

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 12 May 1983

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Crown Lands Act Amendment,
Statutes Amendment (Irrigation),
Statutes Repeal (Agriculture).

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Commissioner for Equal Opportunity—Report 1981-82.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Corporate Affairs Commission—Report, 1981-82.

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

Pursuant to Statute—
Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on—
Proposed development at Mount Barker South Primary School.
Proposed erection of a transportable classroom at Jamestown High School.
Amalgamation and disposal of allotments in hundred of Wonoka.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Pursuant to Statute—
South Australian Energy Council—Report, 1981-82.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION REVIEW

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I seek leave to table the report of the review of the South Australian Health Commission.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: In January 1983, as part of the general review of Government management and operations, Cabinet approved a review of Health Commission management arrangements and performance, focusing particularly on the central management and co-ordination functions of the commission, including the sector offices. Members of the review team were Mr Don Alexander, Deputy Director-General of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Mr Don Faulkner, Director of the Management Systems and Review Division of the Public Service Board, and Mr Mel Whinnen, Director of Administration and Finance in the Department of Mines and Energy.

Before outlining some of the conclusions of the review and indicating what steps I intend to take to implement recommendations drawn up by the review team, I want to emphasise that the Government is committed to the retention and further development of the South Australian Health Commission substantially in its present form. While the review has identified areas which require changes to bring about improved performance, it is important to recognise

that the Dunstan Administration's bold initiative in establishing the commission in 1977 has been a success. In the years since then the commission has been subjected to close scrutiny. Areas of poor performance have been identified and improvements have been made progressively.

This review is another important step in that process of critical evaluation aimed at constructive change. While the review points to some specific weaknesses in management and performance, it recognises the substantial success of the sector concept. It also acknowledges that considerable progress has been made in improvement of the commission's management over the past two years. Although the overall recommended changes in organisation structure are relatively minor, the review points to the need for significant changes in internal management processes. These include the establishment of several committees and important alterations in the role of some officers, particularly the Deputy Chief Executive Officer. The general directions of the report provide the basis for constructive, practical measures for improving management and administration.

The major legislative changes proposed by the report include the reconstitution of the commission itself so that it will comprise two full-time Commissioners, one to be Chairman and one to be Deputy Chairman, together with three part-time Commissioners. This would replace the present composition of one full-time Commissioner, who is the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, together with seven part-time members. This will clearly upgrade its management role. I endorse this recommendation. The report also recommends that the Health Services Advisory Committee should be replaced with a community health advisory committee, and I indicate my intention, subject to Cabinet agreement, to introduce the necessary changes to the South Australian Health Commission Act. Under the current legislation, the Health Services Advisory Committee is made up of nominees of various interested organisations.

It is felt that the overlapping of the committee's role with that of the commission itself has led to the committee becoming ineffective. As I mentioned yesterday, the Health Services Advisory Committee came into being only as a consequence of an amendment moved by the Opposition in the Legislative Council and not even the previous Minister of Health, Mrs Adamson, could find any good reason for its existence. While I am listing proposed legislative changes, I take the opportunity to foreshadow changes to the Health Act to reconstitute the Central Board of Health. I intend that the main powers and responsibilities of the Central Board of Health under the Health Act and the Food and Drugs Act be transferred to a South Australian Public Health Board established under the Health Act, with defined relationships with the Health Commission. I have discussed these proposals with my colleague, the Minister of Local Government, and earlier today I discussed them with representatives of the Local Government Association, with whom I seem to be getting on rather better at the moment than did the previous Administration. I realise that that is subject to change without notice.

A central feature of the review team's proposal is the recommendation:

The Chairman's Committee should be retitled the Executive Committee and the proceedings reflect a more formalised managerial approach.

I agree that the proposals for an Executive Committee, clear definition of the roles of sector and head office units, better financial reporting and closer attention to operational performance are both necessary and achievable. The adoption of the recommendation for an Executive Committee with expanded functions along the lines envisaged, should increase accountability of executives, particularly sector executive

directors, and improve the level of communication in the commission.

On the subject of financial information and control systems, the report notes that previous reviews commented unfavourably upon weaknesses in reporting top management. Although a considerable degree of corrective action was commenced in 1982, when the previous Chairman's reorganisation began to take effect, the 1983 review team recommends a series of worthwhile improvements in reports to the commission itself and in co-operation between the sectors and the head office. There must be vigorous and immediate steps to further develop a consolidated and consistent flow of reporting from health units through sectors and corporate finance to top-level management and to other agencies. In this connection I intend to direct that a project team, on the lines recommended by the report, be established without delay. The project team will be instructed to determine the key financial and information reporting requirements of the commission, keeping in mind that while improved systems and reports will provide better tools for management, it will be the individual managers' ability to use them to good effect that will really determine the extent of any further progress.

The report recommends the establishment of a management review and audit unit within the Health Commission. Without dwelling on the observations of the review team, I concur with this recommendation and I have already initiated the necessary steps to recruit the personnel necessary to instigate the process of internal audit and management reviews. In looking at staffing levels, the review team indicated there was scope for reduction in the corporate office, in some cases involving transfers to the sectors or to health units. It was also suggested that the corporate office, as now constituted, should be abolished. It is my intention to follow up the report with a specific review of the functions and staffing of the divisions that now constitute the corporate office so that effective changes can be made in the direction suggested by the review team.

Some of the review's most precise criticisms relate to computing within the Health Commission and health units. Despite substantial investments of staff and money over a number of years, practical achievements have been slow in coming and limited in extent. Although some individual projects are at last beginning to bear fruit, the report indicates that the overall direction and leadership of the development programme requires attention. Health units have encountered a range of difficulties in applying technology to their management. The report indicates that the Health Commission has failed to integrate decisions on computing into the normal framework of management responsibility and accountability.

Implementation of the review group's recommendations on the use of the executive committee will help to ensure that computing investments are not dealt with outside the mainstream of management decision-making in the commission. However, it must be accepted that direct commitment, responsibility and accountability on the part of senior managers in the Health Commission and the health units involved are essential prerequisites for achieving satisfactory performance. I propose to refer the review group's findings and recommendations on computing within the health sector to the Data Processing Board for comment. Once we receive expert advice from the board, I anticipate further action to upgrade the Health Commission's role and performance in computing.

The committee also addressed the issue of industrial relations in the South Australian Health Commission. Since becoming Minister of Health I have been concerned at the manner in which industrial relations have been handled in both the health units and hospitals. It is my view that

significant changes need to be brought about to upgrade the standard of dealing with both routine matters and industrial disputes. The lack of clarification of roles and responsibilities highlighted in the report, directly impinges on the administration of industrial relations in the South Australian Health Commission.

It is my intention to advise Cabinet that a high-level task force, as recommended by the committee of review be set up to examine industrial relations in the South Australian Health Commission as soon as possible. I advise the Council that I propose to appoint an implementation team to review the report and advise on the implementation of the review team's recommendations. In addition to Mr Don Alexander, who headed the review, the implementation committee will include the Chairman or Acting Chairman of the Health Commission, the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, the Executive Director of the Central Sector, the Chief Executive Officer of the Queen Victoria Hospital, and a nominee of the Public Service Association.

Before closing, I want to make it clear that the one area of the report with which I disagree is its representation of the commission's budget position. The hard fact is that under the previous Government's administration, unrealistically high projections of revenue collections were accepted. The revenue estimate failed to take into account the substantial decline in the number of fee-paying patients in the hospital system together with a significant trend away from public hospital care. In addition, the present health insurance arrangements saddled hospitals with a high level of outstanding accounts.

The Hon. C.M. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: They failed to understand the complexities of budgeting within the system, as did the previous Administration. The anticipated level of revenue is now some \$21 000 000 less than the previous Government's projection in the Budget estimates in 1982. I refute any suggestion, whether from the report or any other source, that the management of the commission's expenditure budget is out of control. In fact, the latest advice I have from the Acting Chairman this morning is that the Commission will be within its expenditure budget at 30 June 1983.

QUESTIONS

POWER SUPPLIES

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about power supplies in South-East towns.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Honourable members would recall that on several occasions I have drawn attention to the problems that were experienced in some towns in the South-East during the disastrous Ash Wednesday bushfires in maintaining power supplies. In fact, a number of towns had their power cut and as a result water supplies were halted. I have earlier referred to the potentially disastrous situation in the town of Kalangadoo, which relies solely on electricity for provision of its water supply. In this particular case on Ash Wednesday more than 200 local people were sheltered in the Kalangadoo Hotel for protection from the fire with hoses and sprinklers arranged around the hotel as a safety precaution. Unfortunately, the loss of power meant that water was unavailable to protect the hotel and the 200 people inside should this have been necessary. In fact, the people were not informed of the position to avoid panic on that day. It was only a change in wind direction which possibly saved the hotel from destruction.

During the inquest into the deaths in the South-East resulting from the fire, reference was given yesterday to a similar problem faced by dozens of parents and children who sheltered on the Kalangadoo school oval. As the fire swept past the oval the sprinklers could not be operated because the electricity supply to the town was cut. I understand that similar problems of loss of water supply because of power cuts occurred in a number of rural towns, including Tarpeena, which suffered badly from the fires. Obviously, had alternative power options been available the risk would have been less, and in some cases loss of property and injury would have been eliminated.

Last month I wrote to the Minister of Mines and Energy expressing the concern of some members of local government with whom I have had discussions about this matter that insufficient alternative power sources are available. To date there has been no response. My questions are as follows:

1. Will the Government give consideration to the provision of diesel-powered pumps as a back-up when normal electricity powered water supply is cut in country towns?
2. Will the Minister arrange for discussions between himself, the Minister of Water Resources and the local government bodies in the South-East to ensure that alternative arrangements for the provision of water supply can be made so that the problems experienced during Ash Wednesday are never repeated?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will be happy to refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICES INQUIRY

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about the South Australian school dental services inquiry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I understand that the terms of reference of the Review of the South Australian School Dental Service, 1983, were as follows:

With consideration for Government policies and the recommendations of previous committees of inquiry into school dental services, the Assessor shall:

- (1) Inquire into and report to the Minister of Health on the appropriateness of the School Dental Service to continue the provision of dental care to children in South Australia.
- (2) Examine and report on the quality of care that has been provided by the School Dental Service.
- (3) Examine and report on the effectiveness of school dental care and the efficiency with which it has been provided.
- (4) Examine and report on the management of the School Dental Service with particular reference to:
 - (a) Previous planning of resources;
 - (b) The efficiency with which the programme has been administered.
- (5) Report on the financial implications of recommendations.
- (6) Any other matters relevant to oral health services in South Australia.

I am informed that the time scale for that very wide ranging inquiry covering quite a broad scope is as follows: 1, 2 and 3 June, an in-House study; 6, 7 and 8 June, quality control; 9 and 10 June, submissions; and 14 June, delivery of report. Does the Minister seriously consider that a worthwhile, useful, effective inquiry on such wide terms of reference can really be conducted in that time scale?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The inquiry is being conducted by Dr David Barmes, a distinguished dentist with the World Health Organisation from Geneva. I understand that Dr Barmes will arrive in the near future. It was always the intention that his contribution to the inquiry be made within two weeks. An enormous amount of material is available for him to review, because sundry inquiries have

been undertaken into dental services, and two major inquiries have been undertaken into school dental services in the past five years. One of those inquiries was conducted in general terms under the previous Administration.

Dr Barmes will be assisted by a senior dentist in private practice from Sydney (his name eludes me). I do not know how long he will spend in South Australia. In view of the vast amount of material that is already available for Dr Barmes to review, I believe that that is not an unrealistic time frame. I have no doubt at all that Dr Barmes will be able to consider quality, review efficiency, examine costs, and so on in a relatively short time, because an enormous amount of statistical material is already available on the school dental service.

DISABLED PERSONS

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about disabled persons.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: On 14 December 1982 I asked the Attorney-General about the Government's policy on disabled persons. The Attorney-General's answer was characterised by a lack of decision and there was a clear indication that he did not know what he would do about structures to co-ordinate a policy on people with disabilities and to enable the momentum of the International Year of the Disabled Person to be maintained both within government and in the wider community.

Disabled people have expressed to me very grave concern about the Government's indecision. It is pleasing to note that in the past few weeks Mr Richard Llewellyn has been appointed as Government adviser on disabilities, and I commend the Government for that. Mr Llewellyn has considerable experience in this field. However, apart from this appointment, there does not appear to be any momentum. Far from providing a basis from which progress for disabled people can be made, any attempt to have one person in Government advising the Premier or another Minister will not be fully effective in covering the wide and diverse range of concerns of disabled people.

It is pleasing to note also that the Government has continued the initiative of the Liberal Government in funding a disability resource centre which is about to open, the manager having been appointed. Again, I commend the Government for continuing that initiative, which was well received by disabled people. Has the Government yet made a decision on the following matters:

1. Which Minister is to have the specific responsibility for the disabled?
2. Is there to be a permanent disability advisory council?
3. Is there to be a permanent inter-departmental committee on disability?
4. Are any other structures to be established?

