, we are looking for loans to help with the re-establishment of the forests, because that will be an expensive exercise. We are looking for those additional measures to assist the bush-fire victims.

Some assistance has already been provided in regard to the frosts that affected primary producers, particularly in the Riverland last year; that programme has now been completed in terms of dealing with claims and processing applications. While I do not have the figures here, I believe that about \$750 000 has been provided in carry-on loans to primary producers who were affected by frost. We have provided carry-on loans for farmers in the drought affected area, and 1 091 applications have been received in that regard, of which, to date, 842 have been processed, involving a total approval of \$13 500 000.

Small business men who were affected by drought are eligible on this occasion; a tremendous number of applications were put before the previous Government, 28 of which have been approved, involving \$770 000. We also administer, on behalf of the Commonwealth, the fodder subsidy—50 per cent of the cost of fodder. I understand that 1 781 applications have been received, amounting to just over \$2 000 000. There is a freight rebate of 75 per cent: 1 918 applications have been received in that regard, amounting to \$870 000. To date we have received only 15 applications for carry-on loans from people affected by bush fires, none of which have yet been processed or approved; nor have we received applications from those affected by the floods in the Barossa Valley. That is a brief summary of assistance in those areas.

DRIVING WITH BARE FEET

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about driving with bare feet.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Other honourable members might have noticed, as I noticed, an item in the *Advertiser* of 27 January in the advice column *What's your problem?*, in reply to a query regarding driving a motor vehicle with bare feet. The advice given was that driving with bare feet is legal but unsafe. I realise that safety, obviously, is very important when one is driving a vehicle, but I know many people who prefer to drive a vehicle with bare feet rather than wearing thongs. They believe that it is much safer and that they have much more control over the pedals if they kick off their thongs. I am sure that I am not the only person who comes into that category, and I know that many people believe that driving with bare feet is preferable to driving while wearing thongs.

Will the Minister, representing the Minister of Transport, outline advice from the road safety experts on this matter? The Opposition need not feel that this question is a Dorothy Dixer: I previously asked the Minister of Transport to provide this information so that the Minister of Agriculture, who represents him, would be able to give a reply without the customary waiting period.

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON: The Minister of Transport, in fact, examined this matter and, as the honourable member states, it is not a question of legislation or regulations under the Road Traffic Act but it is a question for the road safety authorities. It is recommended that people should not have bare feet when driving: in fact, they should wear shoes. However, the authorities agree that some forms of footwear are even more hazardous than bare feet. Thongs and gum boots are mentioned.

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: And high heeled shoes?

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON: Yes. So, it is a matter of degree as far as the safety authorities are concerned, and they say that reasonable shoes are the best footwear, then bare feet, followed by other forms of footwear.

CENTRAL LINEN SERVICE

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question concerning the Central Linen Service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: On 6 January 1983 I issued a press release concerning a report of a consultant to the previous Government about the future of the Central Linen Service. That report listed five possible options for the future of that service. In the press release I said:

The preferred option is for re-equipment of the Central Linen Service at a cost of \$3 000 000 and reduction of the work force from 300 to 186 by mid 1985.

Among other things, an article (referring to the Minister, in responding to the press release) in the *Advertiser* of 7 January 1983 said:

He believed the 'most sensible option' proposed by Touche Ross was improving the laundry over the next two to three years, coupled with reduced staff through natural attrition.

He did not believe the Government should dispose of the laundry.

He expected the recommendation to come before the Cabinet again early in February.

Has a decision been made as to what action will be taken on the report and, if so, what is the decision? Which of the options in the report will be chosen? Has it been decided to depart from the option chosen in any way and, if so, how? If no decision has been taken, why not? When can a decision be expected?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: My original Cabinet submission is still with Treasury. I expected this question to be asked today and made inquiries late last week as to when this matter was likely to go back to Cabinet. It is my understanding that it will be back next Monday. I understand that Treasury will probably be recommending a variation of the recommendation in the sense that, I think, \$3 000 000 was suggested over a period of two years, in terms of capital investment for upgrading. I believe that the recommendation is likely to be that the money be spent over a somewhat longer period, as the Labor Party has a commitment of no retrenchments and there is a balance to be struck between the rate at which the equipment is replaced and the rate of attrition, or the rate at which employees might have to be artificially kept on the pay-roll.

As soon as a decision is made to finalise the programme I intend to talk to the employees at the Central Linen Service. Certainly, it is the Government's intention that the laundry be retained as a Government instrumentality. It is also our intention that the laundry be substantially upgraded, as it has been badly run down over the past two or three years. It is necessary that money be spent on it. I shall explain all of this to the employees, and the Government will be taking the employees totally into our confidence. It is absolutely essential, as the report says, that whatever

action is taken at the Group Laundry and Central Linen Service be explained to the employees so that there is industrial harmony. If the honourable member had been watching closely he would be aware that in the first four months of my stewardship I have paid special and particular attention to industrial relations in the health field.

RURAL REDEVELOPMENT FUNDING

The Hon. C.W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question concerning rural redevelopment funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.W. CREEDON: During the recent Federal election campaign the present Labor Government indicated that it would assist rural redevelopment funding. I believe that one of its aims was to help in the control of natural disasters such as soil erosion. The Minister is aware of the problem caused by soil erosion in South Australia and, as the State Department of Agriculture will handle the administering of such a scheme, is he in a position to inform the Council whether or not his department has any knowledge of the intention of the new Federal Labor Government? If such a scheme is to come into operation—

The PRESIDENT: I point out to the politician who has just walked into the Chamber, as he may not know the rules of the Chamber, that there is seating provided in the Gallery.

The Hon. C.W. CREEDON: Is the Minister in a position to inform the Council whether or not his department has any knowledge of the intention of the new Federal Labor Government? If such a scheme is to come into operation, when can the State expect it to commence? How much money is to be allocated and under what conditions is this money to be distributed?

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON: During the recent Federal election campaign the Federal Labor Party gave a commitment to soil conservation, but I do not have any details as to what money will be provided. This is one of the matters we will be taking up at Federal level. Officers of the Department of Agriculture are preparing plans on what could be done for soil conservation in this State. As soon as I have the detailed information I will bring back a reply.

AUSTRALIAN CHILDREN'S TELEVISION FOUNDATION

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I ask two questions of the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of the Arts. Since the present Government came to office, has any reduction in funding been made to the previous Government's 1982-83 allocation for the Australian Children's Television Foundation? If so, what is the extent of such a reduction?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will obtain that information and bring back a reply.

RAMSAY TRUST

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, a question about the Ramsay Trust.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The success of any investment fund generally depends on the attitudes of the major institutions that possess significant funds to invest. If they deem it a sound financial investment, then it will have a good chance of success. Any Government that has any financial or economic management expertise ought to be aware of that. Therefore, prior to the decision to proceed with the Ramsay Trust, did the Government, first, contact major institutional investors about the possibility of their investing funds in the Ramsay Trust and, secondly, if, they were contacted and, as it appears, they refused, is it true that the reason for their refusal was that such an investment was not a prudent use of investment funds?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not have the details here to answer that question. I will attempt to obtain the information for the honourable member and bring back a reply.

