

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 17 August 1983

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

## PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

*Pursuant to Statute—*  
South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Report, 1983.

## QUESTIONS

## COUNTRY FIRE SERVICES

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question about the Country Fire Services.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Honourable members will be aware of the important part played by the Country Fire Services in fire prevention and fire fighting in rural areas. The role of volunteers is crucial to this exercise. Their equipment, too, is important. Much of this equipment, particularly fire trucks, is very expensive and very necessary. Individual C.F.S. units raise significant funds to help fund their operations. In recent discussions with some members of the C.F.S. it has been suggested to me that C.F.S. units will in future be required to purchase only new fire fighting units, whether as a principal or ancillary appliance. This, they suggest, will result in an unnecessary increase in demands on Government funds and private fundraising efforts. They have indicated to me that savings of up to \$60 000 can be made by equipping suitable secondhand vehicles as fire trucks, rather than purchasing a brand new truck. I point out that some secondhand trucks can be in very good condition.

They say that the foolhardy economics of this exercise are compounded by the fact that many trucks travel only a few thousand kilometres each year. The people with whom I have had discussions believe that there is no risk to safety or performance when a secondhand chassis is used and, conversely, they do not consider any additional benefit is derived from having a totally new truck. Have any directions requiring all C.F.S. units to purchase only new fire trucks been given? If so, by whom? What liaison took place between the C.F.S. Headquarters and the volunteer C.F.S. units?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The scenario outlined by the Hon. Mr Cameron in regard to the purchase of new or secondhand vehicles is news to me. Therefore, I will have the matter investigated quickly and bring down a reply for the honourable member.

## SUPPRESSION ORDERS

**The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:** I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about suppression orders.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:** In December 1982 the Attorney-General announced a review of suppression orders by one of his officers. This occurred after a magistrate, Mr Manos,

is reported to have said on 2 December 1982 that 'Magistrates would not be intimidated by or become party to trial by media.' That statement was prompted by a headline in the *Australian* 'The three unwise men of Adelaide' and comments criticising three magistrates for suppression orders. Then, over a period of months, there followed a series of media comments about suppression orders, identifying concern about the numbers of them and referring to various specific cases which arose from time to time.

On 23 December 1982 the *Advertiser* reported the release by the Attorney-General of a discussion paper on suppression orders. He is quoted as saying:

... it was the first stage of a review into suppression orders. The paper was a 'background document' and copies would be given to interested or affected parties who were invited to make submissions in response by 11 February.

In July there was a report of the Australian Journalists Association submission to the Attorney-General's inquiry, which presumably was continuing at that time.

Yesterday in the *Advertiser* there was a report of a police prosecutor's comment in court that applications for suppression orders were getting out of hand. In the light of continuing concern about suppression orders, I ask the following questions:

1. How many submissions were received in response to the discussion paper released in December 1982?
2. Has the Attorney-General yet received a report on the review of suppression orders? If he has, will the report be released?
3. What is the result of the review, and, are any changes proposed to the present law?
4. If not yet completed, when will the review be completed and will any report be released publicly?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** More than 21 submissions were received in response to the discussion paper. I have received the report and it will be made public. I expect to do this in the reasonably near future. When the report is released the rest of the honourable member's questions will be answered.

## FARM MACHINERY

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question about farm machinery research.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** It is a matter of some interest that more money is invested in farm machinery in South Australia than is invested in livestock. Having recognised that, the Democrats believe that it is time that the South Australian Government caught up with this fact and established a competent unit with the South Australian Department of Agriculture to undertake research into farm machinery. I understand that there were two people in the farm mechanisation section but that the transfer of Hugh Wynter from that section has caused its virtual disbanding. We believe that a competent unit should be established within the department to undertake this research programme. Can the Minister say whether the Government has any plans to establish a farm machinery section in the Department of Agriculture?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I was interested to hear the Hon. Mr Gilfillan's statement about there being more money invested in farm machinery than in livestock, because that is something of a commentary on how farmers have got their priorities a little out of kilter.

**The Hon. R.J. Ritson:** Come on, it is the most efficient agricultural system in the world.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** It is a matter of continuing and interesting debate. Some of the results coming out of research into farm machinery are of interest to all farmers. The department is very much involved in bringing this information to the attention of South Australian farmers. The Hon. Mr Gilfillan says that the unit he referred to has virtually been disbanded, but that was something of an overstatement.

However, I readily concede that funds in the Department of Agriculture, as in every other Government department, are much tighter than they were perhaps five or 10 years ago. As a Minister, I have been absolutely overwhelmed over the past three or four months with requests for additional work to be done by the department in this and many other areas. The only problem is that, with some notable and honourable exceptions, when people (as the Hon. Mr Gilfillan has done) come into my office and request that the department do various things, very few of them make any suggestions at all as to how the Government should pay the department to do those things.

It would be desirable for the Government to do many things, including the provision of more resources for this area. Frankly, unless someone can tell me where to obtain the funds, I do not see how it can be done, given the present economic climate. I will inform the Hon. Mr Gilfillan about the exact status of this unit, which he claims has been virtually disbanded. I will also inform him as best I can about our future plans in this area. It was pointed out to me early in my Ministerial career that this is an area where some reallocation of funds within the department could occur. I did not disagree with that, but when one explores that suggestion further one finds that it is not quite so easy to suddenly cut off programmes in mid-stream.

Those people who have some expertise in the area that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan wishes to assist are not necessarily people who can be relocated from another area of the department. For example, it would be extraordinarily difficult to scale down the veterinary service that we provide and then relocate our veterinarians to work on, say, research into farm machinery. It does not work that way. It is a nice theory to suggest that resources can be relocated, but it is extraordinarily difficult to implement. We must wait until positions become vacant and then determine whether a programme can be downgraded and people employed in other areas. These things are all under constant review in the department. The method of reallocating resources is extraordinarily difficult, even when one sees a need to do so. I will obtain a full report on the status of the section that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan claims has been downgraded.

#### Alice Springs to Darwin Railway

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Alice Springs to Darwin railway.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** I think all honourable members agree that the Alice Springs to Darwin railway should be built now. In fact, the new railway line to Alice Springs should have been continued to Darwin without stopping because the men, equipment and expertise were available and it was sheer madness to stop at Alice Springs. I believe it was political bungling of the first order.

It seems to me that the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory has offended the Federal Government, which suspects him of playing some political game, rather than being 100 per cent genuine about the railway. This could well be so, because the railway would possibly be of much greater importance to South Australia than to the Northern Territory.

I believe that Mr Everingham is genuine about this matter but, whether or not he is, we certainly are and I believe that the Federal Government should be persuaded to change its mind, especially in a meeting with our own Premier.

But the problem remains: the Commonwealth is treating South Australia like a colony, and it always will do so if we let it. The Eastern States approve of that because it suits them. In fact, I daresay that Queensland is trying hard to obtain a railway from Mount Isa to Darwin.

*The Hon. Anne Levy interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** Yes. The new Commonwealth of Australia Government in 1908 agreed to build a railway under the Northern Territory Surrender Act—that is, 75 years ago. In other words, the nation as a whole has made a mockery of Federation ever since then, and that mockery will persist until the agreement is honoured. Can anyone imagine any contract in the business world not being honoured or fulfilled on the grounds that no specific date was set for commencement or for carrying out the contract? It is simply unthinkable. The line can be financed in a number of ways so that cost becomes irrelevant. It could be financed by the issue of bonds, with no extra strain on the Commonwealth Treasury, or it could be financed by an overseas consortium with a Government guarantee.

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** I rise on a point of order. I recall, Mr President, the guidelines governing questions that you read to me quite recently in this Council.

**The PRESIDENT:** I take the point of order. I believe that the honourable member is perhaps going further than is necessary to explain the question.

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** Yes, Mr President. I believe that this project would be of enormous help to South Australia and would, in fact, enable this State to help itself get over the financial difficulties in which it finds itself.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Honourable members can always call 'Question'. The honourable member was given leave to explain his question.

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** I realise that the Premier will go to Canberra with Dr Everingham to discuss this whole matter, and he goes with our best wishes. If the Commonwealth ever had an opportunity to help a State, it is now, and I hope that the Commonwealth Government realises that.

Will the Premier take the necessary steps to take this matter to the High Court of Australia for a decision? Will the Premier explain to the Prime Minister that there are a number of ways in which the railway should be financed without undue inconvenience? Will the Premier, if he is not satisfied with the result of the meeting with the Prime Minister, call a public meeting on his return to enable members of the public to protest? Will the Premier inform the Prime Minister precisely of the economic difficulty in which South Australia finds itself, and seek his immediate help for South Australia to play a major part in the building of the final section of the north-south railway to help us overcome our deficit difficulties by our own efforts?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The question of a High Court action that would attempt to compel the Commonwealth to build the railway in accordance with the agreement made by the Northern Territory when it became a Territory and was separated from South Australia has been raised in various forums in recent times. Indeed, the Hon. Mr DeGaris raised that matter in this Council some time ago. The likelihood of any success in that action is a matter of some debate and controversy in legal circles.

Nevertheless, as the matter has been raised by the Hon. Mr DeGaris, and now by the Hon. Mr Milne, I can tell the Council that the issue is currently being assessed by the Government. I will certainly draw to the attention of the

Premier the honourable member's comments regarding financing of the railway. The Premier and the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory will see the Prime Minister tomorrow about this topic.

I cannot say whether a public meeting will be called following this deputation, but I am quite happy to ask the Premier to consider that course of action. I am sure that the Premier will advise the Prime Minister in quite emphatic terms of the difficulties that South Australia faces in its economic situation and the benefit that—

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** And the promise he made.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** Yes, and the benefit that would flow to South Australia if the line were to be constructed, not just in long-term benefits and increased opportunities for trade between the Northern Territory and us but also the short-term benefits of jobs and employment that would be created in the provision of materials for the construction of the line. Those matters, I am sure, will be placed before the Prime Minister. I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. I should be in a position in the reasonably near future to provide some information to the Council on the first question that he raised.

#### MINISTERIAL ASSISTANTS

**The PRESIDENT:** I would like to explain to the Council the point which apparently is raising some concern amongst members: the seating on the floor of the Chamber of Ministerial assistants. I think that there has perhaps been some misunderstanding about the situation. In the first place, the matter was raised because in this Chamber we have no amplification and therefore no means of transmitting the debates to Ministers' offices. In conference with the Attorney, who had requested that Ministerial secretaries be able to take notes in the gallery, I refused that request, and there are a number of reasons why I believe that that is a valid section of our Standing Orders. I could go on and explain why I do not believe that there should be a free-for-all situation in which people take notes in the gallery.

After some discussion it was agreed that, until such time as this Chamber is amplified and the Ministers' secretaries are able to stay in their offices and take the necessary notes, during Question Time there should be some provision—some place—for these secretaries to take notes, the idea being that it should facilitate replies to members.

The area that I believe is the most appropriate is situated in the south-west corner of the passage. An area can be roped off, allowing sufficient room for the three secretaries to sit during that time and take notes. However, the other position where honourable members see the two assistants sitting at the present time was also under discussion. Although no firm proposal was accepted, I accept that the Attorney has probably misinterpreted—

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** Not at all, Mr President.