If the Government has made decisions, what are those decisions? If it has not yet made decisions, when can decisions be expected?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member seems to be scratching around for some criticism of the Government. I gave a full report to the Council in December as to the Government's policy in this area.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: It didn't contain anything.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If the honourable member has any criticism of what the Government has done in the area of the disabled, he is criticising himself.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: I am asking what your Government is doing.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The fact is that the Hon. Mr Griffin, as the former Attorney-General, was the Minister responsible for the disabled under the previous Liberal Government. He was responsible for the programmes that have so far been developed, including the establishment of an advisory committee on disabled persons, which he was about to set up.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: What about the inter-departmental committee?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There is the Cabinet Committee on Human Services that has responsibility for co-ordination and development of Government policy in the area of the disabled, and I am Chairman of that committee.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: There is a loss of momentum.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If the honourable member has a criticism of the policies that the current Government is pursuing in regard to this matter—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: I am asking—

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member said that there was a loss of momentum. The fact is that what the Government is now doing is what the previous Government did: there has not been a change in policy—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: We made decisions!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:—at this point in time. Those decisions have been continued; they have not been countermanded in any way. What has happened is this: Mr Llewellyn has been appointed to work with my executive assistant, Mr Duigan, to develop a programme, which will be developed by the end of the month, I trust, and which will then go to the Human Services Committee for endorsement and consideration in so far as it has budgetary implications for the next Budget. Up to the present time the initiatives which the honourable member was apparently so proud about last year but which he is now criticising—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: I am not criticising; I am asking what you are doing.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member said that there was a loss of momentum; he was being critical.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Of you—yes.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: He was being critical. All I am saying to the honourable member is this: the Government has not taken any decision to countermand the initiatives that the previous Government had in train. In so far as it is a criticism, it is a criticism of the policies that he apparently implemented.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That is a specious argument.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It happens to be the case. If that is how the honourable member sees it, then that is his problem. He was responsible in that area. I have the general conduct of policies relating to the disabled at the moment. Whether there will be other Ministerial responsibility will depend on the review. There will be a committee, the Human Services Committee of Cabinet, that will be responsible for policy.

There will be an inter-departmental committee, and an adviser to the Minister. All those policies have been announced before. Decisions have been taken on them. The precise structure is now being worked out by Mr Llewellyn, who will present his report to the Human Services Committee of Cabinet. There has not been any loss of momentum. The policies that I have outlined will be implemented. Mr Llewellyn is playing a major role in the assessment and development of the practical proposals to give effect to those policies.

VEGETATION CLEARANCE REGULATIONS

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health, representing

the Minister for Environment and Planning, a question about the new planning regulations.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I have read with interest the news release from the Minister for Environment and Planning today in which there is a quite dramatic restriction on anticipated clearing of native vegetation in South Australia. I support, substantially, the initiative. It takes only a very brief and cursory inspection to realise that the remaining areas of native vegetation in South Australia are at a critical stage, and for all the reasons that the community cares about there should be very strict control over land clearing.

The Hon. H.P.K. Dunn: Haven't you got any more to clear?

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I feel that there are bigger responsibilities than just what I clear. We must be conscious of the biospheric influence of native vegetation. It is not to the advantage of mankind to destroy the native vegetation in order to grow cash crops. That is a deteriorating situation. We are paying the penalty for that in increased erosion and climatic influences that are beyond dispute. It is quite obvious that I support the main intention of this set of regulations.

However, I would like to ask the Minister some questions because, although the measure is well intentioned and important, it takes with it some risks of grave injustice to some people—and I think that it is only a very few of the farming community—if a blanket restriction applies. Although the wording in this news release says that that will not be the case, my suspicions are that, because of the group which is in control, there is very little direct agricultural influence, and it could be very insensitive to the needs of the agricultural community in particular cases.

In a way, the Minister of Agriculture should perhaps share at least in part in the compiling of this answer, because I am positive that it is very close to his newly acquired heart (the section of his heart now pulsing warmly towards the rural population). We will see how he responds to that.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: We have a demarcation dispute straight away.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I have directed the questions to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister for Environment and Planning, drawing it to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture.

1. Will the Minister give an assurance that permission to clear vegetation will be given to landowners who have already undertaken financial commitments to clear vegetation for agricultural purposes, or can show evidence that the economic viability of their holding depends on further clearing?

2. Are the new planning regulations a means of avoiding Government responsibility under the Voluntary Vegetation Retention Scheme? That was an initiative by the previous Government which was well intentioned and supported enthusiastically by many landholders, but there has been very little evidence of prompt response to that scheme by way of Government financial assistance. Although this measure is deemed necessary because there was not enough restriction on land clearing, I believe that the initiative of the Voluntary Vegetation Retention Scheme is good and should be retained.

3. Will landowners still be encouraged to apply for Government financial assistance, as has been available through the Voluntary Vegetation Retention Scheme?

4. What is the waiting time between acceptance of a proposed area under this scheme and a payment for fencing or other assistance to the landholder?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I must say that, as a previous Minister for Environment, I am absolutely delighted by what the Minister for Environment and Planning has done today. The Voluntary Vegetation Retention Scheme, to which

the honourable member referred, was something in which I was very interested during the brief period in which I was Minister. It was taken up by the Liberal Government when it came to office. By and large, it has not worked, certainly nowhere near well enough to stop continued clearing. The figures show quite clearly what small areas we have left in this State, and we are very poorly off in that respect, particularly in the agricultural areas which are still being cleared, and something had to be done fairly dramatically. With regard to particular questions, obviously I will have to take them to my colleague, the Minister for Environment and Planning, and bring back a reply as soon as I reasonably can.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about electricity tariffs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN: In my Address in Reply speech in March this year, I highlighted the fact that in some areas in this State people are being treated as second-class citizens, but having to pay first-class prices for one of their most basic of commodities—electrical energy. The State has at the moment adequate capacity to generate its requirements of electricity, which it sells to most of its consumers at a fair price. If we believe that energy is a commodity that is a fundamental basis for our standard of living, it seems reasonable to me that a common price per kilowatt should be charged to its consumers.

This common tariff is not applied to a number of district councils on Eyre Peninsula. They do in fact pay 10 per cent more than any other consumers in South Australia. There are eight district council areas on Eyre Peninsula that pay this impost. Should ETSA have built and maintained all of the supply grids in these eight district councils, because of the greater distances between consumers and the higher cost of connection a 10 per cent higher charge to cover these obvious increases could be justified. But this is not the case. The district councils, at the request of the ratepayers, have with their own staff built and maintained the distribution networks. Consumers have amortised the cost of the building of the networks over 10 years, and these costs have been significant. For my own district council it is \$1 200 per consumer outside the town boundaries, and in the Kimba area it is \$1 800, plus an initial connection fee of \$80 to \$100.

In the city, the cost is only the connection fee plus the normal tariff, which is 10 per cent less than that for the councils in question. I have observed recently that there has been a change in the billing of power consumed. Earlier bills always had written on them, 'This charge is within 10 per cent of ETSA tariff.' That statement has now been dropped, I suspect to avoid reminding those consumers of the higher tariff they pay to ETSA.

Is the Minister aware of the 10 per cent surcharge paid by the consumers in question? If so, is he taking action to even out the tariff charges? If he is not aware of the 10 per cent impost, will he review the tariff charges to these areas in question with the object of bringing them into line with the ETSA charges elsewhere in the State?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will be happy to refer that question to my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, and bring back a reply.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOVERY

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for the Arts, a question about an archaeological discovery at the Museum site.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Honourable members will recall that on Tuesday I asked the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for the Arts, whether he would ascertain what the Government would do in relation to an important archaeological discovery at the Museum site off Kintore Avenue. The Attorney-General undertook to obtain a reply, if possible, by today. It appears that I will not receive that reply today. That concerns me because, unquestionably, time is of the essence.

I visited the site today and indications are that it will be bulldozed next Wednesday. Honourable members will recollect that the site in question is the basement of the laundry of the destitute asylum, which was built during the 1850s or 1860s. Several professional archaeologists with whom I have discussed this matter regard the site as the most significant archaeological find in Adelaide. It is quite clear that there has been no attempt to slow down work at the site.

It is difficult to reach the site because of the bulldozing activity that is going on all around it, although, as I said on Tuesday, building contractors have been careful to leave the site untouched. This is a matter of great public interest and I again ask the Minister whether he is aware of any inquiries that have been made by the Government in this matter. Is the Attorney aware of the Government's intention in relation to examining the possibility of preserving and incorporating the site into modified building plans for stage 1 of the museum complex?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: On Tuesday I undertook to obtain a reply for the honourable member—that still holds. I will provide the honourable member with the information as soon as possible.

HALLETT COVE SOUTH PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education, a question about the safety of children at the Hallett Cove South Primary School.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Over recent years, a potentially hazardous situation in regard to traffic travelling around the Hallett Cove South Primary School has arisen. Because of the siting of the school and the approach roads, the provision of crash barriers at the school grounds is viewed as an important and necessary requirement. In fact, I am informed that during the past two and a half years three vehicles have entered the school grounds, out of control, fortunately without causing injury.

The April 1983 newsletter of the Hallett Cove Beach Progress Association notes:

The Progress Association has been assured that these barriers have top priority and will be erected as soon as funding becomes available. Let's hope it's not too late as yet again, a car has careered over the embankment near the child parent centre. Luckily, this incident occurred early Sunday and there were no children in the vicinity, next time we may not be as fortunate.

Despite numerous requests and representations over recent months by the Principal of the school, the school council, parents, and the Hallett Cove Beach Progress Association, the Education Department has refused to remedy a situation whereby a potentially dangerous set of circumstances is

allowed to continue that well may be the cause of a death or serious injury to a child (or even children).

In addition, the Central Southern Region Education Office acknowledges the need and states that crash barriers at danger points around the school is viewed as a very high priority by the region. However, at the moment, a lack of funds for minor works has evidently prevented them proceeding. Despite two telex messages to the Assistant Director-General of Education (Resources), nothing has happened. It would be a tragedy indeed if a life were lost or a child maimed because action was not forthcoming. The warning has been sounded many times and parents deserve some assurances that action will be taken now before it is too late. Will the Minister obtain an urgent reply from the Minister of Education as to when this potentially hazardous situation will be resolved?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Education and bring down a reply.

O'BAHN

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about O'Bahn.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: In his speech on the Appropriation Bill in this place on Tuesday, the Attorney-General indicated that, following a review of the capital works programme, the north-east busway programme was to be rescheduled. He said the result would be that the Park Terrace to Darley Road sector would open and operate from 1986 and that there would be a review of the other options for the sector beyond Darley Road after 1986. I am sure that all honourable members would be pleased that the former Government decided not to proceed with a light rail transport system, because that would not have even reached St Peters by 1986.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: They would have run out of money before they got out of the parklands.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I am sure that is true. It is the section beyond Darley Road that in many respects is the most significant, because this section will serve the majority of people in the north-eastern suburbs who are currently experiencing public transport difficulties. I am sure they will not be pleased by the Government's deferral of this stage. The statement by the Attorney conflicts with a press article which appeared on Monday in the *Advertiser* in which the Attorney is quoted as saying that the O'Bahn would be completed in 1986 and the first 2.5 kilometre section of the O'Bahn guided bus system would be completed by July. My questions to the Attorney-General are as follows:

1. Do the Attorney's comments referred to in the *Advertiser* conflict with his statement to the Council?
2. Do these comments indicate that in fact O'Bahn will operate only from Darley Road to Park Terrace?
3. If the Government has not yet made up its mind about the section beyond Darley Road, when will the review of options be completed?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will obtain that information from the Minister of Transport and bring down a reply.

LETTING AGENCIES

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about letting agencies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Early last year the Attorney-General, who was then Leader of the Opposition, asked me a question about letting agencies, the effectiveness of their services, and whether there were complaints against them. Letting agencies provide a list of allegedly available residential tenancies to prospective tenants. They charge a fee of, usually, \$40 for this service. When he asked his question, the Attorney acknowledged that the matter had been first raised by the then member for Brighton, Mr Glazbrook. In reply, I said that the number of complaints made to the department about letting agencies was small, and that was the case at that time. However, subsequently, there was reason to suppose that all was not well in relation to letting agencies, and I caused a survey to be conducted to gauge the opinions of users of their services. Although the sample was small, the survey clearly indicated that all was not well and that there was a need for some control in this area.

I might also mention that many real estate agencies were very critical of the fact that, whilst they were controlled, letting agencies were not controlled at all. I therefore set up a working party in consultation with letting agencies, which were most co-operative, with a view to preparing, in consultation with those agencies, a code of conduct and to introducing negative licensing control legislation. Has this working party proceeded? Has the inquiry been going forward? Does the Minister envisage introducing legislation and, if so, will he give me the approximate time frame?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The work on the code of conduct has proceeded. There was no suggestion by me that that would be stopped following the change of Government although, I must confess, it was my impression that it was to be a voluntary code of conduct and not one to be backed up by registration and negative licensing legislation.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: Not registration but negative licensing.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As I understand it, it is not necessary for the code of conduct to be backed by legislation. However, there is no doubt that complaints exist about the activities of letting agencies. The code of conduct is one method of dealing with that. Work has proceeded following the election in November. Quite clearly, another option that may have to be considered is direct licensing or registration. Those options are under consideration, and I expect to be able to advise the Council and the honourable member on what action the Government intends to take in the reasonably near future.

LOBBYISTS

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question on the registration of lobbyists.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Following the fiasco in Canberra over the past few days concerning David Combe, the former national A.L.P. Secretary turned lobbyist, the Prime Minister has asked the Special Minister of State, Mr Young, to prepare a submission on whether the Federal Government should require Canberra lobbyists to register before they can deal with the Government. In the absence of a Special Minister of State in this State Labor Government, presumably the responsibility for this matter rests with the Attorney-General. I therefore ask him whether the Government has considered the registration of lobbyists? If not, in view of recent developments, will it be considering the registration of lobbyists if they are to deal with the Labor Government?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The answers to the questions are 'No' and 'No'.

SEWAGE DISPOSAL

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Has the Attorney-General an answer to the question that I asked on 20 April regarding Finger Point?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No provision has been made for this project in the Engineering and Water Supply Department's capital works planning in 1983-84 due to other priority needs.