MARIJUANA OFFENCES

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (on notice) asked the Attorney-General: For either the 1981-82 financial year, or the 1982 calendar year—

1. How many people were charged with possession of marijuana, and this offence only?
2. How many people were convicted of possession of marijuana, and this offence only?
3. How many people in each of the above categories were arrested by the police?
4. How many people in each of the above categories were summonsed for the offence?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The question asked seeks to identify the number of people involved in offences associated with the 'possession of marijuana' and that offence only. The crime statistics system maintained by the Police Department is a computerised offence-based system and is incapable of providing ready access to information on 'sole offence' charges, as required by the question. However, the following information compiled by the Office of Crime Statistics may be helpful. I seek leave to have the main part of the answer incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it. It consists of statistical data and interpretation of that data.

Leave granted.

TABLE 1: DRUG OFFENCES REPORTED OR BECOMING KNOWN TO POLICE 1974-75 TO 1980-81

Offence	1980-81	1979-80	1978-79	1977-78	1976-77	1975-76	1974-75
Smoke Marijuana	1 979	2 051	961	1 323	1 281	554	490
Possess Instrument for Drug Taking	621	485	147	212	—	—	—
Cultivate Indian Hemp	173	206	134	233	74	65	20
Other Drug Offences	430	462	198	176	193	110	176
Total	3 203	3 204	1 440	1 944	1 548	729	686

Table 1 shows the number of drug offences reported or becoming known to the police from the 1974-75 to 1980-81 financial years. These statistics have been taken from the Police Commissioner annual reports. Caution should be exercised in interpreting these numbers, since a person who is charged with smoke marijuana and possess instruments for drug-taking would appear twice, once for each offence.

Also available are the statistics for the first six months of 1982 which show that during this period 1 351 offences of use or possess marijuana were reported or became known to the police. During this same period a slightly lesser number of alleged offenders were apprehended for this offence. The following table gives the age and sex breakdown for these 1 337 alleged offenders.

TABLE 2: AGE AND SEX BREAKDOWN OF ALLEGED OFFENDERS INVOLVED IN THE OFFENCE OF USE OR POSSESS MARIJUANA DURING 1 JANUARY-30 JUNE 1982

Sex	Age								Total
	Under 14	14-17	18-19	20-24	25-35	35-44	45-59	60 plus	
Male	4	145	234	470	285	28	9	2	1 177
Female	—	20	30	62	46	2	—	—	160
Total	4	165	264	532	331	30	9	2	1 337

From the Courts of Summary Jurisdiction statistics it appears that 99 per cent of those charged with possess or use marijuana as the major offence were not also charged with an offence involving another type of drug. However, in many cases persons charged with possession are also charged with a lesser offence of possessing drug instruments.

TABLE 3: OUTCOME OF CASES FOR PERSONS CHARGED WITH THE MAJOR OFFENCE OF POSSESS OR USE MARIJUANA, IN COURTS OF SUMMARY JURISDICTION, 1 JULY TO 31 DECEMBER 1981.

Outcome	Number	Percentage
Convicted	459	78.3
Not convicted, penalty imposed	80	13.7
Not convicted, no penalty	8	1.4
Defendant Died	1	0.2
Case Withdrawn	7	1.2
Case Dismissed	25	4.3
Committed for trial	6	1.0
Total	586	100.0

Table 3 gives the court outcome for the 586 persons charged with the major offence of possess or use marijuana, heard in the Courts of Summary Jurisdiction from 1 July-31 December 1981. Table 4 shows the proportions of these arrested or summonsed.

TABLE 4: TYPE OF CASE FOR PERSONS CHARGED WITH THE MAJOR OFFENCE OF POSSESS OR USE MARIJUANA IN COURTS OF SUMMARY JURISDICTION, 1 JULY-31 DECEMBER 1981.

Type of Case	Number	Percentage
Arrest	281	48.0
Summons	305	52.0
Total	586	100.0

The question asked for information for the 1982 calendar year; however, the above statistics are the most recent available.

ALLEGED FINANCIAL MISMANAGEMENT

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS (on notice) asked the Attorney-General: In view of the fact that over the last 12 months the Treasurer, Mr Bannon, in debates in the Parliament, in public statements during the campaign prior to the State election on 6 November, and since that date, has consistently attacked the Liberal Government for mismanaging the State's finances, will the Treasurer provide details of this alleged financial mismanagement by the State Liberal Government over the last three years and in particular—

1. Details of projects commenced by the Liberal Government which were not justified and the cost of such projects?

2. Details of financial mismanagement in Government agencies and the cost thereof?

3. What action will the Government take to remedy these alleged deficiencies?

4. In view of the Labor Party's attitude while in Opposition, will the Government undertake to cease the practice of transferring funds from Capital Account to Revenue Account in the 1983-84 State Budget?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As to questions 1, 2 and 3, the honourable member is referred to the statement made by the Premier to Parliament on 14 December 1982. As to

question 4, unfortunately, the serious Budget situation which has been explained to Parliament, compounded by the worsening effects of drought and the costs associated with bush-fires, may require that some capital funds be held back to finance revenue deficits. It is the Government's intention to reduce and eliminate the need for this practice over time.

CURTIS REPORT

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many copies of the Curtis report into the C.F.S. were produced?

2. How many copies were there in the Minister's office on 10 November 1982?

3. If any, or all, copies were removed, where were they removed to?

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Ten (aside from the master copy held by Mr Curtis).

2. Nil.

3. Presumably to the outgoing Minister's office at Parliament House. One copy subsequently was returned on 22 November 1982.

DEPARTMENTAL FILES

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. How many files of the Department of Agriculture and Woods and Forests Department had been removed from the Minister's office on 10 November 1982?

2. (a) How many have been recovered?

(b) What was the subject matter of each file?

3. How many files had been shredded in the preceding few days?

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Unknown.

2. (a) 44.

(b) Wool Marketing Systems.

Centralised Integrated Wool Auctions.

Local Government Association—re Meat Hygiene Authority.

Export Abattoirs on Kangaroo Island.

Department of Agriculture Aims and Objectives.

National Farmers Federation—Farm Focus: The 80s.

H.I.S.C.O.L.

C.E.R. with N.Z.

Parl. Quest.—Staff appointments—Brian Kennedy.

S.A. Strategy for Future Changes in Agriculture and

Woods and Forests.

Veterinary Surgeons Act.

Changes in appointments in Iraq and Algeria.

H.I.S.C.O.L.