**The PRESIDENT:** You can say what you like; I am quite certain that that is what happened.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** I know what happened: you told me that they could sit there, but you changed your mind.

**The PRESIDENT:** Let me put it another way: I have changed my mind, most certainly, because what I intend to do is rope off that area up there in the section nearest that south-west pillar, where sufficient facilities will be available.

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron (Leader of the Opposition):** I seek leave to make a statement about that matter, because it does raise a couple of questions that I would like to put to you, Sir.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** The Opposition was first aware of this situation when we noticed the two people sitting in the space normally reserved for the Parliamentary Counsel or public servants assisting Ministers. I should have thought that it would be proper for some discussions to have taken place, either between yourself, Mr President, and me, or the Leader of the Government and me if such a difficulty arose. I do not believe that any move should be made to bring people, other than members of Parliament, on to what is virtually the floor of the Council unless there has been some discussion and there are good reasons for that, too.

I ask that those two people (and I do not want to create an embarrassment for them) be asked to leave that area of the Council. We can then have discussions about some area within the Council on which we could agree. Whilst it is obviously your responsibility, Mr President, to make a final decision, the Council must be in charge and the Opposition should be consulted on such matters.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner (Attorney-General):** I should ask leave to make a statement on this matter.

**The PRESIDENT:** I will first answer the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. I point out to the Council that for today's session these two people (because I believe that there has been some confusion) can remain where they are until the end of Question Time. The prerogative is entirely mine. As I told the Attorney-General, I intend to look at the area by the pillar, which would allow secretaries, until such time as the Chamber is amplified, the right to take notes during Question Time.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** I seek leave to make a statement on this matter.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** The situation is that I raised this matter with you, Mr President, because of difficulties that Ministerial staff were having. We undertook to discuss it, and we did discuss it.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** What difficulties?

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** Difficulties encountered by Ministerial officers in taking notes while sitting in the gallery. The fact is that the issue was then discussed. One suggestion was that Ministerial officers should sit at the back in the area that you, Mr President, have indicated. Further discussions ensued and you, Mr President, advised me that Ministerial officers could take their place here, and I advised the Ministers accordingly. That is the situation and, for honourable members opposite, that is why staff members were sitting in that position—because approval was given for them to sit there.

**The PRESIDENT:** I comment on that statement by saying that we had only one discussion: no further discussions were entered into.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PRESS REPORT

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Agriculture):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation about a report headed, 'Fish fees row tax threat', in the 16 August 1983 issue of the *News*.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** My personal explanation is in regard to an article that appeared in yesterday's *News*. That article was a reversal of what was actually presented in a statement that I made in this place last week on fishing licence fees. No person other than Craig Bildstein of the *News* appears to have misinterpreted what I said. In my statement I invited fishermen, who so wished, to provide evidence of their inability to pay higher licence fees. For-

unately, it was a minority interpretation that I intended to pry into people's affairs against their wishes. Nevertheless, it was a wrong interpretation and one that was circulated throughout the State via the *News*.

## QUESTIONS RESUMED

### ETHNIC AFFAIRS

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Ethnic Affairs a question about a report which allegedly has been made concerning ethnic officers in the Public Service.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** This morning's press carried an article that an inquiry had been conducted by the Equal Opportunities Advisory Panel of the South Australian Public Service Board and that a report entitled 'The Ethnic Composition of the South Australian Public Service' had been issued as a result. From reading this morning's article one could easily become alarmed at some of the claims or inferences that must be in that report. The article talked about the myths and stereo-typed beliefs about officers of migrant origin that exist at all levels in the State Public Service.

Even more worrying than that was a claim in the article that there were small but vehement groups of officers who are particularly antagonistic to equal opportunities being given to ethnic people within the Public Service. As a result of that article, I ask the Minister whether that report will be made public.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** It was made public yesterday.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** The article did not say that: it was simply a press release based on the report. As shadow Minister of Ethnic Affairs of this side of the Council, I would like, if possible, to obtain one of those reports.

**The Hon. M.S. Feleppa:** You already have one.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** No, I have not.

**The Hon. M.S. Feleppa:** You do.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** What do you mean?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** I am telling the honourable member that I have not got one.

**The Hon. M.S. Feleppa:** You have to convince the others—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** I simply cannot understand that remarkable interjection. Further, what action will the Minister of Ethnic Affairs take as a result of that report to help such ethnic people if, in fact, there is racial prejudice towards them in the Public Service?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The report was released yesterday afternoon: it is a public document. It is available—it was made available to the press.

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** It was made available to everyone except the Opposition!

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** Not at all. The report was released yesterday. If honourable members have not got a copy, it is because it is on the way. I have a copy here for the Hon. Mr Hill, who is perfectly able to peruse it and make whatever comments he would like to on it. If other honourable members would like the report—

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** I do not think you were as enthusiastic to get it to us as you were to get it to the press.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I gave a copy to the Hon. Mr Feleppa on the way down, just as I intended to give a copy—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I gave it to the Hon. Mr Hill, but he gave it back to me because he wanted to ask his question.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr President. The Minister only brought the report across to me earlier because I asked him for it 10 minutes earlier in the corridor.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** It is a little undignified for the honourable member to carry on like that. Members opposite who are interjecting are being incredibly petty: the report was released yesterday afternoon and is available.

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** But not to us.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** It was given to the press yesterday afternoon. Did honourable members opposite want me to deliver it to their homes last night? The report has been released. I am sure that the Hon. Mr Hill did not want to study it last night. He has now come here full bottle on the matter. Had he given my office a ring this afternoon, the report would have been available. Had the honourable member given the Equal Opportunities Advisory Panel of the Public Service Board a ring this morning, it would have been made available to him. Similarly, if he had called the Ethnic Affairs Commission this morning, the report could have been provided for him. There is nothing secret about it, and I have it available here. Any other honourable members who require the report can let me know and it will be made available to them.

The report concludes, if one looks at it within the limited sample that was concerned in this study, that there is an under-representation of people of ethnic minority and backgrounds in the Public Service and, in particular, they are grossly under-represented in the higher echelons of the Public Service, particularly in the executive and administrative officer range.

That appears to be the case statistically from the report, although I point out that the report was of a limited statistical kind. It did not examine employment beyond those people employed under the Public Service Act. In other words, it did not examine the question of employment in the public sector of persons not employed under the Public Service Act. The report concludes:

There is little available information to suggest the reasons for this under-representation and the possibility that informal barriers to the recruitment of persons of migrant origin existed, and continued to exist, should be investigated.

The eventual conclusions are very tentative, and the report does not come to any firm conclusions about the reasons for what appears to be under-representation of people of ethnic minority origin in the Public Service. Nevertheless, the report contains a number of recommendations, one of which is that there is a need to accumulate further data on the ethnic composition of the service and recruitment selection procedures. The report is released to provide a basis for public discussion of the issues and for further action by the Public Service Board in the area of equal opportunities.

The report's recommendations are now with the Equal Opportunities Advisory Panel of the Public Service Board and an action plan will be prepared, taking into account the recommendations contained in the report. Certainly, if any group in the community or any individual wishes to make comments to the Government on the report's findings, or wishes to make a submission about what further action can be taken, they will be welcomed by the Equal Opportunities Advisory Panel of the Public Service Board.

### FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY

**The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Treasurer, a question about a financial institutions duty.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS:** It now appears certain that the Government will be introducing a financial institutions duty and that the rate of duty will be .04 per cent. While the Government has not announced the actual level of duty, it appears that that will be the level in South Australia. My questions are, first, will the level of .04 per cent to be applied in South Australia be higher than the duties operating in other States? Secondly, having read some of the announcements made by the Treasurer, I notice that the only point mentioned is the imposition of the new duty. No announcement has been made about the removal of any existing duties? In the imposition of the new duty, does the Government also intend, as occurred in New South Wales and Victoria, to remove some of the existing financial transactions duties?

### MINISTERIAL ASSISTANTS

**The PRESIDENT:** Before the Attorney-General replies, I want to make quite clear the provisions which were recently discussed and to which I agreed (and perhaps should not have done) to allow secretaries to take notes in the Chamber. No question was asked of me as to whether they should be providing an advisory service to Ministers. I thought that all that was necessary was that they be allowed to take notes in the gallery because they did not have anywhere else to take them. I hope that that will be observed.

### QUESTIONS RESUMED

#### FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DUTY

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I will obtain information for the honourable member and bring back a reply, although I expect that his questions will be answered when legislation is introduced.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** When will that be?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** During this session.

### CHIROPODISTS

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about the professional registration of chiropodists.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** The Minister will be aware that the Chiropodists Act contains a clause defining chiropody, and in that clause, amongst other things, chiropodists are empowered to perform surgery on parts of the body below the knee. The word 'surgery' is not further qualified in any way and presumably would include a whole range of surgery such as operative treatment of fractures of the lower limb, excision of malignant tumours or micro-vascular surgery. As the Minister will know from his scientific training, it is simply quite unsound to proportion the whole range of surgery of a given region to any particular discipline, and there is nothing in the training of chiropodists (now known as podiatrists) which would indicate that they are at all competent to carry out the range of surgery permitted by the Act.

The fact of the matter is that almost every podiatrist in this State practices with such conscientious assessment of

his or her own limitations that this loophole has lain unused, or more correctly, ununused, for many years. However, I have received some representations and some anecdotal information which indicates that at least one person is using that loophole to cover open operations involving osteotomies (that is, cutting the bones) of the feet for hallux valgus and bunions, and that this person seems to have found a qualified medical practitioner to administer anaesthetics to cover these legal but scientifically indefensible procedures.

I do not wish to identify the aberrant individual further but ask the Minister to give consideration to amending the Act. The obvious amendment is to remove the word 'surgery' from the definition clause of the Act and to place it in that part of the Act which deals with the power of the Government to proclaim other treatments. In this way those minor surgical procedures which may form a legitimate part of podiatric practice may be preserved by proclamation or regulation, and presumably the Government in proclaiming or regulating would act on the advice of the responsible and representative Australian Podiatry Association of South Australia. Will the Minister consider such amendments?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** The honourable member referred to my 'scientific training'. I do not think that, as a veterinarian, I can be thought to presume to speak with authority in this field. I am reminded of a veterinarian colleague of mine who was specialising in the treatment of lower limbs of greyhounds—their paws and pads—and who said he was into 'hard-paw cornography'. One has to be careful when telling that joke after a couple of glasses of wine for dinner. That was my only direct association with podiatry before becoming the Minister.

What I had learnt since I learnt while guest speaker at the podiatrists' annual dinner recently—that is, that they now do an accredited tertiary course. I am also now well aware that there is something of a demarcation dispute going on with the medical profession. There is a notion here, as there is in a number of other areas of professional activity, that would certainly have to be investigated and exhausted before I would be prepared to come down on one side or the other, because I believe that the truth may well lie in between.