BUDGET EXPENDITURE

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (on notice) asked the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, in respect of the departments and agencies under his responsibility:

1. Is there any over-run in expenditure beyond the 1982 Budget provisions in any of the departments and agencies under his responsibility?

2. In what departments or agencies has that occurred and by what amounts and in what specific areas of expenditure or programmes.

3. What programmes funded in the 1982 Budget have been stopped or varied and, if varied, to what extent?

4. If any such programmes have been stopped or varied, why has that occurred?

5. Have any new programmes been commenced in any department or agency under his control?

6. If yes to Question No. 5—

(a) what are those programmes,

(b) when were they commenced,

(c) what is the 1982-83 cost of them, and,

(d) what is the full-year cost?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The response that I give to Question on Notice No. 1 is also the response in relation to Questions on Notice Nos. 2 to 14 which are essentially the same as Question No. 1 but which are directed to other Ministers. The time and effort required to formulate a response to the honourable member's question is not warranted. The Opposition is requested to be patient and wait for the examination of the Programme Budget Papers in the Estimates Committees later this year, when the Government finances are examined in detail. If there are any specific questions which then arise, I will endeavour to obtain replies.

The PRESIDENT: We have a problem in that all questions were not asked of the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General indicate the questions to which he has given an answer?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I answered Questions on Notice Nos. 1 to 14 on behalf of all Ministers.

The PRESIDENT: Is there consensus on this matter?

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: Yes, that consensus is catching.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Yes, Sir.

The PRESIDENT: Therefore, I will assume that the Attorney-General has spoken on behalf of all Ministers.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF PARLIAMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C.J. Sumner:

That in the opinion of this Council a joint select committee be appointed to inquire into the administration of Parliament, and in particular the organisational framework, conditions of employment, the provision of more effective joint support services and other related matters. In the event of the joint committee being

appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by four members including the President, of whom two shall form a quorum of Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee. That a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from 11 May. Page 1434.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: During the course of the former Government the President and Speaker established a review of Parliamentary services including the organisation and staffing of the Parliament. That was under the authority of the President and Speaker, and a committee worked with the President and Speaker on that task. That committee was in fact the steering committee comprising the President, the Speaker, myself, Mr McRae, Dr Corbett (a Public Service Board Commissioner), Mr Kevin Purse (representing the Public Service Association), the Clerks of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly, and three Public Service Board officers (Mr R.A. Nichols, Mr Faulkner and Mr Boxhall). The Hon. Gordon Bruce attended and represented the interests of those members of the staff associated with the Liquor and Allied Trades Union.

The steering committee was broadly based, representing the two Houses, the Public Service Board (which is the employer of some of the staff engaged on duties within Parliament House), the two senior officers of the respective Houses and the employees within the Parliament. That steering committee, with the authority of the President and the Speaker, engaged consultants in the form of two officers from the Public Service Board.

After many meetings between those consultants, the committee, the staff employed in Parliament House and members of Parliament, a draft report was prepared. That report was considered by the committee and, after some amendment, was circulated to members of Parliament. Comments were received by the consultants. It was then further considered by the committee. Finally, the report was tabled in both Houses of Parliament towards the end of the third session of the last Parliament. The steering committee continued to meet to consider the implementation in the light of responses received from the political Parties represented in the Parliament.

As a result of that consideration there was broad agreement on various recommendations which were made by the committee. There were some minor disagreements, largely related to the status of particular officers referred to in the recommendations and the description of those officers, but they were regarded as relatively insignificant areas of disagreement for further discussion. The agreement by the steering committee was that, after receiving the general agreement to the recommendations by the respective parties, including the Government, legislation was to be drafted for consideration by the steering committee. My officers were then instructed to prepare those draft instructions and were in the course of so doing when the election was called. Therefore, instructions to draft legislation did not finally get to the Parliamentary Counsel.

The committee which was reviewing the Parliamentary services, their organisation and staffing recognised that there were a number of matters to be addressed. There are some technical questions about who is the employer of, for example, the catering staff. Crown Law opinion was given at one time which indicated that the Joint House Committee was not the employer. Certain areas of concern existed there because workers' compensation was involved. There was also the question to whom *Hansard* should be responsible. It is presently responsible to the Attorney-General's Department and is part of that department, although it really has no close liaison with that department. It does, of course, depend on that department for its funding and staffing

decisions and for the initiatives which are being taken with respect to the introduction of word processors and on-line communications from Parliament House to the Government Printer.

Then there were the functions being performed on behalf of both Houses by separate officers, some being performed by one officer or more on behalf of both Houses acting together. There was a view that greater efficiencies could be achieved if the accounting services, for example, were provided by one accounting section responsible to both Presiding Officers.

Also, there were other areas of rationalisation that could bring distinct advantages to the way in which the Parliament operates. The recommendations which were tabled in the Parliament were quite clearly the result of extensive consultation and consideration by all who, in one way or another, would be affected by those recommendations. I do not accept the suggestion which has been made by the Attorney-General that the committee and the review was dominated by the Executive. One can see from the membership of that committee that members of Parliament, Presiding Officers and their respective Clerks were in a distinct majority on the committee.

I think that it would be helpful to have the recommendations of the committee on the record. Recommendation 1 was that support services to the Parliament should be provided by three separate divisions, the Legislative Council, House of Assembly and Joint Services. That recommendation respected the well-established position of the two Chambers as having separate and distinct identities. No attempt was made by the review committee to impinge upon the status or authority of the respective Chambers of the Parliament. The second and third recommendations formalise that. The second recommendation was that there should be a Legislative Council Division to provide direct services to the Council. Recommendation 3 was that there should be a House of Assembly Division to supply direct services to the Assembly.

The fourth recommendation, or the third part of the restructuring, was that a Joint Service Division should be established to provide support services across the Parliament. The fifth recommendation was that a Joint Services Committee should be established by Statute to be the employer of all Joint Services Division staff and to oversee the provision of joint services to the Parliament. That would clearly and unequivocally establish who was the employer of the various catering and other staff providing joint services.

The sixth recommendation was that an Administrator, Joint Services, should be appointed to manage the Joint Services Division and to serve as Executive Officer to the Joint Services Committee. The seventh recommendation was that a Parliamentary Services Act should be enacted to provide a clear statutory basis for employing all staff in the Parliamentary service and to establish the Joint Services Committee.

Recommendation 8 was that staff employed under the Parliamentary Services Act should have the statutory right to apply for positions in the Public Service. There is some interchange between staff employed by Parliament and staff engaged under the Public Service Act, but it is a difficult thing to achieve that interchange. The review committee felt that it was necessary, in order to ensure career prospects and greater flexibility in staffing, that there should be much better facilities for interchange between the Public Service and the Parliament so far as staffing is concerned. Recommendation 9 provided that senior managerial staff should meet regularly as a management panel to address particular issues concerned with managing the Parliamentary Service.

Recommendation 10 was that the Parliamentary Reporting Division of the Attorney-General's Division (*Hansard*)

should be transferred to the Parliamentary Service as a branch of the Joint Services Division. Recommendation 11 was that Library functions should be performed by the Parliamentary Library within the framework of the Joint Services Division.

Recommendation 12 was that the staff of the Parliamentary Library Research Service should be increased, subject to resource constraints, by two additional research staff. That recommendation was not unanimously accepted by the committee. At the time, the Liberal Government took the view, in view of the pending retirement of the Librarian, that further consideration should be given to appointing a Deputy Librarian to understudy the Librarian and that there should be no action on the two extra research officers during consideration of the priority for such officers as against a Deputy Librarian and any restructuring of Library staff.

A report was made to us that the appointment of two research officers would not necessarily solve some of the difficulties involved in the provision of research services and that, in fact, some restructuring of the Library staffing might be considered appropriate.

Therefore, the Liberal Government decided to defer the appointment of additional officers in the Library until the matter had been examined further. Recommendation 13 provides:

An action plan should be prepared for introducing appropriate modern equipment and data searching facilities into the Parliamentary Library.

Recommendation 14 states:

The duties of the head of the catering service should be expanded and the title changed from 'Manageress' to 'Catering Supervisor'.

Recommendation 15 was as follows:

An Administrative Services Unit should be established within the joint services division to provide central administrative support services.

Recommendation 16 states:

The financial management process should be upgraded to ensure optimum use of funds and to provide improved control and information for decision-making.

Recommendation 17 was as follows:

Management panel should determine the extent of administrative support functions to be undertaken by the Joint Services Division.

Recommendation 18 was as follows:

A management services and systems function should be developed within the Joint Services Division.

Recommendation 19 provides:

The Joint Services Committee should have overall responsibility for accommodation matters within Parliament House.

Recommendation 20 states:

A security policy and action plan for implementation should be formulated for approval by the Joint Services Committee.

That refers to the establishment of an integrated plan for providing adequate security for the premises and for those within the premises. Recommendation 21 provides:

Secretaries and steno/clerks to all Parliamentary committees should be Parliamentary officers; more flexible arrangements should be adopted for engaging research support for these committees.

The previous Government supported all recommendations except recommendation 12 in principle, and accepted that extra finance may be required as a result of recommendations 6 and 14. At that time I think it was stated that three additional positions would be required, which, in effect, would increase expenditure by about \$75 000 annually in principle; that was agreed to by the previous Government.

Because of the significant degree of agreement afforded before the last election, I am somewhat surprised that the Attorney-General feels that there is a need for a select committee to consider this matter. If a select committee is to be set up, I hope it will not spend months gathering fresh evidence, as did the review team, but that it will accept the

Report on Organisation and Staffing of Support Services to Parliament as an appropriate base for moving forward, rather than wasting everyone's time in going over the subjects covered by that report.

While I do not believe that a select committee is necessary, if it means that the restructuring of Parliamentary support services is expedited, the Liberal Opposition is prepared to support its establishment. I repeat that I hope that the Attorney-General would not see that committee as having to re-examine every issue and to take new evidence and that it would be able to rely extensively on the report of the review team, which received very widespread support. The restructuring of some of the services is very much overdue. The recommendations of the review team provided the most appropriate means of achieving that restructuring, and I believe that that is an appropriate base on which to work. Accordingly, although I do not regard a select committee as necessary to expedite the implementation of those recommendations, I would support it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): In response, I thank the honourable member and the Opposition for their support of the select committee. There is no doubt that that is necessary. There was considerable discussion in the Parliament last year about the so-called review into administrative support services, and no doubt many members believed that a solution was being imposed on the Parliament by the Public Service Board, which is part of the Executive arm of government.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: That wasn't so.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Milne, who has a balanced view, believed that it was so, and I am prepared to accept his unbiased view in this situation. It is important that Parliament and Parliamentarians investigate the question in a formalised way, and the Government believes that the best way to do that is through a select committee. Obviously, the report and the work that was done previously will be considered by the select committee, but Parliamentary staff and honourable members in both Houses may wish to put other matters to the committee. Therefore, this is an appropriate method of carrying out the review. It will be undertaken by the Parliament, by Parliamentarians, for the Parliament, and in my view that is the appropriate method.

The PRESIDENT: Before putting the motion, having reconsidered Standing Orders and after assessing that I am available to serve on this committee, and since I believe that it is the wish of members of the Council that I do so, I am prepared to accept that position. I would hope that this decision does not set a precedent whereby the President is expected to be available to serve on select committees. On this occasion I accept the position quite willingly, and I assure honourable members that uppermost in my mind in regard to my role on the committee is the preservation of autonomy and my role in this Council.

Motion carried.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY LAW, PRACTICE AND PROCEDURES

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C.J. Sumner:

That in the opinion of this Council a joint select committee be appointed to consider and report upon proposals to reform the law, practice and procedures of Parliament with particular reference to—

- (a) the method of dealing with Appropriations for the Parliament;
- (b) a review and expansion of the committee system including in particular—

- (i) the establishment of a standing committee of the Legislative Council on law reform;
- (ii) the desirability of a separate committee to review the functions of statutory authorities; and
- (iii) the method of dealing with Budget Estimates, including the desirability of a permanent Estimates Committee.

With regard to paragraphs (b) (ii) and (b) (iii) the committee should consider the role and relationship of the Public Accounts Committee in the context of these proposals.

- (c) the rostering of Ministers for question time in each House;
- (d) the prescription of a minimum number of sitting days each year;
- (e) the methods of dealing with private members' business;
- (f) other mechanisms to ensure the more efficient functioning of the Parliament including procedures to avoid excessive late night sittings.

In the event of the joint committee being appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by six members, four of whom shall form a quorum of Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

That a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto, to which the Hon. M. B. Cameron has moved the following amendments:

1. That paragraph (b) be amended by leaving out the words 'including in particular' and parts (i), (ii) and (iii).
2. That the following words be struck out—
'With regard to paragraphs (b) (ii) and (b) (iii) the committee should consider the role and relationship of the Public Accounts Committee in the context of these proposals.'
3. That the paragraph relating to the representation of the Legislative Council on the committee be amended by striking out 'six members' and inserting in lieu thereof 'seven members'.

(Continued from 11 May. Page 1439.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Generally, I support the principle of a joint select committee to consider various matters affecting the way in which the Parliament operates. From what the Attorney-General said in moving the motion, I believe that he proposes to introduce a Bill on fixed terms of Parliament and the powers of the Legislative Council. I presume therefore that he does not intend that this committee in its deliberations will examine those questions. However, I would like an assurance from the Attorney-General that that is the position, in view of the fact that he will introduce a Bill dealing with that subject in August.