Stock Disposal Scheme.
 Commonwealth-States Meeting on Drought.
 Drought Relief.
 Sims Farm.
 Parl. Quest.—Hon. Norm Foster—Taxation.
 Punalur Paper Mills.
 Grain Research Levy.
 Samcor Deficit Fund—Maturing Loan.
 Local Government Association; Slaughterhouses.
 Budget Review Committee—Suggestions re funding
 Veterinary Services Division.
 S.E. Sale Yards Investigations.
 Government Deregulation Programme (5 files in all).
 Agricultural Seeds Act.
 Petroleum Products Freight Subsidy Scheme.
 Review of Departmental Fees and Charges (Agriculture).
 Legislative Programme 1977 and subsequent years.
 Citrus Industry Organisation Act.
 Share Holdings in Zed Pty Ltd by S.A. Timber Corporation.
 Animal and Plant Control Act (2 files).
 Report of Marketing of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables in S.A.
 Agricultural Education Advisory Committee.
 Proposed Amendments to Wheat Marketing Act.
 Artificial Breeding Act.
 Nature Conservation Society; Soil and Water Salinity on Kangaroo Island.
 Appointment of Inspectors under Meat Hygiene Act.
 Mr Materne; Subsidy on Carting Fodder.

3. Unknown—the nature of the shredded material could not be determined accurately.

CHAIR OF ORAL SURGERY

The Hon. R.J. RITSON (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

- Has a Dr H. Tideman from Holland been appointed to the Chair of Oral Surgery and Oral Pathology at the University of Adelaide Dental Faculty?
- Is his appointment the appointment described in the 1981 Annual Report of the University of Adelaide?
- What was the date of Professor Tideman's appointment?
- Who were the people that selected the successful appointee?
- On what date or dates did the Selection Committee meet to consider the appointment?
- Has the appointee been offered beds and operating facilities at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?
- (a) Has the appointee been made head of a unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital entitled the Oral Surgery and Facio-Maxillary Unit?
 (b) Will such a unit be created to accommodate the appointee?
- By which institution would the cost of operating such a unit be borne, namely, by the Royal Adelaide Hospital or by the University?
- Will the new professor expect to perform and to teach such operative procedures as repair of cleft palate, excision of head and neck cancer, operations on the face for cosmetic reasons and radical dissection of the neck?
- Will the new professor be teaching these major surgical procedures which extend well beyond the confines of the dentition to non-medical dentists?
- (a) Has the administration of the Royal Adelaide Hospital either ordered or purchased or been requested to order or purchase a duplicate set of instruments of the kind

currently used by the world renowned Cranio-Facial Unit of the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

(b) If so, what was the date or dates of any such request, requisition order or purchase of the duplicate set of instruments?

12. What was the actual or estimated cost of such instruments either ordered or purchased?

13. By which Government institution would such cost be expected to be borne?

14. Is it the Minister's policy to permit reduplication of existing services, particularly in times of economic stringency?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Cabinet has approved an inquiry into oral surgery and plastic surgery services at the Royal Adelaide Hospital with the following terms of reference: to inquire into the general functioning of the oral surgical unit and the plastic surgical unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital to determine delineation of clinical privileges, to ensure proper functioning of maxillo-facial surgical services at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in the future, with particular regard to: admitting rights of oral and plastic surgeons; the administrative structure in which such services should be provided within the Royal Adelaide Hospital; delineation of clinical privileges with respect to treatment of the range of oral and plastic surgical services involving the maxillo-facial area, with particular reference to the management of facial fractures; to recognise the role and function of the existing plastic surgical unit, cranio-facial unit, oral surgical unit and the role of a future Professor of Oral Surgery within the existing units. It would be inappropriate to answer the specific questions raised by the honourable member at this stage.

SURPLUS HOSPITAL EQUIPMENT

The Hon. ANNE LEVY (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

- Did the Queen Elizabeth Hospital earlier this year indicate to executive officers and managers of hospitals and nursing homes throughout South Australia that they had surplus equipment for sale at 25-30 per cent of new price?
- What were these items of surplus equipment?
- Why were expensive items such as stainless steel kidney trays and jugs being sold off so cheaply, when they were obviously fit for use by hospitals and nursing homes?
- Why were these items being disposed of, and what is the cost of replacement?
- Was the then Minister aware of the sale, or did the Minister make inquiries regarding it?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The replies are as follows:

1. No. During the months of July and August 1982, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital circularised a list of obsolete and surplus equipment to the South Australian Health Commission and all hospitals and nursing homes listed with the commission. No prices were quoted in the circularised list but, upon inquiry, prospective buyers were advised that 25-30 per cent savings on new prices could be expected, not at 25-30 per cent of the actual cost of new equipment.

2. The answer is three full pages of material which is purely descriptive and statistical in nature, and I seek leave to have those incorporated.

Leave granted.

EQUIPMENT DETAILS

The items of surplus equipment are as follows:
Stainless Steel

72 only Stainless steel trays 14" x 12" x 1"
 12 only Stainless steel trays 12" x 10" x 2"
 368 only Kidney trays medium 9"
 139 only Kidney trays large 11"

- 106 only Assorted stainless steel lids
- 2 only Cystoscopy trays
- 40 only Stainless steel buckets with lids
- 30 only Assorted dressing trays
- 28 only Large stainless steel canisters
- 58 only Stainless steel bowls large
- 598 only Stainless steel solution bowls medium
- 70 only Stainless steel solution bowls large
- 9 only Stainless steel solution bowls extra large
- 53 only Stainless steel solution bowls small

X-ray Equipment

- 1 only Siemens sirmobile mobile image intensifier
- 1 only Toshiba X-ray unit consisting of:
 - Generator 120Kvp700mA
 - Control panel
 - Motor control anode starter
 - Light beam diaphragm
 - Tube column
 - X-ray table 90/30°
 - Bucky assembly
 - All cables and attachments
 - Tomographic attachment and control transformer
- 1 only Unirad Sono II 100 series diagnostic echoscope system with polaroid camera and handbook
- 1 only Toshiba KXO-700 generator and control three phase, 125Kvp700mA high speed monitor unit RS-117
- 1 only Ceiling suspended tube support system (Toshiba DS-PB) with 'Rotenode' high speed rotating anode tube and high tension cables. The X-ray tube is filtered with a multiple leaf light beam diaphragm (Model TF-6TL-3). Modifications have been made to joints connecting tube arm to the telescope column to improve its strength.
- 1 only Toshiba DT-BAN 90/30° table with high speed bucky head clamps, compression bands, cassette holder, footrest and tomographic attachment, and hand grips.