As to the honourable member's specific question, that matter is currently under investigation. In the fullness of time, when I have received advice from a number of people expert in this area, I will make a decision and a recommendation to Cabinet. As to whether or not it will involve amendments to the appropriate legislation, I am not prepared to comment at this time. I do not believe that I have had adequate time to have the matter not only investigated but resolved.

### ETHNIC AFFAIRS

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** My question is supplementary to an earlier question that I asked about the report on the ethnic composition of the South Australian Public Service. Since I asked my earlier question the Minister has walked across the Chamber and handed me a copy of the report. The inquiry began in March 1981 and the report is dated November 1982. Where has the report been since November 1982 up until yesterday?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** It has been under consideration by me primarily. It ill behoves the Hon. Mr Hill to make any complaint about this report. Action to implement this inquiry was taken in 1979, when I was the Minister; it was to be conducted through the Public Service Board by the Equal Opportunities Unit. From 1979, when those instructions were given until, as the honourable member says—

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** The report states that the study began in March 1981.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I can inform the honourable member that the initial instruction was given in 1979. Under a Liberal Government, from 1979 to March 1981, nothing was done. The Hon. Mr Hill and the Hon. Dr Tonkin sat on the issue for well over 15 months.

**The Hon. K.T. Griffin:** Three months.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** No, from 1979 to March 1981. I point out to the Hon. Mr Griffin that that is 15 months, and it could well be 18 months.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** You sat on the report for nine months.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I am not suggesting that there was any sitting on the report. The inquiry was initially instituted in 1979 as a result of action that I took in response to representations from various people. Apparently, the former Liberal Government did nothing about the issue until March 1981. It took the former Liberal Government 18 months to conduct what was a limited inquiry. The report was provided to the previous Government before the last election, but it took no action at that time. Indeed, a suspicion was gained abroad at that time that the previous Government was not going to release the report. During the last election campaign my Party undertook to release the report.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** After nine months.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** Irrespective of how long it took, the fact remains that the Equal Opportunities Unit of the Public Service Board has had the report all this time and has been preparing a response about the action that can be taken in relation to it. I have made the report available to the public, including the Hon. Mr Hill. I will be pleased to hear the Hon. Mr Hill's comments about the report and the action that he believes should be taken following its publication. That is the position. I was considering the report. I concede that the report could well have been released earlier, but I was concerned to ensure that any action that flowed from it was concrete. Quite frankly, the problem with the report is that it does not draw any definite conclusions. That was the difficulty in determining the specific action that could flow from it, and that was my concern when assessing it. Nevertheless, it was decided to release the report in its present form, despite its limitations. The Equal Opportunities Unit of the Public Service Board will consider the report's recommendations in the preparation of a response on action planned for the promotion of equal opportunities throughout the public sector.

#### WINE TAX

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question about wine tax.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** In an article in the *National Times* this week entitled 'What's in Labor's Budget', Geoff Kitney states in reference to the forthcoming Federal Budget:

It is understood a wine tax will be imposed. Cabinet is said to have overturned objections by Primary Industry Minister, John Kerin, who strongly opposed the tax because of a commitment in Labor's election policy not to introduce it.

I appreciate that the Premier of South Australia has sent a six-page submission to the Federal Labor Government urging it to stand by its election commitment not to introduce a wine tax because of the major economic pressures facing the industry.

However, many people, including myself, question the genuineness of the Government's protestations of concern about the current pressures on the industry and, in turn,

question the value of its protestations to the Federal Government. These doubts arise from a recent decision by the State Government to increase by 28 per cent the cost of water to owners of irrigated vineyards and the decision to effectively increase stamp duty on wine by 3c in each dollar.

If the *National Times* statement that the Hawke Government is to impose a wine tax in the forthcoming Federal Budget is correct, does the Minister consider that Federal Cabinet might have paid more regard to the South Australian Government's concern for 'the major economic pressures on the wine industry at the present time', if the South Australian Government itself had not contributed recently to these pressures?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am not quite sure whether this question should have been directed to me, although I heard the Hon. Miss Laidlaw refer it to me. I am not quite sure why she has referred this question to me, unless it is in my capacity as the representative of the Minister of Water Resources in this place.

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** As Minister of Agriculture.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** No part of the honourable member's question is in any way related to my area of responsibility.

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** I am asking about the wine industry and the wine tax.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The question of a wine tax is not within my province. In fact, it is not even within the State Government's province; it comes within the Federal Government's province.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I have no knowledge at all of what goes on in Federal Cabinet.

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** Why didn't you—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Miss Laidlaw has asked her question and I hope that she will now listen to the answer.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I have no knowledge of Budget discussions in Federal Cabinet. I have no Ministerial responsibility for charges on water used by people living in the Riverland. Again, that is a matter for the Minister of Water Resources. If the Hon. Miss Laidlaw would like a response to that part of her question, I am happy to direct it to the Minister of Water Resources. In relation to the South Australian Government's attitude to a wine tax, that has been made quite clear by the Premier, who had discussions with the Federal Government and made our position quite clear. In fact, the State Government produced a document and, if the Hon. Miss Laidlaw has not seen it, I will be happy to mail her a copy.

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** I have seen it.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Good, then she will agree that it is a very good document, which is clear and well-written. It is a strong submission. As to whether or not the Federal Government agrees with it, that is something that the Hon. Miss Laidlaw will have to ask her Federal colleagues to ask the Federal Government. I have no information about that at all.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** Mr Keneally has already said there won't be a wine tax.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** If the Hon. Mr Davis wishes to ask Mr Keneally a question, there is an appropriate avenue for him to do so: the Attorney-General, who represents the Chief Secretary in this place, would be happy to direct that question to him. I am still a little at a loss to know precisely to what part of my Ministerial portfolio the Hon. Miss Laidlaw's question was directed.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I wish to ask a supplementary question. I find it very interesting that the welfare of the wine industry, one of the major industries in this

State, is of so little interest to the Minister of Agriculture. I would like to confirm whether or not the Minister is, in fact, interested in the welfare of this major industry.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I am very happy to respond to that question, because it directly relates to my portfolio.

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** So did the last question.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Well, the honourable member should be more careful with her questions. The Minister of Agriculture is very interested in the wine industry. It is a very significant section of South Australia's economy indeed. Anything that damages that section of the economy would cause me, as Minister of Agriculture, great concern. The Government, recognising that, has made a very strong submission to the Federal Government. In fact, the Premier himself went in person to the Federal Government with our submission. I have had some discussions with the Federal Minister (John Kerin) on this subject: in fact, I put it right on him. I said, 'Are we going to have a wine tax or not?' He said, 'You would have to be joking—after the events of the last few weeks, you will get no information at all out of this Federal Government.'

Quite frankly, I could not blame him. He barely wanted to talk to me at all when I started asking him what was in the Budget. He was most uncommunicative. However, I can tell the Hon. Miss Laidlaw that the wine industry in this State is in considerable difficulty, and I would be extraordinarily disappointed if a wine tax was imposed by the Federal Government. I have no idea whether or not the Federal Government will take that action. We can only go a certain way, and we have made a submission. If the honourable member has further suggestions—

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** I have said that further State charges should not be imposed on the industry.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Just a moment. We must impress on the Federal Government that it is important that a wine tax not be imposed. I would be delighted to take up the question. Politics should not play a part in regard to a very significant section of our industry that is under a great deal of stress. I believe that politics should not come into it, because this matter will affect South Australia. Rather than the Hon. Miss Laidlaw's politicking and bringing in all kinds of extraneous matters, I hope that the Opposition will be constructive and insist that the State Government impress on the Federal Government the importance of the industry to South Australia and the fact that we can do without a wine tax.

---

## MINISTER OF HEALTH

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I move:

That in the opinion of this Council the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall) has demonstrated disgraceful behaviour and derisory conduct toward citizens, totally unacceptable in a Minister of the Crown, and has also demonstrated a lack of administrative ability in performing his Ministerial duties. Therefore, the Minister should be removed from his Ministerial duties, and replaced; and that a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

The first part of this motion relates to the conduct and attitudes of the Minister rather than his abilities. It is the second part of the motion which addresses his administrative abilities or lack of them. There is a series of incidents on which the Minister has expressed himself and rather forcefully and publicly. He was not always necessarily entirely wrong. But his method of communicating with the public, with members of hospital boards, with members of local government, and with others is quite appalling. Why does he always act in such an abrasive manner? Why does he

always assume that anyone who does not go all the way with him is wrong and ought to be publicly put down and denigrated?

In point of time, the first of the instances to which I intend to refer relates to the Julia Farr Centre. The Minister is reported in the *Advertiser* of 16 March 1983 as saying that 'the lack of foresight and a lack of sound management technique had been illustrated by the events of the past fortnight'. These allegations are reported to have been denied by the Chairman of the board, Mr R.A. Ringwood. I certainly do not deny that there were problems at the Julia Farr Centre and I did not enter into the public controversy at that time other than to say publicly that the Minister's actions represented a case of 'insensitive overkill'. And that is the point.

Some sense of diplomacy, an ability to communicate, an ability to sort things out where possible outside the public arena, is essential in a Minister. When full consultation has been held, when all reasonable attempts at a peaceful settlement have been tried and have failed, then to take a strong stand and to be prepared to be outspoken is a virtue, but not till then. This Minister takes a short cut. He is so obsessed with his belief that he is always right that he does not bother about full discussion. He comes straight out and blasts the people concerned. When one considers the public-minded, dedicated citizens on the board and senior staff of the Julia Farr Centre, one realises that in one fell swoop the Minister has got off-side a great deal of dedicated talent, which, given a little tact, could have been directed for its benefit to our health system and the benefit of sick people—in this case, sick elderly people. A thoughtful editorial in the *Advertiser* on 17 March 1983 discussed the matter. It concluded:

But Dr Cornwall has failed so far to substantiate the accusations of neglect on which he bases the implied threat to tighten Government control over the administration of the centre if not to place it wholly and permanently in the hands of the Health Commission. The differences which have arisen are unfortunate, but should be capable of swift resolution given goodwill on both sides.

Unfortunately, after an attack such as the Minister made, it is difficult to achieve goodwill. I have spoken to some of the board members who bitterly resent the way in which they were treated. They feel that they were rail-roaded by the peremptory and public announcement of the Minister before other ways of resolving the problem had been fully explored. No Government can afford to continue to alienate people working hard and sincerely and in many cases without pay in the health centre.

One would have thought that the Minister would learn from the Julia Farr Centre incident the lesson that there are other ways of curing management problems in hospitals than blasting their boards in public, but this Minister does not learn this kind of lesson easily, as the front page of the *The Transcontinental* of 25 May 1983 testifies. The headlines read:

You have got the worst hospital care in the State and arguably in Australia—Dr Cornwall. Minister blasts board.