I seek an assurance from the Attorney that he does not intend the committee to take evidence on and discuss and consider those particular questions. I have no objection to a committee examining the way in which the committees of Parliament operate or looking at the Budget Estimates committees, but it must be understood that that does not override my support for the way that the Estimate committees work, because they were a valuable addition to the procedures of Parliament in providing opportunities for members to question Ministers at length—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Not everyone thought that.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: If not everyone thought that, then it is their own fault. Having appeared before three Budget Estimate committees I know how much members of Parliament, particularly Opposition members, were more concerned about making political points than gaining information about the Budget. At least twice the then Opposition sought to move a censure motion against me because it was arguing about policy matters irrelevant to consideration of the Estimates. The Estimates committees have before them a wide range of information; more information is available on this State's Budget than on the corresponding Budget in any other Parliament in Australia and, if the then Opposition did not know how to use the committees, it cannot blame the committees for that—it must blame itself.

Any consideration of the Budget Estimates committees is something that I would not object to provided it was well recognised that I believe that they are an important facility

available to members of Parliament and, if used properly by Parliament, they can play an important part in eliciting information in regard to financing of programmes and projects within Government.

I want now to comment on that part of the motion which seeks to examine the possibility of a standing committee of the Legislative Council on law reform being established. I know that some members of the Council believe that a Council law reform committee would be a useful aid to consideration of potentially controversial law reform proposals but, having seen the reports of many law reform agencies around the world and having visited many of them and discussed their work with their members, I remain to be convinced that law reform can effectively be undertaken by a Parliamentary committee.

In many instances the subject being reviewed is highly technical. In fact, it may be a reform of what some people call 'lawyers law', which may nevertheless have significant ramifications for ordinary citizens. In any review of such law, I do not believe that members of Parliament are in any better position to consider and make recommendations on change than a specialist law reform committee acting independently of Parliament.

We have been well served by the Law Reform Committee of South Australia which was established by the then Attorney-General (Mr Robin Millhouse, M.P.). The committee comprises representatives of both Government and Opposition Parties, academics and practising lawyers. It comprises judges, on the one side, and practising lawyers on the other. We have a wide range of experience brought to the deliberations of any law reform committee.

One really has to examine what one wants from such a committee. For example, the Australian Law Reform Commission examines wide-ranging issues of principle, potential developments in the law, and social, ethical and legal problems. Law reform agencies in the States, except New South Wales, rarely have either the staff, the time or the opportunity to conduct wide-ranging inquiries with a view to making recommendations. Law reform agencies in the States are essentially concerned with proposed amendments to the law relating to practical procedure and substantive law which does not involve major questions of social and ethical principles.

True, I have some reservations about every State mirroring the example of the Australian Law Reform Commission. I do not believe that Australia is large enough to warrant seven or eight law reform agencies of the size of the Australian Law Reform Commission and all mirroring the tasks being undertaken.

Even if the law reform agency does present a report to the Attorney-General which is made public, it is not really a question for lawyers as to whether or not the proposal will be accepted but it is more a question for members of Parliament who will have to determine whether or not the law will be changed as recommended. There are a number of reports of the South Australian Law Reform Committee that have not been implemented because the Government of the day has decided that, as a matter of policy, it does not agree with the proposals of the committee. That applies whether it is a Labor or Liberal Administration in office.

There are other reports of the Law Reform Committee of South Australia that have not been implemented largely because they have been regarded as not having sufficient priority in Government. One of those which we have implemented by legislation introduced at the end of the last session and continued in this session related to the crime of suicide. From memory, this was reported upon by the Law Reform Committee of South Australia in 1970, over 13 years ago. The difficulty with law reform is not so much the understanding of the issues by Parliament but being

able to get sufficient time both of Parliamentary Counsel and of Parliament in which to consider the recommendations of the committee and also in regard to the question of policy.

I would be surprised if any committee of this Council were able to agree on areas of principle where the Parties have quite divergent opinions. Let me say that, whilst I have no objection to a number of standing committees examining legislation introduced before Parliament and other issues which might be referred to those committees by Parliament, I have grave reservations about establishing a law reform committee of the Parliament or the Council which is to research *ab initio* policy proposals for consideration by Parliament. I just do not believe that we have the facilities or the expertise to do that.

So far as the committee system is concerned, I again have no objection to, and in fact support, a rational committee system which enables members of Parliament to effectively review the legislation before it and issues raised in the Parliament and properly referred to the committee by resolution. I have no difficulty with the committees considering controversial questions, but I have a couple of concerns.

One is in respect of the mechanics of Government. Certainly, legislation ought to be the subject of consultation with those in the community likely to be affected by the legislation, but there are occasions when legislation is urgent, and I would not like to see that any committee system was impeding the progress of business in the House or that the business of Government was taken out of the hands of Government (whoever is in office). So, there would have to be assurances in any committee system to review legislation that the work of the committees would be done expeditiously and, if there was a matter of urgency, that that could be dealt with urgently without being unduly hindered by the committee system.

The other aspect of the committee system about which I have some concern is this: I do not believe that those committees would be effective unless they had adequate staff who were apolitical. One of the very real risks is that a Party with a majority in a particular House or within the Parliament may seek unduly to influence the appointment of officers to serve the committees and unduly to restrict the access to staff. I hope that if this joint select committee is established it will give very serious consideration to ways by which the impartiality of staff can be assured and adequate staff can be provided to service the committees.

I do not think that members of Parliament have sufficient expertise to deal adequately with all issues which come before the Parliament. That is not a reflection on any member of Parliament; it is an acceptance of the fact that members of Parliament are broadly representative of the wider community, and that all sorts of skills, abilities and experience are represented in the Parliament. In the wider community it is recognised that not everyone has an ability to deal with all issues; in fact, very few have that ability. Therefore, it is important to have adequately trained and experienced staff available to assist if the committees are to be effective. Again, I hope that the committee would give consideration to that.

The statutory authorities review aspect of the proposed resolution is one on which both Parties would agree in principle (I am not sure about those on the cross benches). It may be remembered that the Liberal Government introduced legislation to establish a Statutory Authorities Review Committee of the Council in the last session of the last Parliament. That was amended, and the amendments were disagreed with in the House of Assembly. It was at the stage of a conference where a compromise could have been established to the satisfaction of both Parties. The prorogation

of the Parliament for the purposes of the election, of course, interrupted that process.

In principle, there needs to be some facility within the Parliament to review the operations of statutory authorities—not all the statutory authorities which might be put into that category because they have been established by Statute, but those which carry on business and which are corporate bodies by virtue of their creation by Statute. The advisory committees and other such groups having no corporate status are of little, if any, interest to the Parliamentary review process.

I refer to two matters which ought to be considered by the committee. One is the question of privileges. In other Parliaments there has been some experience with allegations of breach of Parliamentary privilege, not in the sense of defamation by reporting matters referred to in the Parliament, but in respect of the privileges of Parliament and the members. At some time in the future this Parliament will have to consider a specific issue relating to the privileges of Parliament, and it will be at that stage too late to consider appropriate mechanisms for investigating and dealing with questions of the privileges of Parliament. I suggest that, if the committee is established, among the matters it examines would be this question of the privileges of Parliament and alleged breaches of those privileges.

The other matter, which I suppose is rather minor but, nevertheless, is fairly important publicly, is the way in which the business of Parliament is drawn to the attention of the public at large. The public at large will read in newspapers or see on television some of the major controversial issues which are raised in the Parliament, but there are many Bills and resolutions which come before the Parliament which never see the light of day in the media. That is not for want of trying. The Opposition's attitude to particular matters before the Parliament will not be raised, although maybe, but not always, information will be given about the broad resolution or Bill introduced into the Parliament. The committee should be looking at ways by which more information can be made available to the public to inform them of the sorts of matters which are being considered.

I recollect that during the last Parliament some attempt was made to publish a summary of the Notice Paper in the *Advertiser*. I am not sure that that is continuing; in fact, from all the information that I have been able to gather it is not continuing. Maybe there is a need to publish extracts from the Notice Paper for the week or for the day in the daily press. Maybe, also, if we can arrange for the various news media facilities to be provided with copies of the Notice Paper on a regular basis at the same time as members of Parliament get them that might also assist. I suppose that it also means that the media have to examine their own attitude to the way they will draw attention to the issues before the Parliament, because the media have responsibility to alert members of the public to the major and minor issues which are likely to be considered by the Parliament.

I have mentioned some of the matters which I believe are important and which should be considered during the course of a select committee examination of the practices and procedures of Parliament. It is for those reasons that I am prepared to support the proposal for a joint select committee.

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: I support the motion. Arguments can be put forward in favour of changes to the motion, but I will support it unless the Attorney-General agrees to any changes. It has been suggested that the motion tends to limit the freedom of a select committee to canvass those issues that it considers relevant. I point out that the inclusion in the resolution of certain particular items for consideration in my opinion does not limit the committee's investigation to only those points.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: It highlights them.

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: Of course it highlights them, but it does not limit the select committee in any way. The motion refers to three items to be considered by the select committee in relation to the review and expansion of the committee system. If the Attorney believes that there should be a change, I think the only change necessary would be the addition of a clause to provide 'any other matters relevant to this particular question'. We could argue at some length about other aspects of the motion. In fact, it could be argued that the select committee should come from this Council; and it could be argued that some of the references concern only either the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council. While those arguments may be valid, I believe that they are superfluous at this stage. This Council in particular must move to develop more committee work. However, because of the size of our Parliament there is a need for an examination of whether or not joint committees should be developed.

In certain areas, joint committees are quite satisfactory and desirable. The Public Works and Subordinate Legislation Committees are two examples of the advantages of joint committees. I believe that the proposal for a joint committee in this motion is quite reasonable. In its deliberations the committee may suggest, for example, that a law reform committee should be established in the Legislative Council. Whatever the decision, it would be left to this Council to decide whether that should be done and how it should be done. The joint committee would no doubt recommend the establishment of a committee to report upon statutory authorities and, depending on the recommendation, this Council would decide how it is to be done.

The Hon. Mr Griffin referred to the question of law reform and, to some degree, I accept the points that he made. It is very difficult when one considers the amount of work that could be done by a law reform committee of this Parliament. I accept the Hon. Mr Griffin's point that some of the issues involved in law reform are extremely difficult and require a great deal of work. Although I understand his views, I point out that at the present time there are many issues that I believe can only be resolved by consensus between the Parties represented in Parliament. There are certain issues that need to be examined quickly. Any Government, of whatever persuasion, will be somewhat wary about moving into that field. I believe that, if decisions are to be resolved quickly, there is a need for the major Parties—

An honourable member: What about the Democrats?

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: I pointed out some time ago that the Garden of Eden was a perfect place when there were two parties but that it was messed up when a third party arrived. In relation to law reform, particularly where modern technology is advancing so rapidly and the present law is unable to handle that area, a law reform committee could be advantageous. I do not believe that a law reform committee is the only means by which law reform can occur in this State. However, I believe it will be able to do things (if there is consensus between the Parties) that Governments are afraid to approach on many occasions. At this stage, I believe that a joint committee is a necessary device, because recommendations can be examined by each House in turn.

I commend the Attorney-General for his motion and hope that in his negotiations with his Government colleagues we can develop between the Houses more effective machinery for the operation of Parliament. I would prefer to see a committee of equal numbers between the Parties, and on that topic I am pleased to see some change of heart in some quarters. The changes we agreed to in this Council in relation to equality of numbers on select committees have improved the work of those committees. I see no disadvantage to this

Council. I am pleased to note that the Hon. Mr Blevins seems to agree with me.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: I was merely clearing my throat.

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: I am certain that, as a young new Minister, the Hon. Mr Blevins will agree with my point of view that select committees with equal representation from both sides of the Council work well. In fact, I have served with the Hon. Mr Blevins on several committees.

I refer, too, to the work of the Hon. Mr Bruce in relation to the select committee on random breath testing. The Hon. Mr Bruce's Party and the industry in which he worked were opposed to that proposal, but the committee did some excellent work. Rather than lose this motion, if the Government demands that it have a majority, I would not oppose it but express my view that equality, particularly in the present climate of consensus, is a worthwhile objective. I support the motion.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I support the Hon. Mr Griffin and the doubt that he raised earlier today about the proposal in this motion to establish a standing committee on law reform.

I am not concerned, and I doubt whether the Council is concerned, about the method by which such a standing committee would operate. I ask whether a standing committee of this kind should deal only with Bills passing through the Parliament, or whether it should deal with issues relative to law reform, which issues had not reached the stage of being approved for legislation by the Government of the day.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: That is one of the problems with putting this in the terms of reference. It immediately starts to look at certain matters.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: That point is well taken. It concerns me that, if such a committee dealt with issues, it would appear that the law makers would be investigating possible law reform and, at a later date, it would pass judgment upon its own deliberations and decisions. It would be far better, from the principle of law reform (and certainly it would appear to be better from the public's viewpoint), for there to be a separation between that group or those groups investigating the issues of law reform and a Parliamentary group which must consider that same matter when it enters the Legislature in Bill form.

Unless there is a separation, I see some dangers in the overall system of developing law reform and altering our Statute Book accordingly. The independent investigating bodies associated with law reform have done and are doing a very good job in this State. Surely it is better to allow such independent bodies to research and investigate the many issues involved in law reform and then approach the Attorney-General of the day with certain recommendations for changing the law. Then those changes must pass through Parliament if the Attorney-General and his advisers think that such new legislation is warranted.

Finally, after that total and collective scrutiny by the two separate investigatory bodies (and I include Parliament as one of those), surely we would have better law. I speak entirely on the premise that it might well be that such standing committees will simply be able to investigate matters referred to such committees without those matters being already in Bills about to be brought into Parliament. It is important, in the democratic process, that the separation in that machinery ought to be watched carefully and, if possible, retained rather than be lumped together in the one group whose influence within Parliament would be exceptionally strong. I make that point because fears were expressed by the Hon. Mr Griffin in regard to this matter. It strikes me as a very important issue which the committee, if appointed

as a result of this regulation, could keep closely in mind when it in turn deliberates on such matters.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE secured the adjournment of the debate.