Catering Equipment

- 18 only Waldorf food conveyors
- 54 only Milk portion jugs stainless steel
- 44 only Sugar bowls stainless steel
- 102 only Measuring jugs 2 pint stainless steel
- 12 only Large jugs stainless steel
- 35 only Assorted jugs stainless steel
- 24 only Jugs 1 pint stainless steel
- 1 047 only Jugs 2 pint stainless steel
- 100 only Butter pats
- 112 only Milk containers large 9 oz. stainless steel
- 115 only Milk containers, small, tapered, 4 oz. stainless steel
- 110 only Milk containers small 4 oz. stainless steel
- 48 only Bowls large stainless steel
- 61 only Trays stainless steel
- 70 only Plate covers stainless steel
- 48 only Plate scrapers
- 35 only Asbestos mats
- 8 only Vegetable graters
- 19 only Bread bins
- 22 only Finger bowls
- 24 only Toast racks
- 63 only Butter knives
- 21 only Bowls small earthenware
- 7 only Bowls white glaze large
- 11 only Bowls white glaze medium
- 14 only Bowls white glaze small
- 19 only Kettles large
- 18 only Teapots small
- 3 only Frypans
- 10 only Vitamizer jars
- 30 only Vitamizer tops
- 4 only Milk savers

Miscellaneous Supplies

- 34 only Mitchel clips
- 5 only Tracheostomy tubes 'Jackson'
- 1 671 only Dwell catheters Tuta
- 162 only Medicut cannula
- 87 only Viscopaste
- 3 only Boxes (1 000) Peanut swabs
- 16 doz. Gauze bandages 4"
- 3 doz. Gauze bandages 3"
- 5 only Circum. device
- 41 only Cement solvent 'Sacsol'
- 6 only Metal fly sprays
- 12 only Metal kerosene pumps
- 5 only Drums heavy duty floor wax 5LT
- 70 only Whistle tip catheters
- 182 only Graduated pipettes 0.5 ml
- 98 only Opsonic pipettes 0.02 ml
- 24 only Graduated pipettes 25 ml
- 44 only Opsonic pipettes 0.05 ml
- 40 only Opsonic pipettes 0.1 ml
- 89 only Opsonic pipettes 0.2 ml
- 142 only Opsonic pipettes 0.5 ml
- 122 only Opsonic pipettes 1 ml
- 57 only Opsonic pipettes 2 ml
- 97 only Volumetric pipettes 2 ml
- 85 only Volumetric pipettes 3 ml
- 124 only Volumetric pipettes 4 ml
- 60 only Oxygen catheters F.G10
- 97 only Packets Watmans filter papers various
- 79 only Bulb pipettes 25 ml
- 36 only Bulb pipettes 10 ml
- 72 only Bulb pipettes 5 ml
- 16 only Measure beakers 400 ml
- 26 only Measure beakers 600 ml
- 2 only Measure beakers 5 000 ml
- 47 only Spirit lamps
- 29 only Micro sample pipettes 70995
- 130 only Pipette dropper

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The replies continue:

3. The items offered for sale are fit for use by hospitals and nursing homes, which is why all such institutions were offered the items. In view of the fact that in some instances the items are 20 years old, it is not considered that they are being sold off cheaply when they are being reduced by only 25 per cent off the new price.

4. The following factors have contributed to the general surplus of equipment at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital:

(a) *Closure of the Mareeba Annexe in 1981*

Although many of the items transferred from the annexe are being used in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, a considerable amount of the stainless steel items are not required.

(b) *The increased use of disposables*

Conversion to the use of disposable products has resulted in substantial savings. For example, the use of disposable dressing trays has effected savings in linen costs, autoclaving and labour, and consequently has made surplus the stainless steel kidney bowls, solution bowls and trays which were previously used at the hospital.

(c) *Improved patient care and resource utilisation*

The stainless steel jugs previously used at the hospital were not fitted with lids, and when they were in use in the wards it was necessary to place a towel over the tops of them to preserve adequate patient hygiene. The cost of providing these towels was \$5 200 per annum. Replacing the stainless steel jugs with plastic jugs which are fitted with lids has not only improved patient hygiene but has meant that savings in the order of \$5 000

per annum can be made because the use of towels is no longer necessary.

5. Following the question asked by the Hon. Anne Levy in the Legislative Council on 31 August 1982, the then Minister made inquiries into the sale of surplus equipment and a report was subsequently submitted to that Minister. A reply was not given to the member at the time due to the prorogation of Parliament.

ROXBY DOWNS ROYALTIES

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN (on notice) asked the Attorney-General: Will the Government make available the calculation of royalties made prior to the passing of the Roxby Downs Indenture Bill, and any subsequent calculations or estimates of royalties which would be received from the operation of the Roxby Downs mining venture?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The answer is 'No'. The letter of the previous Minister of Mines and Energy of 25 May 1982 to the National Policy Co-ordinator of the Australian Democrats clearly outlined the situation.

MINISTERIAL STAFF SEVERANCE PAY

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN (on notice) asked the Attorney-General:

1. Is severance pay being paid to Ministerial staff, that is, assistants and press secretaries, whose appointments were terminated as a result of the change of Government?

2. If so, for what period are they being paid?

3. What are the amounts and how are they made up?

4. What is the authority for making these payments?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Varying periods from four to 12 weeks, depending on the individual contract and length of service in the said Ministerial position.

3. See attached schedule. In addition to the amounts shown, officers were paid any other accrued recreation leave and long service leave to which they were entitled. That schedule shows that the total payments amounted to \$162 465.80, including an amount to Mr Rex Jory of \$5 722.40, despite the fact that he was apparently still employed on the Government pay-roll.

4. The employees contracts.

ATTACHMENT

Premier's Office

R. Story	8 941.20
R. Jory	5 722.40
B. Edwards	7 925.40
N. Starck	7 925.40
C. O'Connor	5 072.00
E. Hill	3 661.20
	<hr/>
	\$39 247.60

Deputy Premier's Office

J. Kimpton	7 925.40
R. Yeeles	7 925.40
	<hr/>
	\$15 850.80

Office of the Minister of Industrial Affairs

B. Lindsay	4 649.60
J. Williams	5 537.40
C. Rudd	6 974.40

\$17 161.40

Office of the Minister of Education

L. Crosby	\$6 974.40
-----------------	------------

Office of the Minister of Local Government

D. Laidlaw	\$6 974.40
------------------	------------

Office of the Minister of Agriculture

B. Kennedy	4 649.60
R. Rickards	6 974.40
V. Lamb	5 034.00

\$16 658.00

Office of the Minister of Environment and Planning

B. Shearer	6 974.40
D. Russell	6 974.40

\$13 948.80

Office of the Minister of Transport

D. Crosby	2 324.80
R. Burnett	6 974.40

\$9 299.20

Office of the Minister of Community Welfare

R. Worth	\$6 974.40
----------------	------------

Office of the Minister of Health

S. Carey	\$2 113.40
----------------	------------

Office of the Minister of Water Resources

A. Luks	6 974.40
L. Nowak	6 340.20

\$13 314.60

Chief Secretary's Office

P. Stevens	6 974.40
G. Stewart	6 974.40

\$13 948.80

Total

\$162 465.80

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 15 December. Page 162.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The Opposition supports this Bill, which was considered by me as Attorney-General in the Liberal Government. But for the election, it would have been brought in by me. It seeks to remove from the Supreme Court the power to fix fees for lodging and process in the Supreme Court and to provide for those fees to be fixed by regulation. It is not really a function of the Judiciary to fix

fees for the lodging of documents in the court. It is more appropriate as a fiscal measure that should come within the responsibilities of the Government. Accordingly, I am pleased to be able to support this measure.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I thank the honourable member for his support of the amendment.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 16 December. Page 253.)