The Minister never stops to think of the quite unnecessary hurtful effects which this kind of outburst has on honest, dedicated people who are doing their best. Once again, I acknowledge that there were problems in connection with the hospital, and for that reason once again I did not enter into the public controversy. I did, however, travel to Port Augusta and made myself available to anyone who might wish to discuss the matter with me. I can assure the Council that I had plenty of takers. The spokesperson for the nurses said that the nurses were extremely upset about the 'worst hospital care in the State and arguably in Australia' bit. They said that quite naturally the people in the community interpreted the reference to 'worst hospital care' as referring

to the nursing care. In the eyes of the public it is the nurses who deliver hospital care. The nurses had been asked about it by their acquaintances and were embarrassed to go out in public. The spokesperson said that she had, since the publication of the report, gone out into the street in uniform and that the public reaction to her had made her most uncomfortable.

The Director of Nursing saw the Minister and requested an apology in the local press. The Minister did write a letter, which was published in a subsequent edition of *The Trans-continental*. The relevant part of the letter read:

So that there can be no misunderstanding of my position I wish to make it absolutely clear that I made and intended no criticism of the nursing staff or any other section of the staff of the hospital.

But it was too late; the damage had been done. Despite this disclaimer, surely the Minister had the wit to know that 'worst hospital care in the State', in whatever context, would be interpreted by the press and the community as reflecting on the nursing staff. Upon reading the press report itself, one finds that the reference to the 'worst hospital care in the State' was preceded by the words, 'You have got a medical mafia running rampant in the town.'

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** Lovely stuff.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Lovely stuff. The clear picture which I gained was that, while there might have been grounds for complaint by the Minister, it was disgraceful for the Minister to make the public statement that there was a 'medical mafia running rampant in the town,' and I am satisfied that there are no facts to justify this statement. It is significant that at the meeting the report says that the Minister said:

We have documented complaints going back over the years of feuding doctors among the medical practitioners here—to the detriment of the patients.

He said this after the medical superintendent—and this is in the report in the press—had asked him to substantiate his claims. The medical superintendent is reported as having responded:

The feuds were no worse than any other hospital. How do the feuds affect the care here I would like to know. Substantiate it. What are the facts?

It is reported that the Minister did not give specific examples of the complaints. It is Julia Farr all over again: blast the people responsible for running the hospital in a public forum or one which will become public and do not substantiate the claims. It may be that the claims could have been substantiated and that there would have been very red faces if they had been, but a Minister should not make those statements if he does not intend, when he speaks, to substantiate them. It is also interesting to note that when pressed by the medical superintendent to substantiate his claims the Minister said:

I have talked to the local T.L.C. down the street and have a list of complaints about the quality of care at the hospital here.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** A pretty balanced approach!

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** It is! As with the St John dispute, which I spoke on yesterday, the Minister again seems to rely more on what he is told by the unions than on what he is told by anyone else.

*The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! On these occasions we do not need any prompting or interjections. The matter will be serious enough, I believe, as it develops.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** It is a bit of a joke, anyway.

**The PRESIDENT:** Be it a joke or not, that is the way in which the debate will be conducted.

*The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Blasting boards and other persons connected with hospitals is bad enough, but on 29 June the Minister decided to vent his spleen on the Mayor of Port Pirie. The *Advertiser* of 30 June refers to 'a public row at a Port Pirie shopping plaza yesterday'. Further on, the report says:

During the launching a slanging match broke out involving Dr Cornwall and what he described last night as 'Mr Jones and a mob of middle-aged bully boys'. At one stage Dr Cornwall referred to Mr Jones as 'one of the most irresponsible persons in public life in South Australia'.

I must interpose: one wonders whether that was a case of the pot and the kettle. The report proceeded, 'Mr Jones replied by calling Dr Cornwall an "idiot".' I might add here that the Minister does get under one's skin; I seem to recall an interchange along these lines in this Council. 'At least I'm not a middle-aged ocker larrikin,' Dr Cornwall replied. The report continues and reports the subsequent Local Board of Health meeting. The report in the *Advertiser* says:

The letter containing the resignation request was read to the meeting and refers to statements by Mr Jones on Sunday on the Government decision to delay a \$1 000 000 housing project for the Solomontown area of the city. It says that Mr Jones was critical of the Government's deferral of the project when all on the task force had agreed that nothing should be said relating to lead levels until the task force had reported. Dr Cornwall, in his letter, describes the statements by Mr Jones as 'grossly improper'.

I have heard that before, too. The report goes on:

He says that he considers the statements to be an abuse by Mr Jones of his position as Mayor of Port Pirie and of his membership of the task force. 'In my opinion your action has not only compromised your continued membership of the task force, but has threatened its success,' Dr Cornwall says. 'Accordingly, I ask you to resign forthwith.'

Dr Cornwall says Mr Jones should accede to the request 'so as not to further jeopardise the work of the group'. Dr Cornwall also says he made a public statement several weeks ago that he would refrain from participating in the controversy on the lead poisoning issue to allow the task force to operate in an atmosphere of 'co-operation and goodwill'. 'I am disappointed you are unable to do the same,' he says.

Last night Mr Jones said that he would not resign and Dr Cornwall said that he would move to have the task force reconstituted to exclude the Port Pirie Local Board of Health. The Minister said, however, that he would ensure that there would be local representation on the new body. The Port Pirie Local Board of Health also is represented on the task force by its medical officer, Dr K.R. Burdon.

Dr Cornwall said he was 'shocked' by the public display of abuse meted out to a Government Minister in public yesterday. 'The Mayor and his bully boys heckled and harassed me,' Dr Cornwall said. Mr Jones last night agreed that some of those who had shouted at Dr Cornwall were members of the Board of Health. He said that he could not recall whether he had called Dr Cornwall an idiot. 'I could have used that term; there were a lot of people shouting,' he said. 'He was handing it out and I was handing it back.'

He denied that he had compromised his position by discussing the cancelled housing project in the context of lead levels. 'All I said was that I was sorry the Housing Trust had decided not to go ahead with the project on the basis of a note from the Minister of Health to the Minister of Housing, nothing more,' Mr Jones said.

I make it perfectly clear that I am not referring to the rights and wrongs of the dispute or the question of who started it or where the principal blame rests. It was disgraceful for a Minister of the Crown to allow himself to become embroiled in a slanging match with a leader in local government in his own city. To refer to the Mayor as a 'middle-aged ocker larrikin' is simply disgraceful. It is as simple as that.

As I have said, I did not involve myself in the Julia Farr Centre or the Port Augusta Hospital disputes. But on this occasion I was there. At the invitation of the Mayor I was present at the local board of health meeting and I did make a statement on the matter recorded in the Port Pirie *Recorder* on Friday 1 July, as follows:

The shadow Minister of Health, Mr Burdett, has been quick to defend the Mayor's actions in commenting on the deferral of



Housing Trust development in Solomontown. Mr Burdett who witnessed Wednesday's heated exchanges between the Mayor and the Minister of Health, Dr Cornwall, said Mr Jones had acted in a responsible manner by making the comments. It was clearly incumbent on the Mayor to say whether or not the building would proceed. 'Notwithstanding his membership on the task force, he was correct in saying there was no danger in that area. He was quite correct in the circumstances,' Mr Burdett said. He added the Health Minister had a history of side-stepping his responsibilities by appointing inquiries when issues arose, such as the lead issue. Referring to Wednesday's incidents, Mr Burdett said, 'His (the Health Minister's) pattern of behaviour seems to get responsible health bodies such as the Port Pirie Local Board of Health, off-side. 'This happens only too frequently in the Iron Triangle,' Mr Burdett said, referring to comments made by the Minister during the recent controversy over the Port Augusta Hospital Board. He added these problems 'ought to be talked out—

this is what I am saying: this is the substance of what this part of the motion is all about—

in a sensible way without the Minister's tone of condemnation or insensitive overkill.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** You should have something better than that.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** If the Attorney thinks I ought to have something better than that, there is something wrong with him.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I wonder what are the standards of the Attorney-General if he does not think it is disgraceful for a Minister to say things like this about boards and about the Mayor in public without talking out the matter firstly in private. If that is the case, then I wonder what are the Attorney's standards.

Our shame in our Minister was deepened by the fact that the whole shabby incident was reported in the national press in the *Weekend Australian* of 2-3 July 1983. Once again, the Minister has since apologised and settled his differences with Mayor Jones. One suspects he may have been told to apologise (I am sure that he was). But once again, it was too late then. How long is this kind of conduct going to continue? I will be interested to hear how the Minister will justify this kind of behaviour. He may well be able to justify his stance in all of these matters and I do not necessarily dispute that, but how can he justify this disgraceful way of carrying on? This is what I am talking about.

There are other instances which have not been reported in the press. For example, some little time back at Litchfield House, at Hillcrest Hospital, the Minister berated the Chairman of the board in the presence of staff and psychiatric patients waiting for out-patient treatment. Apart from anything else, I am informed that the outburst upset the patients. This is not conduct becoming a Minister of the Crown. If he has not got enough self-control to raise his criticisms in private in a gentlemanly way, he should not be a Minister and that is the point of this motion.

I have a copy of a letter written on 28 July 1983 by a Dr Dale Gerke, a dental practitioner, to the Premier complaining about the conduct of the Minister. I am informed by Dr Gerke that the Minister subsequently contacted him by telephone and said that he could not resile from what he had said but that next time he saw Dr Gerke in the street he would tell him what he thought of him. I am told that it was obvious that what he thought of Dr Gerke was not complimentary. The Minister does appear to be somewhat chastened recently and I have no doubt that he has been spoken to—

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** I am just resting between bouts.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I am sure the Minister is. He has been told to refrain from this kind of conduct, but I am afraid his nature will win out. He does not seem to be able to control himself, and I am sure that he is manipulated to some extent by his press secretary. It is the cumulative

effect of this that I am talking about. In regard to most of the individual incidents I have not spoken out, but the total picture is one of a Minister not willing to handle problems which arise in a strong but gentlemanly and consultative way and such a person ought not to be a Minister. There is much disquiet about the Minister's conduct among health professionals and a very distinct 'am I next' syndrome.

The second part of the motion, and I had evidence of this on the telephone this morning, relates to the Minister's lack of administrative ability.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** Is that all there is on the first part?

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** It is, indeed. Surely that is enough. If a Minister insults people at the Julia Farr Centre, the Board of the Port Augusta Hospital, as well as the nurses and doctors (they saw themselves as being insulted), if he insults the Mayor of Port Pirie and then insults in public the Chairman of the Board of Hillcrest Hospital, that is enough.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** The Attorney thinks that that is all right.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** I just wanted to know—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Attorney-General should be setting an example and not leading in disruption of proceedings.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I said that the debate will be conducted in the most orderly manner that we can observe in this place, and I said that for a number of reasons. As the debate has only just begun, members should start observing such conduct straight away.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Thank you, Mr President. The history that I have related starts in March and persists until quite recently. To me that is a perfectly adequate history. Surely the Minister, as I have suggested before, should have learnt the first time. If he did not learn the first time, then he should have learnt the second or third time.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** He did not mislead the Parliament as you did when Minister.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I did not mislead the Parliament.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable Attorney-General—

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** He—

**The PRESIDENT:**—and the honourable Mr Cameron will both desist from interjecting.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Turning back to the motion that the Attorney-General is trying to distract me from, I think that I have given perfectly adequate examples of the Minister's disgraceful conduct in dealing with responsible members of the public, giving their time in most cases freely to hospital boards.