COUNTRY FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 11 May. Page 1151.)

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): I support this Bill, although some areas in it, as the Hon. Mr Dunn has pointed out, appear to contain problems. The Hon. Mr Dunn has already indicated that he will be moving amendments. I believe that those amendments were, until this time, soundly based. It may be that further information will be made available by the Government which may mean that these amendments are not necessary, although one area concerning retrospectivity contains a problem. At the moment the Bill provides for retrospectivity to 30 September 1979. The result, from my reading of the second reading explanation, is that it would be possible for people involved in the Ash Wednesday bush fires of 1981 to claim additional amounts now or be asked to pay back moneys paid to them if the prescribed amount is less than the amount they have been paid.

To my mind, that is not on. I cannot believe that S.G.I.C. would ask for repayment of any sums, even with retrospectivity to the last Ash Wednesday fire, from people who were injured. It would mean that people who volunteered on the assumption that some method of payment would be made for workers compensation, as was made in 1981 (on advice from the C.F.S. as to the actual wage), could have the amount that they were paid reduced if they earned more than \$315 in their normal work. That will not be fair. In fact, it will be very discouraging to people involved in the C.F.S. in the higher salary bracket. Therefore, I believe that it would be necessary, unless some other arrangements could be made for us to amend the Bill, to ensure that these people were not put at a disadvantage by retrospectivity.

I indicate that, at this stage, I would certainly support the proposed amendments circulated by the Hon. Mr Dunn. It would be quite wrong for us to take any other course of action. I also believe that peoples' future, if involved in C.F.S. activity (and they do place themselves in danger in such work), should be covered for their ordinary wages, subject to the provisions of the Workers Compensation Act and the wording of such Act in effect at that time. I understand that there is a Bill in the Council to attempt to make some alterations.

I would like to see a situation where people involved with the C.F.S. are covered by workers compensation and, if they are in a higher salary bracket, they should be covered by the normal conditions of the Workers Compensation Act. It is important that, if people go to fight fires on behalf of the community, they do not suffer a loss (which could be quite dramatic if they suffer serious injury, as some people did in the last fire; some died, and there is no more complete injury than that). These people and their families should be covered in cases of serious injury. I ask the Government to seriously consider the Hon. Mr Dunn's proposed amendments. I support the second reading, but indicate that I will support the Hon. Mr Dunn's amendments in Committee unless the Minister can give an indication of some other provision that will assist people injured in the Ash Wednesday fire.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Agriculture): I thank the Hon. Mr Dunn and the Hon. Mr Cameron for their contributions to this debate. In particular, I think that the Hon. Mr Dunn's contribution was excellent, given the rather difficult circumstances of the matter (that being a second reading explanation). I seem to have spent a fair bit of time while in Opposition in this Chamber complaining about second reading explanations. Now, in Government, I am apologising for one. The second reading explanation did not go as far as it might have in explaining what would happen to people who were injured in the Ash Wednesday bushfire in February. I will now deal with the two items raised by honourable members.

The first matter involved the question of retrospectivity. This Bill is retrospective to 1979. I am advised by the Parliamentary Counsel that the reason for picking 1979 as the date for retrospectivity was that the relevant section of the Act came into being at that time and, in the style of Parliamentary Counsel, that was considered the appropriate time to which to make this amendment retrospective. It is also the Government's intention, by regulation, to make the provision retrospective to cover the February 1983 bushfire. While I am not disputing for one moment that what the Parliamentary Counsel did was correct (I am sure that it was technically proper), it seemed to the Hon. Mr Dunn, who persuaded me, that a far simpler method of doing this was to put in the Bill provision for retrospectivity to 1 January 1983.

To lay persons such as myself and the Hon. Mr Dunn that is as far simpler, but possibly less technical way, of handling this matter. I appreciate the honourable member's suggestion and indicate that in Committee I will consider it favourably. It was never the Government's intention to go back to 1979, or to deprive anybody of any benefit received in the period between 1979 and this date.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Received, or were entitled to receive?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Hon. Mr Griffin says 'Received, or entitled to receive?' I do not think we should go into that matter, because who was entitled to what, or whether anybody was entitled to anything is arguable. What we are doing in effect is ruling the page off on 31 December 1982 and starting afresh. I hope that that clears up the honourable member's question. If it does not, I will answer more fully in Committee any further questions that he raises.

The second contentious issue raised was that of the prescribed rate. As I mentioned before, compensation paid to people injured in the bushfires in February 1981 was at a figure that the State Government Insurance Commission thought an appropriate amount based on average earnings of the people concerned. The amount payable to unemployed people was based on 50 per cent of the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for average weekly earnings at that time. That formula, I suppose, was as good as any. It seemed to me fairly arbitrary, but as there was no provision in the legislation for a prescribed amount I am sure that the S.G.I.C. approached that problem in a fair and proper manner.

There were few claims resulting from that bushfire. In 1983 there were many more claims. In all fairness to the S.G.I.C., it approached the Government and said that there was no prescribed figure for pay-outs of compensation for C.F.S. volunteers who were injured. It said that the premiums paid were rather low and it wanted to get things in order to enable it to do some accurate costing on this matter, as insurers are entitled to do. It said that it would then consider whether it wished to continue insuring C.F.S. volunteers in the present way.

The Government, not wishing to put an unfair burden on the S.G.I.C., and not wishing to be unfair to C.F.S.

volunteers who had compensation claims arising from injuries sustained during the bushfire, has arrived at a formula which I will now explain. It looked at various figures that might be appropriate when paying the injured (for example, the fire fighters award), and thought that it might be appropriate to take a rate from that award. Again, that was fairly arbitrary, because there was not necessarily any connection between the fire-fighters award and the occupations of C.F.S. volunteers. That idea was discarded. The best the Government could come up with (and I think that this is fair to all) was that any C.F.S. volunteer who was injured would be paid at the rate of the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for average weekly earnings, and the S.G.I.C. has agreed to pay out at that figure.

However, some people earn more than that, and they would be deprived of a part of their livelihood if they were injured in a bushfire. It seems unfair to the Government and to the Hon. Mr Dunn that volunteers should be deprived of the income they would have received had they not volunteered and been injured. Thus, the Government, with the agreement of S.G.I.C., decided on the base as set out in the second reading explanation of \$314.50. In addition, it was decided that the Government would supplement the statutory benefits or weekly earnings loss through injury for employed and self-employed volunteers and that a preliminary allocation of \$50 000 would be made for this purpose from general revenue. The Government believed that that was probably the best way to go about it, in fairness to the volunteers who were injured and S.G.I.C., which has a very modest premium income in regard to this insurance. The Government is to pick up its share of the load.

The Hon. H.P.K. Dunn: Is that a one-off situation?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I believe so. We appreciate that there is some urgency in this matter, because people are being paid a lower rate at present. The Government certainly does not intend to inflict any further hardship on people who have been injured. Therefore, it is in the process of establishing a working party to consider further action in this area. Some of the issues the working party should consider are: the present legislative approach to both purely voluntary firefighters and C.F.S. and emergency services personnel; the level of compensation to be paid to such persons to ensure equitable and adequate compensation for injury; the need to establish a disaster fund from which such compensation should be paid; the level and sources of contributions to be paid thereto; the arrangements necessary with respect to the handling of claims; the relationship, if any, between the recommended scheme and the Workers Compensation Act; and any other relevant issues.

While the arrangements under this legislation will satisfactorily deal with this situation, I assure the Hon. Mr Dunn and the Council that an inquiry into the whole area will be established so that we do not have to rely on *ad hoc* legislation of this nature: rather, we can rely on well thought out and appropriate legislation in this rather difficult area.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: If there is a problem (not necessarily in regard to fire but some other problem involving the C.F.S.) between now and the conclusion of the review, will you make the same payments to ensure that people above average weekly earnings get their full entitlement?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: This is hypothetical, and I cannot give that assurance. Certainly, people who volunteer to do extremely dangerous and useful work, in my opinion and in the opinion of the Government, should not be disadvantaged by their act. I cannot give the honourable member a guarantee on any situation, because the circumstances surrounding such a claim could vary enormously. I am not in a position to do that except in regard to a specific example which I could take to the Government for an opinion. Regarding this emergency situation and this Bill,

because people are suffering a lower level of compensation, the Government would like—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Wouldn't it be easier to accept an amendment that would provide the ordinary workers compensation factor as a part—

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If it was as simple as that, it would have been done. I point out that the Workers Compensation Act does not provide at present for full average earnings. Even so, one of the issues that the working party will consider is the relationship, if any, between the recommended scheme and the Workers Compensation Act. This is a matter for the future. I have conceded that the legislation is *ad hoc* in overcoming this problem. No one will be disadvantaged by the Bill; in fact, some people will be in a better position because of it. The S.G.I.C. is happy about the rate of compensation that it will have to pay out, although I am quite sure that it will lose on the deal. The Government has decided to pay the gap, if any, between the amount paid by S.G.I.C. and a person's average weekly earnings. I commend the second reading to the Council.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN: I move:

Page 1, lines 16 and 17—Leave out 'Thirteenth day of September 1979' and insert 'First day of January 1983'.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Government is happy to accept this amendment on the basis of the advice that has been provided. It in no way alters the intent of the retrospective clause.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3—'Compensation.'

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I must express some concern in relation to this clause. I accept that at present people are not entitled to anything, and that the amounts paid out in regard to the previous Ash Wednesday fires were almost *ex gratia* payments by S.G.I.C., because there was really no prescribed rate.

In those circumstances a precedent was set, although it is not one that should be applied. Although the Government has indicated that it will provide sufficient funds to bring these people up to their normal wage level, it should be done only on the basis of the provisions of the Workers Compensation Act; that is, the normal provisions with a reduction after a certain period. It should not be based on 100 per cent of average weekly earnings. That matter is now under consideration by this Council. It is only that aspect that I would support.

The problem is that we will leave the situation open and, if any C.F.S. person is injured prior to completion of the review, any adjustment of the amount payable will depend on the goodwill of the Government. The Minister cannot provide an assurance, and there is need for urgent action to ensure a satisfactory position and that this situation does not recur, because we could be restricting people by this provision. I would have preferred a provision operating in such a way that ordinary workers compensation provisions applied to the prescribed amount. There may be some difficulties because of the way in which compensation premiums have been set out by S.G.I.C.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It may not accept them.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: It has problems outside this provision. Therefore, I see a need for urgent action because the C.F.S. is not necessarily involved in fires. It can be involved in other community problems—

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Chemical hazards.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Exactly. I saw at Port Wakefield real trouble that could have involved C.F.S. personnel. The C.F.S. could have been wide open. The sooner the

revision is completed and S.G.I.C. decides on rates, the better it will be.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WORKERS COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 May. Page 1453.)

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The Government has really excelled itself in this short Bill, which contains 13 clauses, 10 of which are bad. In the main, the Bill covers three principles.

1. It seeks to include overtime and site allowance in the computation of average weekly earnings.

2. In respect of work-induced hearing loss, it removes the 10 per cent threshold and removes the requirement that claims must be made within two years of the retirement of the worker.

3. It takes away the requirement that after 26 weeks 5 per cent of the weekly payment shall be paid into the Workers Rehabilitation Assistance Fund, and that 5 per cent of certain lump-sum payments will be paid into the same fund.

Let me look first at the provisions which include overtime and site allowance in the computation of average weekly earnings. On the merits, this is completely untenable. Site allowance is paid as compensation for the very real inconvenience and expense which certain workers incur while on site. If they are unfortunately injured and are receiving compensation, they are not incurring the inconvenience of the costs and they should not receive the allowance. Overtime is very properly earned by one's working the additional hours. A worker who is injured and who is paid compensation is not involved in this extra exertion. The South Australian costs of workers compensation are far ahead of the other mainland States.

The figures in other States are as follows: in Victoria, the adult rate of compensation is \$147 a week plus \$42 for a spouse allowance and \$14 for each dependent child (maximum of two); maximum weekly payment \$218, or average weekly earnings, including overtime, whichever is the less. In New South Wales for the first 26 weeks it is current weekly award rates for occupation, excluding overtime or over-award payments, etc. If no award, it is the amount prescribed by the commission (at present \$237). After 26 weeks, it is an amount prescribed by the commission. From 1 April 1983, the prescribed amount is \$133.80 maximum, which is an enormous drop after 26 weeks.

In Queensland, for the first 26 weeks it is the award rate of pay or, when not under an award, average weekly earnings, including everything, or \$259, whichever is the less. After the first 26 weeks, it is the equivalent of guaranteed minimum wage at present \$170.40—an enormous drop; dependent wife \$28.95 and each dependent child (no limit to number) \$11.95, but not to exceed the award rate of pay. In Western Australia, it is the normal rate of pay under the industrial award for hours worked; overtime or other allowances are not included. When not under an award, one must try to relate to an award for that occupation; if not possible, the normal weekly wage applies. Overtime and allowances are specifically excluded. In Tasmania, average weekly earnings apply or the award rate, whichever is the higher.

In 1982, when the Bill to amend the principal Act was introduced, the Government sought to make compensation 95 per cent of average weekly earnings. This was still generous

in relation to the position in other States. The Hon. Lance Milne proposed the compromise amendment which led to the present state of the Act. I oppose strongly any departure from this. This and the other proposed amendments would increase the already disproportionate high cost of workers compensation in South Australia by about 15 per cent, which of course will be completely disastrous to industry, to development and, above all, to employment in this State.