The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN: I thank His Excellency the Governor for his Speech when opening this Forty-fifth Parliament. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and reaffirm my loyalty to the Crown and the Commonwealth of Australia.

His Excellency referred to the death of two former members of the Parliament, the Honourable Cyril Douglas Hutchens and the Honourable Gordon James Gilfillan. The former I knew not at all, the latter only briefly. I offer my condolences to their families.

As a new member of the Parliament I would like to thank those who have welcomed me to this forum, particularly those on this side of the Council who, in the short time I have been here, have assisted me greatly. While on this theme, I must also place on record my thanks to those people who supported me up to this moment, particularly those from Eyre Peninsula and other country areas. I shall do my best to put forward and represent their views. I must give special mention to my wife for her encouragement and assistance. Living as we do, in excess of 35 km from a town, involves her in taking messages and being a part-time secretary while I am not at home.

When the Forty-fourth Parliament was prorogued, three members from the Liberal Party retired. They were the Hon. John Carnie, the Hon. Boyd Dawkins and the Hon. Don Laidlaw. The Hon. John Carnie started his career on Eyre Peninsula as the member for Flinders and later became a Legislative Councillor who served with some distinction. I wish him well in his new endeavours. The Hon. Boyd Dawkins retired after serving more than 18 years in this Council. He was a member who served with great propriety and who was always concerned about the welfare of constituents, particularly those in the country. An indication of his concern and contribution to his community has manifested itself in the form of the honour given to him for his contribution to music and choral work. I indeed wish him and his wife well in their retirement.

The Hon. Don Laidlaw obviously possessed foresight and acumen which will be missed from this forum. I wish him well, and no doubt his foresight and wisdom will manifest itself in the future. Another person whom I must mention is the Hon. Norm Foster, whom I did not know personally. However, his record is well documented, and it goes without emphasising that he was a man of conviction. Good luck to him in the future.

His Excellency noted the economic malaise which is sweeping the nation and causing many problems to people's lives and futures. It would be naive of me to stand here and offer a cure without being a student of economics, or being old enough to have gained hindsight from the previous Great Depression. However, having run my own enterprise for more than 20 years, I am allowed some leeway to comment on the present situation.

In my opinion there is a gap which is growing between the 'haves' and 'have nots'. The 'haves' are those with jobs and increasing real incomes and the 'have nots' are those who have been retrenched or who have never had an income. It does seem simplistic, but surely greed plays a major part in this picture. It is the greedy who are stopping this country from progressing as and how it should. Who are the greedy? They are identifiable, and a look at wages, profits and inflation will quickly give an indication. Government indices of the past 12 months show that inflation is in excess of 10 per cent. Profits have fallen from 13 per cent to 10 per cent, while wages have risen by more than 17 per cent. Powerful unions have been able to extract these increases solely for their own benefit, with little forethought of the consequences.

We cannot now compete with other countries that produce at a lower cost because of their lower wages. One of the more insidious consequences is the run-down of the machinery needed to manufacture goods. If business is not allowed to have enough profit, to refurbish its plant and keep it up with modern technology, it in turn becomes non-competitive and contracts are lost, which results in loss of jobs.

We see on television every day advertisements promoting the theme 'export and grow', and we would all agree with that. However, if we cannot compete with other countries because of high production costs growth in jobs, wages and real income must slip back. I suggest that a considerable improvement in endeavour and application by all would improve productivity and lower costs. Large sections of the work force are pushing for a shorter working week, or for more fringe benefits, making us, again, less competitive.

There is a parallel. The rural community is in a similar bind, but for different reasons. At present, the rural community is suffering a severe drought. In other words, for the rural worker times are tough: his income has been cut because he has little produce to sell, his stock need extra care and feeding, and his work effort must therefore go up. If the farmer were to adopt the attitude of working less and wanting more his banker would soon have his farm on the market. There is not only a rain drought in Australia but also an economic and trade drought throughout the world. Recovery will be much quicker for Australia if we tighten our belts and bend our backs just a little harder while this drought is with us.

While on the subject of the rural community I will spend some time developing that theme. The recorded history of South Australia, though only a short 147 years, has seen its development and growth influenced by changes from one industry to another. Wakefield had a grand plan of settlement without the use of convict labour through private enterprise and free will. Early settlers took up land, initially around Adelaide, then pushed mostly north taking with them Merino sheep. The wool from those sheep was exported to England and became the first major export earner.

A shepherd, while tending his flock in the Burra area, discovered copper. This led to the establishment of the mining industry, and copper later became a great export earner for this State. The cultivation of wheat became the next growth period and the fertile area in the Mid-North became the grain bowl of Australia. However, wheat growing expanded beyond this area to as far north as Wilpena Pound, because in those days many people believed that rain followed the plough. Goyder, an early surveyor, proved how wrong these people were by defining a line across South Australia, roughly east and west, above which the rainfall was insufficient to sustain the regular production of cereals. He did this by identifying the native vegetation and basing his judgment on that; to this day Goyder's line is still quite accurate. The mining of precious and semi-precious metals, gold and other metals, followed, but agriculture was still

the primary export earner. The cessation of World War II saw the Playford era bring a minor industrial revolution to South Australia that has progressed steadily until the past few years. During this period wool again became a great export earner and reached the dizzy heights of \$4 per kilogram. At that time petrol was less than 7c a litre. By comparison, today wool is approximately \$3 per kilogram and petrol 44c a litre. In the late 1950s and early 1960s wheat and barley again became prominent export earners. This was brought about by the introduction of bulk handling, which removed the hard manual work of filling and stacking bags. Today it is still a large export earner when favourable seasons allow it to grow.

This picture demonstrates what a valuable contribution agriculture has played in the development of this State. I believe that it will continue to do so for many years to come. But all is not rosy in the rural sector, with falling prices, weak markets, and many countries, particularly those in the E.E.C., having highly subsidised primary exports that compete for our markets. The reason for this is not immediately clear but I think that many countries have learned that a stable and viable rural sector leads to better employment, stable government, and an improved balance of payments.

At the moment, subsidies on rural exports from the E.E.C. are extremely high and some products that it traditionally imported are now exported. For example, England can now export wheat, although not of a high quality. She is, however, doing that and taking a market share that Australia might reasonably have been expected to enjoy. For how long the people living in the E.E.C. will continue to pay high subsidies to their rural producers is conjecture, but I guess that the reaction will be to want cheaper food which has not been subsidised by other sections of their community such as secondary industry. This may allow Australia, a cheap, efficient producer, to increase its market share in the future.