The second part of the motion relates to the Minister's lack of administrative ability. My allegation in this regard is that the Minister is whittling away, to say the least, the independent managerial responsibility of boards of management of hospitals and other health units. He has from time to time said that hospitals' independence must not go too far, but I wish to look at some individual examples. I am informed that when the Board of the Lyell McEwin Hospital sought to appoint management consultants to advise them on the appointment of an executive officer they were informed that the Minister's approval would be needed. Why? They are a board of management surely?

On 10 May I raised in this Council the letter from the Health commission to recognised hospitals asking them to provide details to the relevant unions of employees in respect of whom pay-roll deductions for union dues were not made (page 1320, *Hansard*). I considered that this was an invasion

of the confidentiality which ought to exist between employer and employee. The Minister defended this action and said all the employees in the recognised hospitals are in one sense or another employees of the South Australian Health Commission. Boards of management of recognised hospitals would be very interested to hear this. This demonstrates the way in which the Minister is interfering in hospitals. He spoke, at the same page of *Hansard*, of 'substantial residual independence'. I hope that all members of boards of management who give freely of their time realise that, according to this Minister, they have only 'residual' independence. It is only what is left that they may handle.

I am informed that some hospitals have found that the Health Commission wishes to place those hospitals' workers compensation insurance with particular brokers. Is this any kind of independence?

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** There is \$700 000 involved; that is why I want to do that.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I have made the point all along that I am attacking the *modus operandi* of the Minister and not the fact that he may be able to save the board money. I am attacking the fact that he seems to be trying to pressure them into doing certain things.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** What about something of substance?

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** There has been plenty of substance in what I have said.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** What about some criticism, if you have any, of his administration or of actions that he has taken?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Attorney-General will come to order.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Perhaps the Attorney-General has not listened or is trying to pretend that there is no substance in what has been said. If he considers that there is no substance in what I have said, then I do not have very much confidence in his ability, either.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** On the matter of administration, the point that I raised (and I think that this is a very grave charge) is simply that the Minister has interfered with, and demonstrated that he intends to go on interfering with, the independent managerial responsibility of boards of management. I am disturbed by the recently announced guidelines for hospitals making communications to the press, and I suspect that, although the guidelines were framed in a way which appeared mainly to offer help, this is an attempt to gag the hospitals or at least to ensure that the Minister is aware of what they intend to say. All these are instances of a taking away of the independent managerial responsibility of hospitals, and board members have told me that they are frustrated by all this. Why should they give their time to go along as puppets only to find that the Minister is exercising the power, anyway?

I refer briefly to the Minister's inconsistency on the issues of marihuana and smoking. He originally said that he would introduce a private member's Bill (a strange thing for a Minister to do in the first place, I would have thought) which would make possession and cultivation of marihuana for personal use no longer an offence.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** What has this to do with a lack of administrative ability?

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** It shows incompetence and inconsistency, and if the Minister listens he will find out why. The Minister then said that he would postpone this Act subject to the carrying out of surveys, presumably to be carried out at departmental expense (and in relation to a private member's Bill). He then announced that a Government Bill would be introduced by him to increase the

penalties for drug trafficking—and we strongly support that—but reducing penalties for possession of marihuana for personal use. The Minister also said that he would continue with his private member's Bill to make this no offence at all, depending on the outcome of the surveys to be undertaken. With all this, the Minister is apparently prepared to take action to control cigarette smoking. The whole thing seems to be completely incompetent (which may answer the Attorney's question) and inconsistent.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** What has this to do with administrative ability? The Hon. Mr Burdett is criticising the Minister for policy. He is not talking about administrative ability.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Attorney-General, as one of the speakers in this debate, can make his points later.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I am not criticising the Minister's policy but saying that it is administrative incompetence when a Minister does all these very inconsistent things at the same time, because competent administration involves consistency. Because of his behaviour, his interference in the management of hospitals, and the other matters that I have raised in regard to marihuana and the consistency of his administration, I urge this Council to show its lack of confidence in this Minister.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health):** I must say, as an old Jesuit boy, that last night when I took this motion home and read it I examined my conscience in the best traditions in which I was raised. I may have lapsed a little from those tenets in later years, but having examined my conscience I could not for the life of me find anything—

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** You could not find anything except your ego.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I could not find anything that would have caused a responsible Opposition to move a motion in these terms—'demonstrated disgraceful behaviour'. A no-confidence motion (not an urgency motion) in a Minister of the Crown, traditionally, in the Westminster system, is reserved for some very grave sort of impropriety. Either there has to be clear evidence (or at least the suggestion of clear evidence) that the Minister has misled the Parliament, or there must be some clear evidence (preferably crystal clear evidence) that the Minister has profited in some way, quite improperly, from his office under the Crown. These sorts of things are listed in Erskine May and Pettifer. They are there to be seen by anyone who has a notion of the propriety of the Westminster system; they are listed for the world to see.

You, Sir, can understand that, on the false presumption I had that this was a responsible Opposition, I was going through any matters that had occurred in the past nine months in the discharge of my public duties which could seriously have prompted the Opposition, and in particular the Hon. John Burdett, to move such an outrageous motion. The motion also refers to 'disgraceful behaviour and derisory conduct toward citizens', a fine antediluvian phrase that fits nicely with the Dickensian lawyer who moved it, 'and states that the Minister has also demonstrated a lack of administrative ability'. I shall cover these areas, and I am sure that members will bear with me if I cover them at some length.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** It's not worth it.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** It saves me having to speak in the Address in Reply about this by going through in an orderly fashion the list of things that we have been able to get going in the health area in the nine months that the Bannon Government has been running the State. What we have got today is the total abuse, in the most scurrilous way, of the Westminster tradition.

For nine months, the so-called shadow Minister of Health, Mr Burdett, has been as quiet as a mouse—it has been 'John who?' We have not been able to find him. Very sensibly, he kept out of the Julia Farr story because, being formerly at least a reasonable man, he knew very well that what I was forced to do was the right thing and consistent with all my other moves. It was primarily and almost exclusively done in the interests of the residents.

If there is a common theme running through all these things that the Hon. Mr Burdett has brought up today, it is my actions that were taken in the interests of residents, patients and South Australians. But what has happened, of course, is that the shadow Minister, sitting there quietly in the trenches, unable in any meaningful way to front and cause any destabilisation of the Minister, has been constantly and increasingly under threat from his colleagues on the back bench.

There are sitting on the back bench several pretenders to the shadow Minister's position. It is no coincidence that Mr Ingerson, the member for Bragg, is showing an interest in the health area. Mr Ingerson approached me only two days ago seeking my co-operation to allow him to visit some of our health units and approach some of the senior officers in the commission directly from time to time for briefings and to obtain information. In the open spirit that has characterised anything that I have done since becoming a Minister, I said, 'Yes, provided that you notify my chief administrative officer and I know to whom you are talking and where you are visiting at any time, that will be no problem.' Mr Ingerson clearly sees himself as a pretender.

Mr Baker, the member for Mitcham, is suddenly an erstwhile expert, circulating learned papers and critiques of the Opit Report, matching his grey matter with that of the learned professor. From time to time, Mr Baker has made statements dealing with the health area. Obviously, Mr Baker has looked around and is one of the few Opposition players who has not won a prize—15 on the front bench, plus the odd strapper. In fact, if a member does not make it on to the Opposition front bench he is not doing too well. As one of the players who has not won a prize, Mr Baker has obviously fixed his beady little eyes on John Burdett's position. Of course, there is also the rising young star on the back bench in this Chamber, the Hon. Mr Rob Lucas.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** What about Mr Davis?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I am dealing only with the real hopefuls at the moment, not the no-hopers. The Hon. Mr Lucas has shown a particular interest in the health area. If one takes the trouble to go through *Hansard*, as I am sure the Hon. Mr Burdett does from time to time, one can see that the majority of questions asked in this place are directed to me as Minister of Health (that is a statistical fact) and that a large number of those questions are asked by the Hon. Mr Lucas. The Hon. Mr Lucas is obviously a pretender also, not necessarily in the best sense of the word.

It is disgraceful that, at a time when we in South Australia and this nation as a whole have the highest unemployment rate since the Great Depression of the 1930s, the time of this Council is being taken up with a completely spurious motion. The motion does no credit to the member who moved it and it does total discredit to what should be Her Majesty's official Opposition. Instead, we have a rag tag, bob tailed mob who sit opposite cackling like jackasses and regularly behaving most irresponsibly. I will have more to say about the behaviour of members opposite as I proceed.

What has really happened today is that, under pressure from aspirants on the back bench, the Hon. Mr Burdett has decided to lumber out of the trench in which he has been residing for the past eight months with a hand grenade in each hand; but all he has managed to do is blow off both

his feet. I will now turn to some of the specific charges that are supposed to be the basis—

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** The assertions.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Yes, the assertions which are supposed to be the basis for this motion. I repeat that a no-confidence motion is the gravest action that an Opposition can take against a Minister. The first assertion is the question of censorship, that I am jumping all over hospitals and health units and that I will not allow them to speak to the press. I will spend a little time on this matter because it is complete nonsense and I want to put it to rest for all time. Following discussions with my press secretary, the then Acting Chairman of the Health Commission and other senior Health Commission officers quite some time ago (from memory, I think it was in May), it was decided that a lot of good things were happening in our hospitals which the public simply did not know about.

I believe that it is highly desirable that hospitals and health units generally have an on-going liaison with the press and with the media in general, because it is important that the public feels some warmth towards hospitals in their areas. For example, in Mount Gambier this was specifically recommended by Dr Barry Catchlove when he conducted an inquiry into the problems of the Mount Gambier Hospital in 1982.

In a list of guidelines we said that the Health Commission had a responsibility to keep the people of South Australia well informed about activities, services and new developments within the State health system. To ensure that this occurs, it is vital that the best possible relationship is developed and maintained with all sections of the media. However, in doing this, certain guidelines should be observed by incorporated health units and individuals employed by the commission.

In relation to health matters, the normal point of contact between the Government and the media is the press secretary to the Minister of Health. Health officers have been advised to contact the press secretary, during working hours and after hours, about developments in their areas which may be suitable for press release or media conference. As an example, I refer to the *in vitro* twins who were born at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The hospital telephoned my office and requested some assistance with a media conference. My office sent a press officer to the hospital to assist it in the organisation of a press conference. I point out that I was not responsible for the *in vitro* twins in any way, directly or indirectly.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Did you go down and kiss them?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** No, I did not go down and kiss them. A media conference was held at the hospital, in the public interest. That is the sort of thing that is alluded to in the guidelines. With the exception of Flinders Medical Centre, which is very good at public relations, most of the hospitals are not very good at all. Accordingly, the information circular was sent out. I point out that the circular was released over the signature of the Acting Chairman of the Health Commission and was cleared by the commission. It did not go out directly through me.