The present Bill, with its very generous scale of compensation, may be worthy of consideration in times of plenty, but it is disastrous in the present state of the economy. The A.L.P. seems to be hell bent on squeezing every cent out of the employer for those who are employed, but it completely ignores the effect of its policies on employment. It thereby disregards those unfortunate people who will be unemployed because of the demands of those who are in employment.

One of the problems associated with the level of compensation that is proposed in the Bill is, of course, that there may be little incentive for a worker on compensation to go back to work. In some industries where there is seasonal overtime a worker may, of course, lose money by going back to work.

I next turn to the question of hearing loss. The second reading explanation emphasised that hearing loss is a very serious disability. There is no dispute about that. However, at the lower end of the scale of hearing loss it is very difficult to determine whether or not the hearing loss is work induced. Most people from middle age on suffer some degree of age induced hearing loss. If sensible provisions are not enforced, we could well end up with most of the community receiving compensation for hearing loss—again, a luxury that we cannot afford at this time.

In 1982 the then Government, in its Bill, sought a threshold of 20 per cent, but the Government accepted an amendment moved by the Hon. Mr Milne, again out of his compassion, I am sure, for disadvantaged people, to reduce the threshold to 10 per cent. To do away with the threshold altogether is to give compensation to people whose hearing loss is not work induced.

The previous Government's 1982 Bill again sought to confine claims for hearing loss to those made within one year after retirement. That seemed to the then Government to be entirely reasonable. However, again the Hon. Mr Milne extended this to two years, and I am quite happy about that. But, particularly because of the prevalence of hearing loss in middle aged and older people and the difficulty of determining whether or not it is work induced, to remove any time limit altogether is ridiculous.

Thirdly, the Bill takes away the requirement of 5 per cent of compensation after 26 weeks (and members will know that in some other States the rate is reduced after 26 weeks, but not here) being paid into the Workers Rehabilitation Assistance Fund. This proposal in the Bill is not reasonable. In view of the high level of compensation and the fact that it is not reduced in South Australia after 26 weeks, the requirement of the present Act is perfectly proper.

The Bill also seeks to remove the compulsory elements in regard to rehabilitation. I cannot understand this. An honest worker—and most of them are—prepared to make use of the rehabilitation facilities has nothing to fear.

Clause 12, enabling sporting umpires and referees to have the benefit of workers compensation, is the only really good part of the Bill. This clause is a shining light in a sea of darkness. There is no doubt that umpires should have the same right as sportsmen. If this Bill is defeated—and I hope that it will be—I would support a Bill which the Government might introduce specifically to give this protection to umpires or referees. If this were not done, I would be happy to introduce a private member's Bill to cater for sporting umpires and referees.

I make one comment about clause 7 of the Bill, which deals with the hearing loss threshold issue—and therefore I disagree with it. However, I always try to co-operate with the Government, and I point out to the Attorney-General that there appears to be (and I hope that his colleague will pass this on) a defect in drafting in this clause that will need to be changed. Clause 7 of the Bill strikes out subsection (5a) of section 69 of the principal Act, but would leave subsection (5) of section 69, as amended in the 1982 Act reading:

The worker shall, subject to subsection (5a), be entitled . . .

And yet subsection (5a) is struck out by this Bill. Obviously, there is a difficulty there. This clause also should have been struck out and replaced. The Bill should have addressed subsection (5) as well as subsection (5a).

In conclusion, I cannot support this Bill, for the reasons that I have given. It will increase to ridiculous levels the already high cost of workers compensation. It will worsen South Australia's competitiveness in regard to development and employment at a time when we can least afford this. At a time when the Government ought to be fostering employment and development, it gives a strong disincentive to maintaining or increasing employment. For these reasons, I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 11 May. Page 1448.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Let me put on record the procedures which were followed in the formulation of the State Budget. The preparation of a Budget usually starts in about December or January preceding the August date when it is to be presented to Parliament. Departments are asked to provide to Treasury an indication of their claims for the next ensuing financial year. Treasury then examines the departmental claims. There is a response from Treasury, and ordinarily there will be a series of negotiations between departmental officers and Treasury before the Budget is in a form to go to Cabinet for approval for introduction.

Under the Liberal Government, after the first Budget which we introduced (essentially the Budget of the Corcoran Administration), we established a Budget Review Committee of Ministers and, as part of the formulation of the Budget, the Budget Review Committee was charged with the responsibility for personally interviewing departmental officers with respect to their claims, and then with respect to the allocation that was being recommended by the Treasury for Cabinet.

The Budget Review Committee of Ministers generally started this work in late April or early May and worked fairly consistently for several months prior to the Budget being submitted to Cabinet. Then, after the Budget review consideration, the Budget was put into a formal context and submitted to the Cabinet through the Treasurer for approval at about the end of July.

Some four weeks after approval, the Budget was introduced by the State Treasurer. Treasury advice to the former Government was that a minimum of four weeks was required between formal approval of the Budget by Cabinet and its introduction. The Budget papers had to be printed by Treasury officers, corrected and then reprinted before submission to Parliament. A lot of work is done behind the scenes by

Treasury officers between Cabinet approval of the Budget and its presentation to Parliament. The 1982-83 Budget went through that tortuous process and was finalised at the end of July 1982.

The information used to prepare the Budget was essentially based on historical information and experience, but it endeavoured to predict the trends and unusual items of receipts or expenditure that might be incurred during the 1982-83 financial year. Because of the time constraints, it was not possible to make any amendments between the time Cabinet gave its approval and its introduction into Parliament. It is most unusual even to contemplate an amendment to a Budget while it is before Parliament. All Budgets, because of a number of factors, are subject to fluctuations in receipts and expenditure. Seasonal adjustments may be necessary on both sides of the Budget.

Those adjustments may be up or down, and the predictions can vary from month to month. Early in the financial year it is difficult to make precise predictions. The former Government held monthly meetings of the Budget Review Committee to monitor the Budget's progress and to make adjustments as they became necessary. The further we get into a financial year the better able we are to predict the result for that year. There is a longer historical period upon which to base predictions for a much shorter forward period, that is, the balance of the financial year.

The former Government has been criticised for not making provision for the drought. At the end of July last year, although the position was a matter of concern in some rural areas, it was not evident that we would have the disastrous drought which finally became apparent in the latter part of 1982. It was not possible even in July to predict that the pumping costs for Murray River water would be so high because of the lack of rain in the latter winter months.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Spring rains have helped.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Yes, and the autumn rains have dramatically changed the rural outlook and Adelaide's water supply situation—so much so that one can see how climatic changes can affect a Budget. I have no doubt at all that, because of these winter rains, the present Government will adjust its Budget for this year to take into account increased earnings for the State as a result of a much better season than would have been possible if those rains had not occurred.

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: Do you think railway revenue will increase, too?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Not country railway revenue, because our country rail services were sold to the Commonwealth in the mid-1970s. Marine and Harbors port charges may increase the amount of revenue because of the increased grain flowing through South Australian ports.

The seasonal conditions that were so disastrous towards the end of last year were not so obvious when the Budget was being formulated in July 1982. Therefore, no criticism can be levelled at the former Government for not accurately predicting the results of the drought. It is easy to be wise after the event. We will see whether the present Government is able to make more accurate weather predictions as it formulates its Budgets for the short time that it will be in office.

The Budget Estimates Committees had a great deal of information before them. As I said in an earlier debate today, they had before them more information in relation to State financial affairs than did any other Government in Australia. The then Leader of the Opposition applauded the fact that the Budget Estimates Committees were to be established, and said that programme performance budgeting with all its information was to be supported.

If the Budget Estimates Committees did not satisfy the former Opposition, it has only itself to blame. Opposition

members had all the information required. Obviously, they did not do their homework or did not know which questions to ask. The facility was there and it was up to individual members how they used that facility.

As I have said, my experience as a Minister in relation to Budget Estimates Committees was that many members of the former Opposition were more interested in using the committees as a forum for criticising the Government rather than obtaining information about the estimates and projections of income and expenditure within the State. I understand that the Senate Estimates Committees in Canberra work much more effectively because they are not treated as exercises to embarrass a Government or to take points on policy issues; rather, they are regarded as a means of obtaining information about financial income and expenditure.

Although the Premier professed ignorance about the condition of the Treasury soon after his election, I believe it was a hollow criticism, because all the information was available to him. The Premier is at fault if he could not use those facilities. The former Opposition's criticism of the Liberal Government is quite unwarranted and without substance.

The present Government can assist its Budget situation by reversing its decision to increase the public sector workforce and place more work back into Government hands. It can do as the Liberal Government did and reduce the public sector workforce. Some 4 500 public sector jobs were reduced by attrition over a three-year period. It can put out work to the private sector construction industry. This also applies to other work which can be done more effectively and at less cost in a competitive private atmosphere than it can by a sheltered public sector workforce.

The Government should give attention to smaller Government in many respects, particularly in the area of de-regulation. Whilst the Attorney-General has indicated no prior knowledge of the Commonwealth Government's proposals for further regulation of companies, I would be appalled if any of those provisions came into effect in Australia. If any example is needed of a burden to the private sector, that is a prime example, involving enthusiastic over-regulation and over-burdening of the private sector.

I suggest also that the Government could eliminate some red tape. I understand that the Minister for Environment and Planning was having his officers do some work on the National Parks and Wildlife Act. Under that Act one has to fill out a form for just about anything. My children have two tortoises. Initially we had to get a permit to purchase them and have to pay \$4. Every year I get a form from the National Parks and Wildlife Service asking me to fill out the return and advise what has happened to the tortoises.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: You tell them that they are doing very well, thank you?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Every time I send the form back I put a protest on the bottom asking whether it is all really necessary for two tortoises. They send me the form and I send it back with some information. They then send me an application for a renewal of the licence. I send that back and they then send me a licence. I became somewhat concerned about this and suggested to the then Minister that he do something about removing this over-regulation. He promised to do something about it. When the election was called, regrettably nothing had been done. I hope that the present Government will take up that point and give some attention to removing some of that excessive red tape. I suggest that that sort of paperwork is totally unnecessary. Why should we engage public servants on that task when they could be doing much better things with their time?

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Like preparing answers to your questions.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Yes, they could be better occupied preparing answers to my questions.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Did the tortoise saga happen during your three years in Government?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: No, they were purchased during the life of the previous Labor Government.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: But you did not repeal that legislation?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am not criticising either Government. I raised it with the previous Minister and he undertook to do something about it. His department was in the process of reviewing all the forms but unfortunately any changes had not got to the point of being promulgated. I am suggesting that the area ought to be examined closely as I am sure we can eliminate much of that paper shuffling to achieve better use of public servants' time.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: What happens when the children start breeding tortoises and go into business selling Australian wildlife?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: The interesting question is whether it is wildlife. Why should a Government be policing whether or not one breeds one or two tortoises and whether one gives them away or sells them? The Government should only be concerned with the conservation of native flora and fauna. If someone happens to acquire a tortoise through legitimate channels, why does one have to have a licence? Let us not explore this area too much as it is very minor.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It is the most interesting thing I have heard on the Appropriation Bill. You have got me in.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I hope that the Minister will look carefully at the matter. The Liberal Government wanted to eliminate the areas of over-regulation and unnecessary licensing in the Department of Industrial Affairs. Cyclical billing was introduced. We were introducing a composite form of—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: One-stop shopping.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Yes, one-stop shopping for renewal of all licences and eliminating licences which were totally unnecessary. That is a good policy for the Labor Government to pick up and follow. I hope it will do it in all areas of government.

In government, once a form is initiated, people do not think about whether it is still needed. It is accepted that that form is sent out on an annual or triennial basis. It does not matter whether or not the information is useful. I am not critical of public servants for that. It is easy to get into the position of not critically examining the need for licences or forms and the object for which the information is being sought. It is an observation which needs to be picked up. Whilst it will not have a large impact on the Budget, it can be one of the factors which contribute to keeping staff resources and costs down or making those resources available to other and more appropriate needs of government.

The other area to which the Government can give greater emphasis is that of resource development. I am pleased to see that the Government has continued to support the Roxby Downs development, which will mean a significant number of jobs being created for South Australians. We will also have the royalties which the mine will produce. In addition to the direct jobs being created, as we have explored on many occasions, many indirect jobs will flow from resource development.

Varying multiplier ratios are quoted from time to time but the most commonly used is for four indirect jobs for every one direct job. That has spin-off benefits for the Government, not only through royalties but also through pay-roll tax and other revenues associated with a large population such as that which would be involved directly or indirectly in the Roxby Downs development. I also suggest

that the Government needs to pursue other areas of resource and industry development and expand its mineral and oil exploration. One recognises that there is some lead time with some of the major projects but, unless we plan now, a Government cannot hope to make progress some years down the line.

I am disappointed that the Government did not take the opportunity to allow the Honeymoon project (with something like 100 direct and indirect jobs) to proceed and recommended that the Beverley uranium project—

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: The socialist, Mr Mitterand, might solve that for us.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: He is certainly very much in favour of uranium development. When he was campaigning he committed the socialist Government in France to reducing the emphasis and reliance on nuclear energy. For the first year there was a slight reduction in emphasis but subsequently the projects in France to develop uranium energy sources accelerated. He still has a commitment to generate some 70 per cent of electric energy needs for France from nuclear power.

The Hon. R.C. DeGaris: Mr Mitterand told Mr Hayden he wanted our uranium.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: He did, and I hope Mr Hayden has considered that request and will make every post a winning post in endeavouring to gain commercial contracts for the sale of uranium ore to France. The other area in which the French have an interest is uranium enrichment. The French have a process of enrichment different from the British and American ones. They, equally, are interested in uranium enrichment facilities being established in Australia.

Before the last State election South Australia was one of two States considered as a site for the establishment of that industry, which, from memory, would have provided about 5 000 jobs in the successful State.