To demonstrate the problems facing the Australian farmer, let us look at the wheat industry, one of the biggest export income earners. I have figures from the State year books 1976 to 1981 showing export prices per tonne in those years, as follows: 1977, \$97; 1978, \$116; 1979, \$137; 1980, \$153; and 1981, \$151. This is a rise in return of 57 per cent over five years while inflation, on consumer price index figures, has risen overall to 73 per cent in the same five years. More importantly, wheat prices in 1981 were 1 per cent lower than 1980 but inflation was greater than 10 per cent. This trend in lower prices for rural commodities can be demonstrated across the board with few exceptions. One further example of what I am saying is that a loaf of bread has risen 14 per cent in the two years since 1979-81.

Petroleum products costs rose 65 per cent during the same period. These products have a considerable impact on the cost of production of wheat, which, in turn, becomes bread on your dinner table. If these trends in high costs and low returns continue, the future is certainly bleak for the rural community. Traditionally, there has always been great fluctuation in costs and returns to farmers. However, looking at the more optimistic side, if costs can be contained by lowering inflation, the traditionally efficient Australian farmer will increase his contribution to the economy of Australia.

The disasters that have struck this State during the past year have devastated many areas, but the greatest losses have been sustained by the rural community. Drought had already lowered expectations, but to be then ravaged by fire and flood would demoralise all but the strongest. Many farmers had not only their homes but also their means of creating an income, such as stock, crops, fencing, sheds, and machinery, destroyed. However, to their credit I have not heard a great deal of bleating for hand-outs, and, in

fact, most have said that a long-term loan is what is necessary to help them. I am sure that this would be the quickest way of getting those areas that are now devastated back into production. The machinery for handling this situation is at hand within the Department of Agriculture and I hope that the Government gives that department its full support because, after all, the money being handed out is in the form of loans, and will be returned as soon as the recipients are on their feet again.

Very recently the Minister of Lands announced that the rent on pastoral leases would be increased by 50 per cent. I find this quite disturbing when I look at the situation before us. For 10 years cattle prices have been very low. At the same time, cattle stations are low in stock numbers because of the campaign to eradicate T.B. and brucellosis. Stations carrying sheep are not that well placed either as wool prices have not increased with inflation and carcass prices have generally been low. Added to that, both cattle and sheep stations have received lower than average annual rainfall, and this low rainfall has left many properties barely viable.

During the past 12 months a lot of publicity has been given to the overstocking and denuding of much of this station country. I do not defend overstocking and the eating out of native vegetation, but I am sure that an increase of 50 per cent in rent on pastoral leases will be counter productive, because it will lead to further economic pressures on the pastoralists, who will increase stock numbers just to survive. A more compassionate approach to the pastoralist would, I am sure, lead to their being more co-operative in future.

I now intend to spend a few minutes to talk about the area I am most familiar with—Eyre Peninsula. It is a large area of South Australia, comprising 27 per cent of the intensively farmed area, not a great distance in radius from Adelaide. Of course, road miles from Adelaide present a different picture, and having to travel around the top of Spencer Gulf adds approximately twice the distance of a straight line to any part of Eyre Peninsula. This causes a rise in the cost of living in the area because of road freight. It is interesting to note that people living in Port Lincoln will incur approximately the same cost in freight as they would if they lived in Melbourne and had all their goods freighted from Adelaide, so similar are the distances.

Eyre Peninsula itself is an equilateral triangle with sides of 350 km in length on which is carried out numerous enterprises that contribute significantly to the State coffers. The following are some figures for Eyre Peninsula production related to the rest of the State. They are averages for 10 years to 1981, based on information supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and are as follows:

	per cent	1980-81
		\$
Fishing	49	22 000 000 (on present prices)
Mining (Iron, Gypsum, Lime, Sand)	50-20	30 000 000
Wheat	37	90 000 000
Barley	22	36 000 000
Oats	5	
Wool	13	32 000 000

The greatest portion of this production is exported, and is therefore of great value to the real income of this State. However, many people on Eyre Peninsula feel that they do not receive due recognition from Government instrumentalities in the provision of roads and communications. There is indeed a low population, and if Whyalla is not included 2.6 per cent of the State's people live there. If Whyalla is included, the number rises to 5 per cent.

Local government on Eyre Peninsula does a very good job in relation to road construction and maintenance considering the area, the road distance, and the revenue they generate, but there are so few sealed arterial roads that a great deal of council revenue is used in maintaining and forming unsealed arterial roads. Fifteen per cent of South Australian roads are sealed—Eyre Peninsula has only 2 per cent of its roads sealed. From these figures it is quite obvious that a bigger slice of the cake is needed to upgrade the road system on Eyre Peninsula. Councils are not asking for money to seal minor roads, but they are asking for reasonable all-weather roads that join towns and centres of commercial interest.

To give an example, the neighbouring towns of Cowell, Kimba and Cleve, each with a population of 800 to 1 000 and distances from 50 to 80 km apart, have one sealed road between them, and that happens to be between the two towns that are the closest together. This situation would I believe be quite unacceptable elsewhere in the State. From the information I can gather, an improvement of allocations to Eyre Peninsula seems remote for several reasons. First, the emphasis on road building within the State has run down. In the mid-1960s local government in this State was spending \$21 000 000 on road construction. In 1980, 15 years later, the figure had risen to only \$49 000 000, so if inflation is taken into account a much smaller percentage of the State revenue is now spent on roads. For the people in my area that emphasis has run down too quickly, and what is considered a right in suburbia and the more densely populated areas, is not available to that productive area of the State, Eyre Peninsula.

High on the priorities of His Excellency's Speech was a commitment to the development of tourism. Eyre Peninsula has a potential in this field, with its abundant fishing, its beautiful beaches and unaffected hinterlands, to attract many tourists. However, with a mere 2 per cent of its roads sealed, people will not feel encouraged to head to these places over rough roads damaging their vehicles, as the locals must do. Even though an Eyre Peninsula resident does not have very much sealed road, he pays dearly for what he does have. His council rates are \$52 per head, while those for the rest of the State are \$28 per head. With 2½ per cent of the population he uses 6 per cent of the motor spirit and 20 per cent of the distillate. Consider the extra money he pays to government in fuel taxes for the privilege of living west of Spencer Gulf. The slow march forward in relation to road construction and sealing on Eyre Peninsula may also be due to the representation at State Government level in the electorate of Flinders.

We are by nature a conservative and hard working section of the community. It is the last area of the State that has been developed and, as such, there is a lot of pioneering still going on. Most people have had to earn a living and not spend time on what might be considered more peripheral matters of entertainment, social intercourse and how to win advantage from Government. I believe that we have not won that advantage because our representation has been out in the cold both in Government and in Opposition. An electorate may not expect to receive the same consideration when its representation is in Opposition but, when the Government is changed and there is still no voice, the electorate is doing itself an injustice. Flinders is in just such a position.