The circular also states that officers in the Health Commission or in health units should advise the press secretary when media representatives approach them for comments or in relation to contentious or newsworthy items, in order to ensure the widest possible coverage and to allow publicity. Nowhere does the circular state that no doctor or member of staff must not talk to the press. The circular states that it is a good idea to tell the press and the media about the good things that occur in many of our hospitals; secondly, it states that we need a degree of co-ordination; and thirdly it states that the expertise of my press secretary, media liaison officers and the press officer of the Commission

(who does not service me but looks after the general affairs of the Commission) are available.

The Hon. Mr Burdett made some quite ill-informed comments, and at that stage he had not even seen the circular. Plenty of copies of the circular are available for the media and the Opposition. I presume it is like having a secret press release! We do not release information in circulars so that it can be kept under wraps. We did not make a secret document—quite the reverse. I will now contrast all that with the actions of my predecessor. I refer to an interesting little document dated 11 November (a bad day) 1980.

The letter is to the Chairman, Central Board of Health, and is headed 'Advice to Minister of Health re Media Comment'. Over the signature of one Jennifer Adamson, the then Minister of Health, it is stated:

I stress the importance of immediate advice being given to me when—

- (a) discussion of any matter affecting my portfolio has taken place between staff of the South Australian Commission; and
- (b) media interest can be expected in a matter affecting my portfolio—

she wanted immediate advice of any matter—

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** Isn't that what he was criticising you for?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Precisely, but I did not do it.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** You are saying that Mrs Adamson did it?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** Wasn't Mr Burdett in Cabinet at that time?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I will come to him in a minute: I am saving him up. A circular went out over his name. It was further stated:

I am placed in a difficult position when officers under my administration are reported as commenting on matters about which I have not been informed.

So, everyone had to notify the Minister. Further, it was stated:

Will you please ensure that, regardless of the time of day or night, or the presumed importance of the matter, I am informed immediately any comment has been made to the media, or when an issue surfaces in which the media might be likely to express an interest.

So, regardless of the hour of the day or night, and whether or not the matter appeared to be trivial (nothing was too small, no time was too difficult), the Minister was saying, 'For goodness sake, don't have any officer of the commission or any officer out there in the hospitals make a comment without my being contacted. Pull me out of bed at 3 a.m. if you will, but for goodness sake don't dare make a comment.'

*The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** That was addressed to the Chairman of the Central Board of Health.

*The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** The honourable member will wipe the egg off his face as I go on. I also have a circular from the Department for Community Welfare. There sits the Dickensian lawyer who for three years and two months was the Minister of Community Welfare. Let us have a look at what he had to say in a circular that he distributed to staff under the heading 'Points to be followed':

The normal point of contact between the Government and the mass media of communication in relation to community welfare matters is the Press Secretary to the Minister of Community Welfare.

That is phrased in exactly the same muted tones as was the information circular that was sent out.

*The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Apparently, there is a difference. I see. It is all right. Apparently, anyone in the hospitals can make any statement he likes and cause all sorts of furphies in the community, but, if one happened to work for the then Minister for Community Welfare, one had to look out. Not a word could be said. Just to be sure that no-one (and I mean no-one) talked to the press, we see that it was further stated:

The Public Service Act provides—

he is reminding them in the strongest possible tones—

that an officer may not without the permission of the Minister directly or indirectly, and whether anonymously or otherwise, make any communication or contribution or supply any information to any newspaper or publication of a similar nature on any matter affecting the Public Service or any department thereof or the business or the officers of the Public Service or any department thereof or on his own office or on his own acts or duties of an officer.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** Who signed that?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** John Burdett.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** Is it the same one?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** It was signed by John Burdett, Minister of Community Welfare, and he has the gall to talk about censorship on the basis of this very modest information circular that went out over the name of the Acting Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission.

**The Hon. J.C. Burdett:** That is pathetic.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** The honourable member is telling me that it is pathetic. It is about as pathetic as his motion. I suggest that the Hon. Mr Burdett should get on quietly with wiping the egg off his face. The honourable member seems very keen to go to great lengths in regard to the St John organisation. I am pleased to inform the Council that, as everyone who has followed this matter knows, I have acted in the most responsible manner possible during the nine months that I have been Minister of Health. I had Professor Opit in my office I think within three days of being sworn in as Minister, and I asked him to produce a report to try to find a long-term solution to the industrial disputes in particular and to the other problems in general that had been evident in the St John organisation, particularly in regard to the organisation of ambulance services over a decade.

I was determined that that would not go on under my stewardship. I am happy to be able to inform the Council today, despite the fact that the Opposition in the most blatant, political, and irresponsible way possible has tried to inflame this issue, that negotiations are not only proceeding between the interested parties but also proceeding very satisfactorily. In fact, I am also happy to inform the Council today that the volunteers met last night and agreed to a package resolving the St John afternoon shift dispute. Some fears were expressed that the agreement might be the first step in eliminating volunteers. However, the meeting was persuaded by the senior representatives, and the package was finally accepted unanimously; that is, the package which I have worked so hard to put together and in regard to which I have had senior officers of the commission implement full consultation with all the interested parties to the St John dispute.

Some of the things that were agreed on go well beyond what I would have proposed. It was agreed that there be a special consultative committee on industrial relations, and conditions of service were agreed. It was also agreed that the specification of responsibilities and conditions of service of ambulance officers be regularly reviewed.

Regarding volunteer contract of service, it was agreed that St John would develop a contract of service document that would be signed by all volunteers. Regarding in-service assessment, it was agreed that St John submit a formal

proposal to the southern sector office of the Health Commission requesting funds for both the 1983-84 financial year and for a full year to enable the employment of two in-service assessment officers, who are to be employed on a permanent basis. Regarding staff recruitment, it was agreed that St John would supplement its existing staff recruitment practice with open advertisement, and that this practice be started immediately.

In regard to the overtime clause, to show the real spirit of conciliation and compromise that I have been able to engender by the actions I have undertaken in the recent months, and despite the dreadful politicisation attempted by the Opposition, it was agreed that a variation of the existing award clause 9 (1), overtime, be made whereby St John would be given full authority to allocate overtime as required. The variation should read as follows:

An employee may be required by the employer to work reasonable overtime, and such employee shall work overtime as directed in accordance with such requirement.

The proposed new afternoon shift hours will be rostered initially from 1400 hours to 2200 hours with a crib break. There will be a review of the times in six months after actual experience data becomes available. Location and rotation of afternoon shift crews were agreed. Regarding overlap of professional and volunteer crews, as the afternoon shift will initially operate from three metropolitan centres, and in order to provide a satisfactory overlap of both paid and volunteer crews either side of 1900 hours, which is a difficult time, volunteer crews will be permitted to commence duty in all metropolitan centres from 1800 hours onwards.

Preference of responding crews, re-rostering, tasking of night shift crews, integration, and responsibility of parties were agreed, and so it goes on. That is above and beyond the best I might have hoped for. Therefore, I could claim again, as I said at the outset, that in the matter of the St John dispute, I had, as I always have, the interests of the patients at heart. It is significant that in the contribution from the Hon. Mr Burdett today the words 'consumer', 'patient', and 'South Australian public' were not heard once.

Never once did the honourable member mention patients. He talked about the egos of boards of management; he talked of how the Mayor of Port Pirie might have been upset and insulted—and I will come to it in a moment; he talked about the odd one or two in Port Augusta who might have been upset and insulted; but never once did the honourable member talk about the well-being of patients. He has apparently no concern about that at all. Never once did he mention it in a 30-minute contribution. That is where one of the basic differences occurs between the honourable member and me.

Of course, if there is one area in which one might expect a good conservative politician to have some expertise—since they often claim it—it would be in the area of financial management. Again, John lumbered from the trenches yesterday, blazing away about how hospital boards of management were being forced to insure with the one insurer. Really, that is totally pathetic. What we do have in the South Australian Health Commission currently is an ongoing consultancy with Reed Stenhouse, insurance brokers—private enterprise. They were appointed by the Tonkin Government, and I am quite happy to say that they are doing a splendid job.

I never interfere. It is not my intention to interfere because they are performing in a splendid way. They are examining all companies with which we as a commission and our hospitals, as the Hon. Mr Burdett refers to them (one would have thought they belonged to the taxpayers) and our health units are placing their insurance. I have here a document which was prepared for me only yesterday by the Director of Corporate Finance and Administration in the South Aus-

tralian Health Commission. It says that under the South Australian Health Commission scheme—the one which has been devised for the commission by the brokers, Reed Stenhouse—at the Childrens' Hospital alone there are potential savings in general portfolio insurance and in workers compensation of \$250 000 a year.

The Hon. John Burdett says that we have interfered. I mean the commission and me because, quite frankly, it was not a policy matter; it was an ongoing matter. I do not run down every burrow to try to conduct the commission on a day-to-day basis; that would be ludicrous. The honourable member really attributes powers and energies to me that I do not have if he thinks that I am rushing about the commission telling it how to conduct its day-to-day affairs and its business. Of course I do not; it is a \$600 000 000 operation. I am not the chairman of the commission; I am the Minister of Health.

But what happened is that the sector directors wrote to each of the hospitals in June, and I will quote from the letter which went out over the name of Mr Ray Sayers, the Executive Director of the Southern Sector, about the alleged compulsion which was coming from the Minister. I knew nothing about it at all at the time, but let us look at the compulsion and where it was coming from—the commission or the Minister?

**The Hon. J.C. Burdett:** Who alleged it?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** You alleged the compulsion. Let us have a look at what you said:

City and country hospitals were told not to renew their workers compensation with accustomed firms but in future to use a particular firm of brokers.

That was a callous, cynical, stupid untruth. Let me read as I was doing when I was interrupted. That is the first interjection to which I have responded. Forgive me, Sir. Mr Sayers, in his letter to the Boards of Management, says:

Obviously, your board may wish to continue its existing arrangements; however, it is believed that, because of the purchasing power of the Health Commission under its present arrangements, you will find that the premiums quoted are extremely competitive.

I will repeat that slowly and let it sink in. Then the honourable member will realise what a goose he made of himself yesterday. It says:

Obviously your board may wish to continue its existing arrangements; however it is believed that, because of the purchasing power of the Health Commission under its present arrangements, you will find that the premiums quoted are extremely competitive.

I would have thought that that was just plain good, competitive business in the mixed economy for which I as a democratic socialist have very high regard.

The next matter to which I refer is the question of my alleged lack of competence. When this matter came out in the debate there did not seem to be any case whatsoever, but I want to refer briefly to some statistics as to how I have occupied my time in the period during which I have been Minister. I will not go through the policy issues or all the initiatives, but there have been literally dozens of them—areas in which I have been able to move for the benefit of South Australians and South Australia. I will not go through all of those because self-praise, I believe, is no recommendation, and I will leave that to others better qualified to be objective than I am.

I cannot lay my hands on the statistics, but I have memorised them. In the period in which I have been Minister I have received 187 major deputations on, I might say, 187 different issues—it is a very diverse and difficult portfolio. I have also managed to squeeze in visits to 62 hospitals and health units in the metropolitan area and, as you know, Sir, I am almost a resident of the West Coast. I have visited 40 country or non-metropolitan hospitals and talked to their boards of management.