I suggest that the Government needs to place much greater emphasis on mineral and oil exploration. For the record, and I have quoted these figures on previous occasions, mineral exploration expenditure in 1981 in South Australia was \$51 100 000, which was \$20 000 000 more than in 1980 and almost five times the expenditure in 1979. The number of mineral exploration licences in Australia at the end of 1981 was 466, 393 more than at the end of June 1979. Those licences were held by 92 companies, more than double the number of companies involved in mineral exploration in South Australia at the end of June 1979. Off-shore petroleum expenditure commitments towards the end of 1982 for the following six years totalled something over \$130 000 000.

On-shore, in the Cooper Basin and elsewhere, exploration and development commitments totalled about \$200 000 000. There was, during the past three years, an expansion in manufacturing and mining investment in South Australia from about \$300 000 000 in October 1979 to something in excess of \$3 480 000 000 as at December 1981. I think that there are some more up-to-date figures and that in June 1982 the figure had increased to \$4 030 000 000 for projected investment expenditure in South Australia. All of these infrastructures will encourage other development in South Australia and will provide jobs and direct and indirect revenue for the State.

I urge the present State Government to get on with the job and to develop South Australia and get on with some of the initiatives it has promised but which it has not yet honoured. It will be interesting to note the way in which the Government honours or dishonours its 1982 election promises with respect to the creation of jobs. It has got \$5 000 000 from the Commonwealth for job creation schemes, but we have not seen any more emphasis than

that by the State Government on private sector job creation schemes. We have seen a fizzle in the Ramsay Trust, we have not yet seen the Enterprise Fund, and we have seen a promise (made before 6 November 1982) that there will be no tax increases for three years. However, there has already been a remarkable 'about turn' on this. In the context of that Appropriation Bill and supplementary Supply Bill I put on record that there is considerable concern within the Opposition about the way in which the present Government is handling the affairs of Government. It is not keeping a tight rein on Government expenditure. It is not getting on with the job of developing South Australia and creating long-lasting job opportunities for South Australians. It seems to be devoid of the will to get on with putting South Australia back where it belongs—that is, well up the ladder in the prosperity and job stakes in Australia. I support the Bill.

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: I will not speak at length on this Appropriation Bill, which highlights the extreme difficulty of the financial position facing South Australia. No member in this Chamber would disagree with that statement. What concerns me is that some honourable members speaking to the Bill are placing the blame for this financial difficulty firmly on the shoulders of the present Government or, on the other hand, placing responsibility firmly on the shoulders of the previous Government. In my Address in Reply speech I expressed my view that both major political Parties made promises to the electorate at the last election that they could not fulfil. I believe that to be the truth of the matter. I also said that the A.L.P. promises were more expensive than those made by the Liberal Party. I believe that also to be the truth of the matter. Part of the Budget over-run must be accepted by the present Government and part must be accepted as the responsibility of the previous Government. Also, part of the over-run is the result of severe drought and natural disasters.

I do not intend segregating various items to place figures on the various parts. There are one or two points I wish to stress. The first is to describe to the Council what I see as the pernicious doctrine of mandate which has been developing in recent years. This doctrine of mandate is particularly pernicious when it is seen in a Westminster system of Party politics, combined with the presidential style elections that have been developing at both State and Federal level. At least in the presidential American style the Parliament still holds the Executive responsible, and the Parliaments still ensure that the perniciousness of mandate is not as severe as in the Westminster system. The present mandate has two conceptions:

1. Unless some act of policy has been clearly stated to the electorate in advance of a general election, the Government of the day has no authority to execute it.
2. Any far-reaching proposal in an election speech not only authorises the Government to fulfil that proposal but instructs it to carry it out.

Either interpretation of this doctrine deprives Parliament of its sovereign right to exercise judgment. It has been the main problem we have faced. A government makes promises with the idea of gaining votes in an election. It then has to fulfil all of those promises irrespective of the difficulties that may eventuate from the adoption of those promises. Not only is the Government caught in this trap, but the Opposition usually keeps harping on the question of broken promises, thus forcing the Government to carry out that mandate.

The policy of the previous Government was to reduce taxation, reduce the size of government, allow the private sector to develop more strongly, and I strongly support that general principle. But, in fulfilling that promise, that Gov-

ernment was forced to absorb, in every Budget, large sums of capital to meet its current Budget deficit. I was the only Liberal in this Council who drew attention to this point. It is true that, as far as I can research, it is the first time that a Government has absorbed such large sums from capital in each of its Budgets.

There is no doubt now that this Government, faced with the problem of that inheritance and with the problem of its philosophy (that is, its continuing belief in the growth of the public sector) is also faced with extremely difficult budgetary problems. I do not intend speaking at great length on this problem, except to say that the time has come for Parliament to take a more active role in preventing what I see and have described as the pernicious doctrine of mandate. I have already mentioned in the previous debates that the American States now all have either constitutional or statutory provisions to prevent Governments from continually absorbing capital funds to balance recurrent deficits.

The provisions vary from State to State; nevertheless, action has been taken to ensure that Governments are controlled in this regard. I believe that it is time that we as a Parliament considered those proposals. The Hon. Mr Davis stated that he does not believe that the Parliament should move in this regard, because there may be times, such as in regard to a natural disaster, where a Government has to absorb capital funds to meet a recurrent deficit in the Budget. That is quite a reasonable statement. Most of the American States say, 'Yes, that is quite okay. You can absorb capital if you so desire to balance the Budget. But it must be returned by an increase in taxation the following year.'

I have said that the philosophy of reducing taxation and reducing the size of government is one that I support, but if that is to be achieved we need to press for what I will term the privatisation of many of our activities. Reducing taxation and at the same time maintaining the size of Government is not a possibility. The previous Government did try to undo some of the knots in this puzzle and considered the Frozen Food Factory and Monarto. But to reduce taxation and fund the Budget by capital absorption cannot be justified. The present Government must come to grips with its own philosophic dilemmas. Some of the developments taking place in the States of Canada, for example, could well be investigated for introduction here. I refer of course to the privatisation of many activities, particularly in regard to oil exploration, pipeline construction, and so on.

There are very many areas of Government activity in which one could consider moves to the private sector, with a great deal of advantage to the State's economy. I know that this will be anathema to the present Government, but, if we are to see greater efficiency with strong economic recovery, such policies must be undertaken, or at least investigated. We should consider moving a whole range of Government activities to the private sector. Even if the Government has 50 per cent shareholding in some of these activities, we must consider what I term the question of privatisation to overcome Government expenditure.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: In what areas particularly?

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: One could refer to ETSA, the Pipelines Authority, Woods and Forests, and even education. We should consider whether Government activity is efficient. One could consider a tremendous range of activities in regard to privatisation. I do not wish to be difficult, but I read what the Hon. Mr Cameron stated in this regard, and I hope that in reply the Attorney-General will make some comment on this matter. I am puzzled by the following statement of the Hon. Mr Cameron:

But, more than raising the tax burden, the A.L.P. mortgaged the future of South Australians by increasing our State's indebtedness in all but one year of its government. In other words, for

nearly a decade our borrowings grew and grew in an effort to fund Government activities.

Under the Liberal Government, reliance on borrowings fell. Indeed, borrowings as a proportion of total outlays declined substantially. In 1970-71, under Labor, borrowings were 20 per cent of all outlays, yet in the three full years of Liberal Government this figure was cut to an average of just over 9 per cent.

That is difficult to follow, because I understand that the loan raisings of the Government are from the Loan Council, on semi-government borrowings, ETSA loans, Housing Trust loans, and comparable State housing agreements. I understand that the Hon. Mr Cameron is saying that, in approaching the Loan Council, the State did not take up the Loan funds that were available to it. If that is the case, it is a serious charge against the Liberal Government.

Having been involved in government for some time, I know that, when the States go to Canberra to argue their case before the Loan Council, no State says, 'You are giving us too much. We will not take as much this year.' The States argue for the best share of the available Loan funds that they can get.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: The point is that we did not get as much as we expected to get.

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: That is probably so. The point I make is that surely the Liberal Government in South Australia did not fail to take up the available resources, which is what the Hon. Mr Cameron stated. Further, it is quite fallacious to compare total outlay to moneys borrowed. Variations occur in State borrowings. For example, ETSA could borrow a large sum but may not spend the money in the next two years. In comparison to actual outlays, that is quite a fallacious figure. I am concerned that, if the Liberal Government did not do its best in regard to taking the borrowings that were available to it, we should know about it and we should know why it did that. I do not believe that that was the case.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: Dr Tonkin said that he tried very hard.

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: The former Premier stated that he battled very hard to gain every possible penny from Loan funds. I know that Premiers fight to the best of their ability in relation to a State's share of Loan funds. Therefore, I do not understand what the Hon. Mr Cameron referred to. I would like further explanation and I hope that the Attorney-General will consider those figures.

In concluding, I draw attention to my Budget speeches of the past three years. I said on one occasion that the Budget was a sad document. One can say also that this document before us is a sad document. While this Government must accept some of the blame, previous Governments and the Parliament itself must accept their share of blame also. I support the second reading.

The Hon C.W. CREEDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CASINO BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly with the following amendments:

No. 1. Clause 11, page 4, after line 33—Insert new subclause as follows:

(3a) The authority may, if requested to do so by a person who has been required to answer a question by the authority or who has produced books, papers or documents to the authority, by order prohibit the publication in any newspaper or by radio or television of the name of that person, any answer given by him in proceedings before the authority or the contents of any book, paper or document produced by him to the authority and a person who fails to comply with the order shall be guilty of an offence. Penalty: Ten thousand dollars.

No. 2. New clause:

Page 6, after line 19—Insert new clause as follows:

16a. Where a person (other than the person who is operating the casino) purchases gambling chips to use in an authorised game he must, before the chips are delivered to him, pay for them in full by bank-note or coin.

No. 3. Clause 19, page 7, lines 24 and 25—Leave out subclause (5) and insert the following subclause:

(5) The commission shall pay moneys paid to it in respect of the operation of the casino as follows:

- (a) an amount that is not less than one per centum of the net gambling revenue of the casino must be paid to the Housing Improvement Fund;
- (b) the balance of those moneys, if any, must be paid into general revenue.

Consideration in Committee.

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

This is a good amendment as it provides a necessary safeguard, and I urge the Committee to accept it.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

This amendment is designed to stop people cashing cheques at the casino if they lose and are chasing their losses. It is a sensible amendment. I do not believe that one can go to a casino and cash a cheque in order to play at the table. I would imagine that a casino deals strictly in cash, and this amendment spells out clearly that the casino must deal only with cash. The amendment is sensible, and I urge the Committee to support it.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Can the Minister advise the Committee whether the provisions of this clause are common to most casinos in the Western world?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Not having been in most casinos in the Western world, I find that question difficult to answer. Common sense tells me that the chances of my walking into a casino and having a cheque cashed so that I can play the tables are remote. That would be highly undesirable. Another place has amended the Bill to make it mandatory that no cheques are cashed in the casino. It is an excellent amendment and, although I am not an habitue of casinos, I urge the Committee to support the amendment.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I question the wisdom of this amendment. Although the Minister cannot be expected to say whether or not casinos in the Western world lay down this practice, more and more tourists visiting Australia do not carry bank notes or coin with them—the trend throughout the world is to credit cards and travellers cheques.

There is no doubt that the amount of coin carried by people seeking entertainment (particularly, I am thinking of tourists) is becoming less and less. If tourists come to Australia, if we want to attract them to Adelaide to enjoy this proposed casino and all that it has to offer, if those tourists ascertain, as they probably will in their travel brochures and other pamphlets, that a specific feature of the Adelaide casino is that one has to take coin or bank notes there, and if in the other casinos in Australia normal credit facilities are provided and cheques and travellers cheques are accepted in the casino, I think that the tourist invariably would go where the more modern practice applies.

I wonder whether, if we are going to have a casino, we want to put this kind of leg rope on it, because it will denigrate it and almost make it a laughing stock if it stands on its own in regard to this requirement when compared with other casinos in Australia. I would like, therefore, to ascertain from the Government—this is now, I understand, deemed to be a Government Bill in this place—how this requirement stands up to the practice adopted, for example,

in Hobart, Alice Springs and Darwin. It is a most unusual requirement, in my view.

We are dealing with an operation which involves people of considerable means. People who seek casino gambling as a sport and a recreation generally speaking are people who are not accustomed to carrying bank notes or coin. Therefore, we are limiting the potential casino as a revenue-producing entity for the State—and that is one of its objectives, of course. It is a means through tourism and patronage to bring in income for the State. We are limiting that in a ridiculous way by putting in this requirement.

When one considers what will happen if this restriction remains, one can see that the patron will have to be chasing around (possibly at the hotel desk, if this casino is housed within a hotel complex) to obtain coin for use, not in the hotel operation but downstairs in the casino. That is what will happen, so what is the benefit?

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Don't go through it again, Murray, please.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: It is not a question of going through it again. If Parliament wants a casino—and by the vote in both Houses it appears that that is the case—surely measures should not be placed within the legislation at this late point which might make us a laughing stock.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: You have just explained how they can get around it.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Is that good legislation? If one expects that they can get around it, what is the point in putting it there? Why does one cause the patron to walk 50 metres and inconvenience the hotel staff in an activity that is none of their concern? So, is it not quite ridiculous when one pauses and thinks about what we are doing? I suggest that we ought to send it back to the other House. It is reasonable to expect this House to look at these questions with some sanity, surely. The question in the other place must have been emotional—people were speaking for hours on end.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: We put it in for very good reason.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: I am sorry. I did not hear. I will ask the Minister again: first, what is the reason; secondly, how will our casino measure up to others in Australia on this point?