One last inequality that I cannot pass without mentioning is the tariff charged on a large part of Eyre Peninsula for the most basic of commodities, namely, electricity. This State has an excellent industry of electrical generation and distribution, supplying energy to all parts of the more populated areas at what must be considered a reasonable tariff, that is, by interstate comparison. Those rates are the same

throughout the State until you get to Eyre Peninsula, and then 10 per cent more is charged for every kilowatt used. There are exceptions, the City of Port Lincoln, the District Council of Tumby Bay and a small part of Elliston. But the rest of the district councils, Franklin Harbour, Cleve, Elliston, Kimba, Le Hunte, Murat Bay, and Streaky Bay, which have developed their own distribution network and employ their own linesmen, must charge their consumers 10 per cent more than the rest of the State. This is because they pay 10 per cent more to ETSA for power. Quite incredibly, the lines that transport the power to lower Eyre Peninsula (which pays the lower rate) traverse two of the district councils that pay 10 per cent extra for the privilege of having the power.

Electricity must be considered a basic commodity in this day and age; to be without it plunges us literally back into darkness. This discriminatory policy of ETSA and the State Government needs altering to make those citizens who pay dearly for living far from the city lights feel as though they are part of this State. I have painted a somewhat pessimistic picture of Eyre Peninsula, but unlike Hanrahan I do not think 'we will all be ruined'. The people of this area, like those in the rest of the State, will soldier on, given a fair go.

There are people who live under far harsher conditions than those on Eyre Peninsula, and I hope that I can represent their point of view if and when the necessity arises. Ten days ago the people of Australia expressed their will to change the Federal Government. This State Government should not now be placed in a position where it can blame the Federal Government for causing it hardship. I shall look forward to the performance of both with interest. I support the motion.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and in so doing it gives me very great pleasure to be addressing the Council from this side for the very first time in my Parliamentary career. Before I speak, very briefly, about the recent elections that have brought about this happy set of circumstances, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate all honourable members who were elected to this place in November last year, particularly those who are joining us for the first time.

The past few months have been very significant in the history of this country: since November last year, we have seen the election of three Labor Governments—first, our own State Government in November 1982, followed by the convincing victory of the A.L.P. in Western Australia in February this year, culminating in the spectacular victory of the Federal Labor Party at the national level just over a week ago. The national victory, I believe, was very important for Australians for at least two reasons.

First, the result that the A.L.P. achieved at the Federal polls was one of the best results that that Party has ever obtained in a Federal election since its inception, and it was a very heartening result for all people in Australia who support Labor philosophies. The national victory is important, also, because it comes at a very crucial period in our history, in view of the current economic crisis that we are suffering. I believe that, with four State Labor Governments and a Federal Labor Government, we have a rare opportunity to implement the programmes that we believe will improve the lives of the majority of Australians. For millions of Australians, the change has come just in time. A rapidly increasing number of Australians have been sliding steadily into poverty during the past seven years under the Fraser Government; these people now have some hope of recovery.

I cannot let this moment pass without mentioning one particularly disadvantaged section of our community that will be significantly better off under a Labor Government. I refer to women in Australia. There is absolutely no doubt

that the A.L.P. is, and is recognised by the majority of women in Australia as being, much more in tune with women's needs than is the Liberal/National Party coalition. I was interested to note that some astute Liberals are now recognising this to be a fact. For example, during the recent Federal election campaign, Dame Beryl Beaurepaire, who is a Vice-President of the Liberal Party in Victoria and who was formerly the Chairperson of the National Women's Advisory Council, lamented this fact on a radio interview.

I was interested to note during the weekend that the Young Liberals organisation has also pointed out that the Liberal Party has been quite deficient in the policies that it has developed over the years in regard to women in this country. Australian women will be better off as a result of the election of a Labor Government in at least two ways. First, women's views will be much better represented in Parliament as a result of the recent elections, because there has been a quite considerable increase in the number of Labor women who will be taking their places in those Parliaments. In South Australia, two new Labor women were elected to the House of Assembly in November, and I would like to congratulate them—Susan Lenehan and June Appleby—on the very hard work that they put in to achieve those results.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: And one Liberal woman.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am talking about Labor women. In Western Australia in February, five additional Labor women joined the ranks of the Labor Caucus, and there is now a total of six Labor women, compared with (I think) only one Liberal woman in Western Australia. As a result of the recent Federal election, an additional five Labor women have been elected to the Federal area, making a total of 12 women in the Labor Caucus. Included amongst those newly elected women in Canberra will be Dr Rosemary Crowley, who will be joining the Senate, representing South Australia. Dr Crowley will be the first Labor woman to do that.

Although I believe that we should not be particularly proud that it has taken the A.L.P. so long to send a woman to Canberra, this step and the improved representations during the past 12 months for women in the other Parliaments to which I have referred (and I should also include the Victorian elections, because a number of women were elected in that State) demonstrate to the women of Australia that the A.L.P. is not just paying lip service to the needs of women but is doing something positive about meeting those needs.

The second reason why I believe that women will be better off under Labor Governments is that the A.L.P. has demonstrably better policies for women. Over the past few years the Labor Party has worked very hard to put together a programme which takes account of changes in the lives of women during the past few years and which also takes into account their special needs. The Fraser Government and the Liberal Party in this State have largely ignored women as though they did not really exist.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: Why do you say that?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: During the past seven years we have seen what some commentators have called the feminisation of poverty in Australia. Women comprise over 60 per cent of social security pensioners and beneficiaries, more than 95 per cent of supporting parent beneficiaries are women, the majority of pensioners who live solely on welfare are women, and the rate of unemployment for women is much higher than it is for men.

The Liberal Party claims that it supports the family, but during the past seven years it has presided over economic policies that have caused the destruction of many families which failed in their struggle to keep up mortgage payments or which tried without success to find a second income to

keep afloat. On the one hand, the Liberals abused people on pensions and unemployment benefits as pariahs on the welfare system and on the other hand they denied those people the chance to be independent, because the Liberal Party supported economic policies that have made it impossible for those people to get jobs or, if they obtained jobs, to work because of a denial of proper child care arrangements, so that those people were unable to take jobs. The record of the Liberal Party in all these matters has been appalling, and women in Australia have recognised that. I believe that women also recognise that, with a State and Federal Labor Government, they will get a much more sympathetic hearing of their grievances and, more importantly, action to meet their needs.

Another much smaller group of people in Australia who I hope will benefit from the election of a Labor Government and about whom I really want to talk today are transexuals. The needs of transexuals have been overlooked in our community, probably because they are so small in number and, therefore, have less political clout than have other sectors of the community. We should not allow ourselves to ignore their plight merely because they represent a small minority of the population. Many people confuse transexuals with transvestites or homosexuals.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Can you explain the difference?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I can. A useful definition has been put together by two experts, John Money and Richard Green. They have described a transexual in the following way:

A transexual is an individual anatomically of one sex who firmly believes he belongs to the other sex. This belief is so strong that the transexual is obsessed with the desire to have his body, appearance and social status altered to conform to that of his 'rightful' gender.