**The Hon. J.C. Burdett:** Including Port Augusta?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I have talked to the one at Port Augusta, and I will come to that in a moment. On the whole question about being abrasive, of course I am abrasive. I am well known for it. I am always abrasive when it is necessary to protect the interests of the patients and of the public—the consumers in that very big health care system with a \$600 000 000 budget for which I am responsible.

I want to tell the Council today—and I want to tell anyone who cares to listen—that I will continue to be abrasive to that small number of individuals in the system who want to resist change for the sake of looking after their own little empires. I am and will go on being about the business of seeing that South Australians get the best health care that is available in this country. Let me give the council some practical examples. The Julia Farr Centre: what an extraordinary example for the Minister to choose.

**An honourable member:** The shadow Minister.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Yes. Even a shadow Minister is at this stage, I would say, pretty shaky, and after the extraordinary business of bringing this thing on today and giving me and the Government in general an opportunity to go over the successes that we have in this one area alone—let alone all the others—I would say that he would be in very grave trouble. I have done more for the Julia Farr Centre in the nine months in which I have been Minister of Health than anyone has been able to do for the last generation.

Let me document that. Under the Liberal Government, the previous Minister had a cost allocation study done of the Julia Farr Centre because it was feared that there was a lack of accountability. About \$7 000 000 of South Australian taxpayers money goes into the Julia Farr Centre at current dollar values. So, the Minister at the time had a cost allocation study done.

That showed that there were some grave irregularities. When that report came to the Minister's desk it went to the then Premier's desk (Mr Tonkin's desk), but nothing was done. Why was nothing done? Was it because Mr Tonkin went to 'school'? Is it because he went to St Peters as distinct from us also rans?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Yes, he went to 'school'. They could not upset the old boy network despite the fact that it was obvious—

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** That's a shoddy thing to say.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** It may be shoddy in your view, but it is so true. They would not move until I was given the documentation, which was leaked to me. I made it public and from that moment on things started to improve, but they had not improved sufficiently. It came to my notice earlier in the year that residents were being moved against their will, that the morale at Julia Farr was shocking, that it was getting worse, and that the centre was far from happy.

I rang the Chairman of the board. Indeed, I took it upon myself to ring him. I had not only a right to do that but a clear duty: I am the Minister of Health and I administer on behalf of South Australian taxpayers \$7 000 000 allocated to the Julia Farr Centre. Clearly, I had a duty. I rang the Chairman and said that I was not happy. I said, 'It has been brought to my attention from patients, residents, relatives of residents, friends of residents and from staff across the board at the centre that things are far from happy. I do not want these moves to proceed until everyone has had a chance to sit down and talk about it and get their act together.'

Unfortunately, that was not done. A few days later I did what I had to do. I had gone through the processes of discreetly contacting the Chairman of the board—the Hon. Mr Burdett says that that is the sort of thing that one ought

to do (I agree with him; I also plan my moves carefully and intelligently). Having spoken to the Chairman and having been informed that despite our discussion the moves were on the very next day, I came back from Cabinet on the Monday night and, on being advised of the situation, I told the Chairman that we were doing certain things and putting in an administrator. I said, 'We are doing a number of things because I have to look after the interests of patients.'

Not only was that done but, because of the amicable negotiations that have continued subsequently, it is now likely that Julia Farr will rewrite its constitution. Indeed, it has already accepted conditions of subsidy for the financial year 1983-84, so that now, for the first time, there is financial accountability. Financial accountability was not available under the Tonkin Government, but it is now available under the Bannon Government and available under my administration as Minister of Health.

So much for gross incompetence—\$7 000 000 and not a clue about what was going on! That is what happened under the Tonkin Government but it is not happening under the Bannon Government. Furthermore, because of the amicable negotiations that are proceeding, I expect that the constitution of the Julia Farr Centre will be rewritten, that it will become an incorporated health unit under the South Australian Health Commission Act, and that we will have accountability in perpetuity. Of course, that also means that we can have serious discussions about how to utilise the 204 beds in the west wing which lay vacant, unoccupied and unused during the full three years and two months of the Liberal Government and which would have remained unoccupied forever had I not been able to take the initiative.

I will be brief about Port Augusta. I first discussed this discreetly with the board. The position was well known: it was known throughout the medical profession in South Australia and elsewhere that things had been bad there for a decade. It was well known to the previous Minister and Government that things had been bad at the Port Augusta Hospital for a decade, that doctors were feuding, and that the standard of medical service in some areas in particular was entirely unsatisfactory.

The honourable member said that I did not produce any evidence and that I did not go about it discreetly and so forth. Let me give the lie to that. I first went to Port Augusta on 1 March and spoke to the board of management. I laid it before the board clearly and concisely that there were certain things that had to happen. The board had to go through a redelineation of the privileges of the medical staff: that had to be done and had to be seen to be done through outside appointments who were independent of the medical practices in the town.

It appeared to me that the board understood plain English. Also, I said that I wanted a quality of care control system put in place. The board appeared to agree with me. However, I was not two hours out of town before that position was reversed: the board was nobbled as it had been nobbled for years by medicos from the various practices. When I heard of that I went back and confronted the board. Of course I did, because running through this whole business is the question of patients. I look after the interests of patients and not of some vested interests; I look after the interests of the patients, consumers, and the public; I look after the interests of South Australians.

The honourable member claims that I did not produce evidence—it was shooting from the hip and it was dreadful to call people names: it was a tactic that was dreadful. In the time that I have been Minister I have been abrasive to perhaps a dozen people, and I make no apology for that because it was always specifically in the interests of patients in South Australia. I have been extremely courteous and

co-operative with thousands of people and I have looked after the interests of more than 1 000 000 people.

Coming to this abrasive business with the Port Augusta board and whether I had any evidence, of course I did: surveys had been done during the time of the previous Government. Let me refer to just one—the survey undertaken by a senior anaesthetist from Queen Elizabeth Hospital who went to Port Augusta and who produced a written report. He looked at the 10 general practitioners giving general anaesthetics in Port Augusta. To paraphrase it, the report said that the majority of those giving anaesthetics had only a rudimentary knowledge of drugs, equipment or procedures.

The Opposition claims that I should not have interfered, that I should have let that continue. Having told the board gently and when it did not happen, of course I went in and was perfectly pleased to get right amongst it. I can tell the Council that 98 per cent of the people in Port Augusta supported me. I have already spoken about the St John dispute. In regard to Port Pirie, on that matter we should wait until the task force has reported. Dr Phil Landrigan will be here in the first week of September and will be making reports and recommendations to me. As to whether I felt physically intimidated when the Mayor and councillors were about me at the Plaza Shopping Centre, I can tell the Council that I did. I do not appreciate having local councillors or a Mayor saying, 'Idiot, you have no guts,' and 'Get into him, Bill.' However, I am not getting into the schoolboy antics of who started it because I want to say that in this matter, as in others, I am protecting the interest of the mothers, children and others in Port Pirie.

I did not hear the Hon. Mr Burdett say that. He seemed at great pains to protect a few members of the local council, yet not once in his 30 minutes while he spoke did he talk about the kids in Port Pirie. Is he concerned about them? Apparently not, yet they are the ones about whom I am concerned, and they are the ones about whom I will continue to be concerned. Of course the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Olsen), who increasingly has the affliction of foot-in-mouth disease, did not mind saying a few words and was reported in the Port Pirie *Recorder* in regard to deferring (and I stress that) the public housing project until we have further advice on the lead-contaminated areas. He said I had no evidence at all. I gave the lie to that in Parliament the other day. We had comparative figures on blood lead levels of children in Port Pirie West Primary School as against those from children taken 18 months or so ago at Thebarton Primary School.

Those figures show that, on average, the lead levels above 20 micrograms and upwards at the Port Pirie West school were three times as bad as they were at Thebarton. Thebarton, of course, is situated on one of the busiest, most polluted intersections in Adelaide. So where is the Opposition's concern? What did they do about the environmental lead pollution problems in Port Pirie in the three years that they were in Government? Nothing! What did they do for the kids at Port Pirie in their three years in Government? Not one thing! That is the Opposition's attitude. What is it that causes them to have the gall to come in here and move a vote of no confidence, the highest possible censure they can move against a Minister of the Crown. They are in tatters—it is absolutely disgraceful.

I will not say anything more about Hillcrest Hospital. Dr Dale Gerke is a new-found friend of Mr Burdett. The Hon. Mr Burdett is now championing a man who has one outstanding qualification—he has vilified and denigrated the school dental service consistently and persistently for three years. He nearly drove Mrs Adamson mad when she was Minister of Health. He has nearly driven me mad (not quite, but almost), so much so that when he recently wrote

to the Premier, breaching Standing Orders under which the select committee on the dental technicians Bill is working, I might say (and I am shocked that John Burdett, with his alleged respect for the Parliament and its Standing Orders—

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** Did you speak to Dr Gerke when—

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I have spoken to Dr Gerke, although I never went to bat publicly for him—I was not that silly (nobody could be that silly except the Opposition spokesman on health—poor John Burdett, into the minefield again). This is the man who has taken up an inordinate amount of the time of senior officers in the South Australian Dental Service and who has vilified and denigrated the best school dental service in the world—not just the best in the Commonwealth but, on evidence we now have from Dr David Barmes (chief of oral health for the World Health Organisation), the best, or one of the best, in the world. This service has been denigrated for three years by Dr Dale Gerke, new-found friend of the Hon. John Burdett, shadow Minister of Health.

I turn now to the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The board of management of this hospital wanted to employ management consultants. The first I knew about this happening was when Dr Bill McCoy, Executive Director of the Central Sector, spoke to me and said that I would have to put my initials on a piece of paper. Knowing my views on the over-employment of consultants by the previous Government, I guess Dr McCoy thought it wise to bring the matter to my notice. The former Government spent \$750 000 on consultants in the health area in 1981-82 alone. I approved the application (there was never any doubt that I would approve it). I certainly did not intervene in that matter. I did not know that it was going on until it was brought to my attention by Dr McCoy. I do not have the time or the energy (despite the fact that I work 90 hours a week) to get down every rabbit burrow. I would not know specifically what is going on in a hundred hospitals around the State. I have been to most of them, but I am not involved in their day-to-day running. Mr Burdett's allegation is nonsense.

The Hon. Mr Burdett ought to try to get on top of his shadow portfolio. He has been offered the resources of my senior officers—he can talk to them from time to time. He would be better off doing his homework, trying to get on top and trying to act as a responsible Opposition member instead of a member of a rabble Opposition. I am concerned, to some extent, about the future of the Bannon Government if the Opposition does not get its act together a bit better because it is well known that good Oppositions make good Governments. I think that this is a good Government, but after the next three or four terms of the Bannon Government if the Opposition does not get its act together a bit better, the Government will come unstuck, and I am a bit worried about that. I repeat the offer I have made on sundry occasions to the Hon. Mr Burdett that for as long as he survives as shadow Minister of Health (and I suspect that that will not be long—which will upset me a bit—

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** Even less time after this.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** After this fiasco it will be only a week or two. Provided the Hon. Mr Burdett speaks to my chief administrative officer first, we are prepared to coach him in his job. I think that that is a fair offer. I would not mind coaching him. He certainly needs coaching. He talked of preference to unionists. I am not ashamed of that, because that is this Government's policy and not something I dreamt up off of the top of my head. It is a well known Government policy and, as a member of the Government, I am proud of it. I have said before that I want to know when I go and talk to union representatives that they are talking on behalf of all people employed in our hospitals. The matter of autonomy has been talked about

before and is hardly worth talking about now. I have also talked about censorship before.