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The answer is that I really have no idea, except that common sense tells me that one cannot walk into a casino and cash a cheque. The measure is there to stop people going there, in the unlikely event that they could cash a cheque in the casino, to chase losses. If it means that one has to go outside to acquire some more cash in order to come back in, maybe the fresh air will bring a little sanity. The measure was put in by a very concerned member in the House of Assembly. I appreciate totally what he did; it is a credit to him. I urge the Committee to support it.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: I challenge the statement that in any casino one cannot cash a cheque. I was in the casino in Darwin two or three years ago when an associate of mine ran out of money temporarily and simply went to some authority within that casino (I assume to the counter where he got his chips), made arrangements with a cheque, and came back with more chips. It was as simple as that. We want to be sure about whether or not this applies elsewhere. That is only one example. I have not been involved with this kind of gambling in other casinos where people I know have run out of chips and have had to make other arrangements. I do not know the position, but I should not be expected to ascertain it; the Government, which has the Bill and is in charge of it, should know these facts.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: The original question, as I understood it, was whether a similar provision exists in casinos

elsewhere. I am advised by a well informed colleague (certainly not by myself) that similar provisions do exist in Manila, Baguio, Hong Kong and Macau. I cannot speak as an expert in this matter of casinos overseas, but I am informed, as I said, by a colleague that they exist in those four casinos elsewhere. I confess that when the question was first asked it raised a query in my mind but, having listened to the Minister's response and to my informed colleague telling me that similar provisions exist internationally, I am comforted that we would not be the odd casino out in this respect. I will support the provision.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. Frank Blevins: I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendment No. 3 be agreed to.

This amendment is one that I am happy to support. The proposition is that the revenue from the casino allocated through this amendment is revenue that will be derived from the operations of a casino owned by private enterprise in accordance with the spirit of the amendments moved to clause 16 by the Hon. Mr Lucas. It seems that if we want to start allocating revenue to one place or another into general revenue, to some extent that is not very meaningful because we could, if we wished, reduce the payment from general revenue to the Hospital Fund. I believe that at least one person in the House of Assembly was appeased by having this amendment incorporated. I can see no reason to delay the Committee any further. I am happy to support the amendment for what it is worth.

Motion carried.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

SURVEYORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: OODNADATTA

The House of Assembly transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

That portion of section 1184, north out of hundreds, set aside as a teamsters and travelling stock reserve as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on 8 December 1982, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1980.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: BALDINA

The House of Assembly transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

That the travelling stock reserve, sections 292, 293 and 294, hundred of Baldina as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on 5 October 1982, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1980.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1983)

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

**JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON
PARLIAMENTARY LAW, PRACTICE AND
PROCEDURES**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C.J. Sumner (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 1599.)

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): In responding to the debate on this motion to establish a joint select committee to look at law reform and the practice and procedures of Parliament, I thank honourable members for their general indication of support. I do not wish to respond at length in view of what appears to be general support for the motion. When the message is returned from the House of Assembly I will move that Joint Standing Order No. 6 be suspended to give the Chairman of the committee a deliberative as well as a casting vote.

If that were passed, the Government would agree to an equality of numbers on the select committee which would not have been possible, whilst also retaining a Government majority, had it not been passed. I will not deal with the matter at this stage, but will deal with it when the resolution is returned from the House of Assembly. I will be asking the Government to move in the House of Assembly a similar motion which will enable an equality of numbers. The Government would still have an inbuilt majority on the committee.

A number of issues are raised in relation to the committee. The Hon. Mr Griffin raised a number of these matters. He queried whether a law reform committee was appropriate. He tended to overlook that, ultimately, any law reform that comes about will be as a result of Parliamentary action, and it is very appropriate, in fact, that law reform matters should be dealt with by a law reform committee of the Parliament. I emphasise, as the Hon. Mr DeGaris did, that the motion, where it particularises certain issues, is not meant to be restrictive in any way. The general words are sufficient for the committee to inquire into other issues that are raised.

It is not my intention to be restrictive, but merely to direct attention of the committee to certain issues raised in this Council and in public debate in recent times and to review the experience of the Estimates Committees. There is no intention to restrict the nature of the committee to the matters specifically mentioned, although they will be considered.

The Hon. Mr Griffin mentioned the question of staff. That is a problem that the committee will have to consider, particularly in the current climate of severe budgetary and manpower restrictions in Government departments. This issue will have to be tackled at some stage. I hope that all members of the Parliament will adopt a reasonable attitude to the question of staffing. It is an important aspect which must be tempered by the current difficulties that the Government has with its budgetary position.

I look forward to support for this committee in the House of Assembly. I think that it could be significant, and I hope that it will be significant in terms of reform of Parliamentary procedures to make this pinnacle of democratic process work more effectively. I thank honourable members for their support.

The Hon. Mr Cameron's amendments negatived.
Motion carried.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 1609.)

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): In concluding this debate, I indicate that a number of fairly wild claims have been made by honourable members opposite in relation to the projected Budget deficit. I do not think that anyone in this Chamber would be under any illusion about the seriousness of this problem. For those honourable members who did not read it, I indicate that the second reading explanation sets out how the expected deficit of \$115 000 000 has arisen. It sets out the components that have contributed to the deterioration of \$73 000 000 from the Budget projections, that is, \$115 000 000 less than the planned deficit of \$42 000 000. This was set out in the second reading speech, and, if honourable members care to look through it, they will see that the great bulk of this overrun is comprised of factors beyond the Government's control.

Disaster relief and restoration comprised \$81 000 000 gross expenditure less \$58 000 000 recovered from the Commonwealth Government. This was not the fault of the Government. Pumping involved \$3 000 000 extra—again not the fault of the Government. Loss of woods and forests contribution amounted to \$4 000 000 and again one could hardly blame the Government for that. I refer also to loss of harbor revenues, \$3 000 000, less special Budget assistance from the Federal Government, \$10 000 000, resulting in a net addition in relation to national disasters of \$23 000 000.

The rest of the increase is made up by salaries and wages increases of \$14 000 000. No substantial across-the-board wage increases have been granted by the Labor Government since November. These increases came earlier than anticipated and would have occurred no matter what happened. Remission of the gas levy amounted to \$4 000 000. That, again, was an action taken by the previous Government.

There was a \$26 000 000 spill-over in departmental expenditure and advances. That included \$17 000 000 in the Health Commission. That overrun occurred because revenue in the Health Commission did not match expectations in terms of hospital fees. The problem there was that budget expectations were not met in terms of income. That \$26 000 000 spill-over in departmental expenditure did not occur because the Health Commission spent more than was budgeted for, as the Health Commission is on budget with its expenditure. What happened was that the Health Commission's income was \$17 000 000 less than was expected, so there was a \$17 000 000 deficit. That leaves other areas of spill-over in departmental expenditure of \$9 000 000.

Government policy might have contributed in regard to our manpower retention policies and the like. I do not want to run away from that fact. However, not all the deficit could have been avoided by other policies. About \$8 000 000 is attributed to election promises which were made by the Labor Party and which it has implemented. It is interesting to note in that respect that, had the Liberal Party been elected following the November election, such expenditures would have had to be made. According to Liberal Party costing at the last election, its promises would have cost \$13 000 000.

The Liberal Party promised electricity price concessions to pensioners, increased pay-roll tax exemption levels, and increased stamp duty exemptions on the first home. Had the Liberals been re-elected, there would have been an additional cost to the Budget as a result of their election promises. The only sum in the overall deficit of \$73 000 000 about which there can be substantial argument in terms of

the Government's responsibility is the \$9 000 000 over-run in Government expenditure.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Cameron says that no-one believes me. I am merely quoting figures from the second reading explanation provided by the Treasury, which figures are available for the honourable member to see. If the honourable member can indicate the inaccuracies in my comments—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: It is your interpretation.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If the honourable member can say where the inaccuracies lie, I will be pleased to hear that. Honourable members must be aware that these are not final figures but estimates. By 30 June, the situation may worsen—one cannot say. These figures are Treasury estimates. I have been through the items and, of the \$73 000 000 over-run in the Budget in this financial year, a maximum of \$9 000 000 (and it will probably not be as much as that) can be attributed to Government policies that differ from the policies of the Liberal Party.

Much play was made about the fact that a forecast was made in December, which increased dramatically by the time the statement was given. There has been a further deterioration of \$40 000 000 since that December forecast, when a budgetary statement was made by the Treasurer. Again, that over-run and further deterioration relate to natural disaster relief (\$14 000 000); loss of Woods and Forests Department contribution as a result of bush fires (\$4 000 000); the over-run in departmental expenditures, to which I referred and which was mainly the result of a fall-off in health receipts (\$17 000 000); the over-run in provision for salary and wage increases (\$9 000 000), which again was not related to Government policy; and the cost of election promises (\$8 000 000), making a total of \$52 000 000. That was offset by special grants of \$10 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government, resulting in a deterioration in the Budget provision from December to the present time of \$42 000 000.

In that analysis, in terms of Government policy, if the Opposition wants to hone in, attack and get into the Government about its expenditure policies, let it do so on the basis of factual information contained in the Treasurer's document. All I am saying is that there is the capacity to say that some of the deficit results from Government policy, but the maximum, on the figures that Treasury has placed before us in the second reading explanation, is about \$9 000 000 in total deficits this year. There is an increased deficit of \$73 000 000.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: No.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I would be interested to know why the honourable member is shaking his head. He has not explained to the Council where he finds any difficulty in what I have said.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Maintenance of staffing levels in the Health Commission is set at \$5 000 000. That related to a conscious decision of the Government. The Attorney-General should ask the Minister of Health. If one adds that \$5 000 000 to the \$8 000 000, the result is \$13 000 000.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Lucas must not interject.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Lucas referred to \$5 000 000. The overall deficit is estimated at \$115 000 000, and the contribution of this Government's policies is a minimal amount of that sum—about \$9 000 000, based on the figures presented in the second reading explanation. Clearly, \$42 000 000 was contributed by the former Government's policy in transferring funds from capital works to revenue. The rest relates to natural disasters, salary and wage increases, remission of the gas levy and the cost of

election promises, none of which can be attributed exclusively to the present Government.

Many exaggerated statements have been made. The full details of the budgetary position will be presented to the Council within three months and, following the provision of figures for the financial year, honourable members can then make their contributions in regard to that situation. I wanted to set the record straight in regard to several exaggerated claims by Opposition members.

In regard to the museum, which was referred to by the Hon. Mr Hill, I indicate that that project has not been stopped and that the contract is in progress, with \$23 500 000 in cash terms to be spent on constructions in the next four years. The Hon. Mr DeGaris raised questions to which I will obtain answers. His questions related to the extent of borrowing by this Government compared to that of the former Government and the allegations of the Hon. Mr Cameron, which were refuted by the Hon. Mr DeGaris, who asked for specific figures which I will obtain and provide for him by letter. I thank honourable members for their contributions.

Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

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

That Standing Orders be suspended to enable the sitting of the Council to continue beyond 6.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Schedule.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I have a series of questions on the Estimates of Expenditure and statements made. They are:

1. Was the statement made by the Premier to the House of Assembly in February, in which he said that by November 1982 the Budget had blown out by \$9 000 000, a correct statement, or does he now withdraw that statement?

2. What was the precise breakdown of the State's \$9 000 000 blow-out in November 1982; that is, in the same sort of detail as the predicted deficit in this Appropriation Bill?

3. What is the estimated cost to both the recurrent and the capital Budgets in 1983-84 and 1984-85 for each of the recent major disasters—bushfire, flood and drought?

4. Will the Attorney-General provide a detailed breakdown of the estimated \$8 000 000 over-run in departments other than the Health Commission?

5. Was there any documented advice to the previous Government that the estimated costs included in the last Budget for additional pumping of water from the Murray River should have been \$8 000 000 higher and, if so, will he provide copies?

6. Was there any documented advice to the previous Government that the estimates for the round sum allowance for wage and salary increases included in the last Budget should have been \$14 000 000 higher and, if so, will he provide copies?

7. Was there any documented advice to the previous Government that an extra \$5 000 000 should have been provided in the last Budget for staffing levels in the Health Commission to be maintained and, if so, will he provide copies?

8. Was there any documented advice to the previous Government that a further \$2 000 000 should have been provided in the last Budget for settlement of past workers compensation claims and, if so, will he provide a copy?

9. What proportion of the \$21 000 000 shortfall in revenue to the Health Commission is due to (a) reduction in overall number of bed/days utilised, and (b) increase in number of uninsured patients receiving hospital care?

10. Was there any documented advice to the previous Government that there would be a \$21 000 000 shortfall in revenue to the Health Commission and, if so, will he provide a copy?

11. Will the Government advise which of the component parts of the \$28 000 000 deterioration in the health arena referred to in the second reading explanation is not covered by the hospital cost sharing arrangements?

12. Will the Attorney-General obtain the assumptions behind the estimate of accumulated deficit in Consolidated Account of \$400 000 000 by 30 June 1986? In particular: (a) what is the assumed rate of increase in costs/prices? (b) what is the assumed rate of increase in unit wage costs? (c) have costings of Labor Party promises (now Government promises) made during the last election been included in this Estimate of \$400 000 000?

13. Will the Attorney-General provide details of the 'success in restraining expenditure levels which were beginning to run over budget at the time we came into office'?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will endeavour to obtain replies to the honourable member's questions.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 May. Page 1340.)

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this Bill. It is a normal Supply Bill, and I do not believe that it needs any further discussion from me.

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

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move: That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as to enable messages to be delivered to the House of Assembly while the Council is not sitting.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.37 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 31 May at 2.15 p.m.