This makes transexualism quite different from transvestism, which the same writers, Money and Green, have described in the following way:

Transvestism is the act of dressing in the clothing of the opposite sex. It is usually attributed to a psychological compulsion and is often practised for the individual's general sexual stimulation or to assist in the achievement of orgasm.

So, one can see that the two conditions are quite different. A transexual is a person who actively seeks a sexual transformation to satisfy his or her psychosexual condition and a transvestite is a person whose behaviour relates to satisfying sexual needs, and these people do not seek to change their sex.

It is usually during the first few years of life, and certainly well before puberty, that transexuals begin to feel that they are people trapped in the wrong body. Many eventually seek sexual reassignment surgery to alter their physical condition to conform to their psychological view of themselves. This procedure is complicated and lengthy. A person is usually required to live as a member of the reassigned sex for one or two years prior to surgery and, during this time, it is normal for them to undergo hormone treatment and intensive psychiatric assessment. After this period if they are considered to be suitable candidates for sexual reassignment surgery, then an operation will be performed.

For many transexuals this is where the problem begins. We have a ludicrous situation in Australia whereby persons may undergo a sexual reassignment operation but, after they have done so, their legal status stays the same. In other words, a man—and it is usually men who seek to undergo this operation—may become a woman by undergoing such an operation but, as far as the law is concerned, she is still a man. So, needless to say, this is very distressing and often embarrassing and humiliating to the person concerned and, according to many medical experts in the field, can also prevent such people from fulfilling emotional and sexual

relationships, thereby hindering what may be, in any case, a very difficult adjustment process after surgery.

What we have here, as is the case with so many things, is a situation where the law is lagging behind advances in medical science. In my view, unless we do something to rectify this situation the law can rightly be described as an ass. The solution to this problem is not easy. There are many complex issues which must be considered, but I do not think that it is really all that difficult a problem and it is time we did something about it as the numbers of transsexuals in Australia are growing and, as that happens, so will the problems that surround it.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: Do you know why the numbers of transsexuals are increasing?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I meant to say that the numbers of operations being performed are increasing. The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has been considering this matter since some time in 1979, and there has been very little progress.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That was not what you said last year when you were criticising me. Now that there is a different Attorney-General you think that you can give him credit for it, do you?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: He has not done anything—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That is a change of heart.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I said that the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has not been doing anything about it. I have not said anything about the situation since the Government changed and had not finished my sentence. The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has been referring this matter back for reports on particular aspects of the question and it seems that it has been reluctant to take decisions which need to be taken. From my research it seems that the solution to the problem is largely dependent on a definition of 'sex' for the purposes of this question. At the moment the definition of 'sex' used by the courts is taken from the famous case of April Ashley in *Corbett v. Corbett* in the United Kingdom in 1970. In this case Mr Justice Ormrod applied a very strict physical criterion for his definition of 'sex', involving chromosomal analysis, gonadal examination and genital examination. During that case evidence was also adduced that a person's psychological orientation to sex should also be considered to determine what his or her sex was. But, Mr Justice Ormrod chose not to take this aspect into account.

Since 1970 his ruling has been extensively criticised and it has certainly created problems within the British legal system. Many medical experts in this field say that this interpretation of sex is inappropriate in so far as it relates to transsexuals. They say that we should be looking at gender identity rather than gender factors, that we must take into account the fact that, due to medical technique, it is possible to alter a person's physical state to conform to his or her psychological state.

In other legal jurisdictions this question has been viewed more sympathetically and, in my view, more realistically. The legal status of transsexuals was changed in Switzerland in 1945. The following quote illustrates the very sensible approach taken by the court at that time, when it said:

Now that the patient's psychic association with the female sex is strongly supported by anatomical changes it appears to us impossible to go back. It would therefore be advisable to recognise legally a state which the law did not prevent from coming into existence.

Similarly, in a New York case where a transsexual wanted to register a change of sex following surgery, the court adopted the psychological criterion in its deliberations and said:

Where there is disharmony between the psychological sex and the anatomical sex, the social sex or gender of the individual will be determined by the anatomical sex. Where, however, with or without medical intervention, the psychological sex and the anatomical sex are harmonised, then the social sex or gender of the individual should be made to conform to the harmonised status of the individual and, if such conformity requires changes of a statistical nature, then such changes should be made.

The law has been changed in a number of countries throughout the world to give legal recognition to sexually reassigned persons. These countries include Italy, South Africa, Switzerland, Sweden, four Provinces in Canada, and the majority of States of the United States of America have also made one provision or another. Recently, West Germany announced its intention to amend the legislation there.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: How do they cope with sporting events?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I do not know. That is something that the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General should be looking at because I can find no information anywhere about that being considered at all. In the countries where changes have taken place action has varied. Most countries have allowed changes to birth registration; some have allowed marriage rights, and others have not. Methods adopted for change have also varied. For example, in some places a new birth certificate is issued to a sexually reassigned person and the original one is able to be released by the appropriate registrar only by court order. In other places, the original birth certificate stays in place and a notation is made on the certificate regarding the fact that a sex change operation has occurred.

In Australia the problem is complicated by the fact that some laws affecting transsexuals are State laws and others are Federal laws. Ideally, any legislative change should be uniform and enacted throughout the country. This is why the deliberations of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General are so important. The situation of the legal aspects of change varies from State to State, but in all States the key to change seems to depend on the amendments to birth registration.

Other matters that must be considered as part of this question include the Marriage Act (that is, you have to decide whether or not transsexuals should be permitted to marry), the child adoption legislation, discrimination laws, laws relating to sexual violence, criminal law where sex is a factor, the penal systems, some social security matters, industrial awards, legal documentation such as passports, right through to such mundane matters as the use of public conveniences, for example.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: And sport?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yes, and sport. From this, we can see that the range of issues to be worked through is really quite complicated, but I believe that solutions are possible if politicians are prepared to take the necessary action. More and more transsexuals are now seeking medical attention. I have been told that at least 35 operations per year are being performed in hospitals in Adelaide and Melbourne. As the number of people affected increases, so, too, does the potential for legal trouble. In the past 18 months or so since I started taking an interest in this matter there have been a number of cases of legal discrimination and/or interpretation which have been highlighted in the media. I think that these problems will multiply in the future.

In addition to that, pressure for change will occur. Already, transsexuals in Victoria have formed a lobby group, and a support group of medical and para-medical people working in this field has been formed and is actively advocating changes to the law. It would be very easy for Parliamentarians to push aside questions such as this which affect so few people in the population. It would be easy to postpone taking any action until the lobby for change became stronger

and the position became clearer, but this would be unjust, inhumane and cowardly. To be put right, this requires commitment rather than courage. I hope that the question of legal status for transsexuals will be one of the areas for legal reform which will receive proper attention now that we have a sympathetic Attorney-General in Canberra as well as in the majority of States.

As was stated in the Swiss court in 1945, it would be advisable to recognise legally a state which the law did not

prevent from coming into existence in the first place. Anything short of this would be hypocritical and grossly unfair.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.56 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 16 March at 2.15 p.m.