Turning to the matter of marihuana smoking, I think that this is a matter that will be better dealt with on another day. We will be introducing a complete rewrite of the Controlled Substances Bill early in October. It will be the most progressive and advanced legislation of its kind in Australia. It certainly will not be terribly adventurous in terms of penalties for people possessing marihuana. It will take note of the fact that the courts are nowadays imposing an average fine of \$117 for personal possession of marihuana and are not locking people up—nor should they be. The Bill will not proceed to decriminalisation at this stage and will be a Government-sponsored Bill. Again, I think that the old knee-jerkers have been into this.

The Hon. Mr Burdett, of course, has entirely different ideas from the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Olsen. They seem to be considerably at loggerheads. Mr Burdett says that he is going to wait and see and have a bit of a look, but Mr Olsen wants to lop off arms, legs, heads or any other appendages he can find in a typical knee-jerk, stupid, cynical political reaction. I conclude that it is really going to be terribly boring listening to the rest of the speakers in this debate if they are not a bit better than the man who speaks for them. It is really going to be quite dreadful.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** We have to hear from him again.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** He sums up! My goodness! I will have to leave this place for half an hour as I have something to do that I can only do on my own, and I also ought to go and have a cup of coffee (even Ministers perform natural functions). I conclude where I started, and let us be serious again, that this is a total disgrace to the Parliament of South Australia. It significantly marks down the current values of the Legislative Council. It is disgraceful. On the other hand, to some extent it is difficult not to laugh because to treat this matter as a no-confidence motion, quite frankly, is hilarious.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition):** The Minister used words that confirm what was in at least the first part of this motion (that is, that in the opinion of this Council the Minister of Health has demonstrated disgraceful behaviour and derisory conduct toward citizens totally unacceptable in a Minister of the Crown). He has just used them again. He has gone right through the whole exercise again, not only to the citizens but also to members in this Council. He seems unable to express himself without using words and phrases that are derisory. The Hon. Frank Blevins and the Attorney-General do not carry-on in the same manner (and it is a total credit to them that they do not), although I am concerned about the Attorney-General because he has indicated some regard for the methods employed by the Minister of Health. I would think much more of him if he had not done that.

I hope that his comments do not indicate to the people of South Australia that he believes that that sort of behaviour is acceptable. If he does think that that behaviour is acceptable, he has gone a long way down in my estimation. I suppose he thought that the Minister's reply to Mr Burdett was a tirade. It was surprising for the Minister to answer the Opposition in that way: to jump up immediately, before he had even heard everything that the Opposition wanted to say. It is the first time that I have seen that happen. The Minister said that the Opposition displayed an improper attitude. I believe that the Minister of Health has displayed a great deal of irresponsibility during his time in office, and he has certainly not restrained himself.

The Minister of Health has certainly not restrained himself when going off his head in Port Augusta, Port Pirie, at the Julia Farr Centre and on many other occasions. That is

exactly how the Minister has conducted himself. The Minister of Health referred to the Opposition as a 'rag-tag, bob-tailed mob sitting opposite, cackling like jackasses'. If the Minister believes that that is an appropriate way in which to conduct himself, he has a lot to learn. There is only one place for the Minister, and that is out of his Ministerial portfolio. I can understand the Minister walking out of the Chamber, because he can give it but he cannot take it. That is the way in which he operates. The Minister can say that he has other duties to perform, but that is no reason for him to leave the Chamber when a serious debate is being conducted. The Minister is displaying his natural contempt for this Council, by walking out of this Chamber when there are matters that must be debated with the Opposition.

**The Hon. K.T. Griffin:** He's leaving the Attorney-General to carry the can.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** I can understand that, because he cannot control himself when he is criticised.

**The Hon. K.T. Griffin:** Do you think that he's been told to go out?

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** That is quite possible. Of all the Ministers of the present Government, the Opposition receives more comments and complaints from the public about the Minister of Health. Naturally, we receive comments and complaints about all Ministers, but we receive many more about the Minister of Health. The complaints we receive about the Minister of Health are not just about his decisions; more often, the complaints are about his behaviour, his arrogance, his contempt for others and his bully-boy, self-opinionated attitude. Those descriptions all come from members of the public.

I have had an opportunity to witness the performance of the Minister over a number of years. I had hoped that, over a period of time, especially when he became a Minister, his behaviour would improve. However, that has not occurred. It may be acceptable to some that a back-bench member in Opposition displays some degree of irresponsibility and his comments are sometimes outlandish when making a point, but when a member becomes a Minister he is elevated to a status that warrants careful and reasoned behaviour, not a callous disregard for others.

The Hon. Mr Burdett highlighted a number of incidents and circumstances where the Minister of Health behaved in a manner totally unacceptable for a Minister of the Crown or for someone normally placed on a pedestal by the public. It is not acceptable to have a Minister of the Crown running around this State bullying people to get his own way and pressuring them so that his point of view prevails at all costs. The Minister claims that he does this in the interests of the public. There may be occasions when the Minister can defend some of his decisions, but he cannot defend the way in which he implements them. It is not proper for a Minister to take on people publicly.

I felt a sense of shame when I saw the Minister on television one night when he was visiting Port Pirie. I was ashamed that a Minister of Health from South Australia was carrying on so disgracefully and that his actions were being televised all over Australia.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** It was an insult to Parliament.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** It was. I felt insulted and I am sure that the people of South Australia felt insulted. The Minister implied that the Mayor of Port Pirie was at fault, and he has claimed that consistently. The Minister has reflected on a person who was elected to the highest office of the City of Port Pirie. The Minister reflected not only on the city of Port Pirie but also on its citizens, because they elected their Mayor. The Minister should have treated the Mayor of Port Pirie with some respect and not with the contempt that was displayed for all Australia to see. The Opposition cannot accept that type of behaviour.



The Minister's utter contempt for others is not only evident in the way he performs outside Parliament. If ever there was a sign of what was going to happen in the future it was sent by the Minister of Health when the Hon. Mr Burdett said that the Minister seemed to be much quieter. The Minister interjected and said, 'I'm just resting between bouts.' That shows the public that the Minister of Health is aiming to have a few more goes and that what we have already seen is just the beginning. Obviously, the Minister is not changing his pattern at all—he is going to continue.

In this Council the Minister consistently and regrettably resorts to abuse and personal attack when his arguments falter and his facts fail. The Minister's approach is best highlighted by comments made by you, Mr President, when in June last year you had to stem the flow of the Hon. Mr Cornwall's frequent interjections, by saying:

I do not want the Hon. Dr Cornwall to fly into a rage every time someone opens his mouth.

That is exactly what the Minister does. The Minister does not seem to be able to control himself. Whenever a member says something that in any way contradicts the Minister he goes overboard in a manner that is totally unacceptable. Whenever anyone dares to question the Minister or to have an alternative point of view they can expect a virulent attack on themselves, on their capacity and on their integrity. Mr Foster, a former member of this Chamber, can attest to that.

I have seen occasions when the Minister, as a member of the Opposition, behaved in a disgraceful manner. How many times can honourable members recall being told by the Minister of Health to 'shut up' or 'stop being an idiot'? Those phrases reflect a pitiful grasp of the English language, contempt and an arrogance which is quite unacceptable to all fair people. I will refer to several examples of the Minister's contempt in this Council. They are all comments by a Minister of the Crown in this Chamber. I refer to *Hansard* of 29 March at page 670, when the Minister said:

The honourable member is one of the weakest things ever to come into this Parliament. He should stay out of it for God's sake!

Also at page 670:

...my God, may John Burdett never, never, never, no matter what political accidents we have, be Minister of Health.

At page 740:

If the stupid member will shut up for a minute I will reply to his puerile talk.

At page 741:

Shut up!

At page 975:

I do not believe that you, Mr President, are protecting me to the extent that you should, quite frankly.

Other comments by the Minister include the following: 'This matter is far too important for me to be subjected to jackasses laughing and carrying on.' 'He is a bloody jackass!', 'You are the greatest goose to ever come in here', 'You are a real bloody comedian', 'If members opposite want it, they can cop it between the ears', 'I am quite enthusiastic to get as many people as possible in the system as members of their appropriate industrial unions,' 'Shut up. You are an absolute idiot,' and 'Shut up and listen!'

**The Hon. K.T. Griffin:** Is all that in *Hansard*?

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Yes, it is in *Hansard*. I now refer to some comments directed to the Hon. Mr Milne for daring to disagree with the Minister of Health, as follows: 'You rotten old phoney', 'You are the greatest phoney since Father Christmas', 'You are straight out of Barnum and Bailey', and 'You are a Liberal in a dirty white shirt'. They are just some of the things that the Minister of Health has said in this Chamber. His behaviour in this Council has not improved one iota. If anything, it has worsened.

**The Hon. K.T. Griffin:** He is more arrogant.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Yes, he has developed an arrogance and an ego that are difficult to contain. We hear continually about 'what I am doing and how I am the greatest'. I do not know whether the Minister realises it but, when he was talking about the Julia Farr Centre he was, in fact, reflecting on former Labor Ministers of Health, all of whom were very good men and for whom I had a very great regard. The Minister does not worry about those people, because before him there was nothing, according to the Hon. Dr Cornwall.

I can tell the Minister that there is a lot of feeling in the community about the way in which he performs as Minister. I know that as a Liberal I ought to be pleased that the Minister carries on like this and that he is upsetting the community. For instance, in the District of Mount Gambier, whenever there is an election campaign and when people hear that the Hon. Dr Cornwall is proceeding to Mount Gambier, we know that we will win the seat. Dr Cornwall lived in Mount Gambier, and people there know him: he reminds them of what can happen if they elect a Labor member. In fact, I encourage Dr Cornwall whenever possible to go to Mount Gambier during election campaigns, because he is our best weapon in the war of politics there.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** He is regarded as a power of a vet, too.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** I will not go into details of his professional background. He used to be my vet, and I would not like to reflect on him. Perhaps if I was to reflect on him it would indicate that I should not have paid the bills, but I did so. It is a very important matter when an Opposition takes a step such as this: it is not done lightly or for the reasons that the Hon. Dr Cornwall tried to explain. It is done because the Minister has developed an attitude towards the community and towards the people in this Parliament that is derisory. The Minister did not like that word, obviously, but that is what he did, and he continues to reflect on people.

Dr Cornwall can be the Minister of Health and he can do all of these things: he does not have to tell us what a good job he is doing, because that will become obvious if he does a good job. However, at present no-one would try to judge that, because people regard the Minister as arrogant and egotistical, and they believe that he is holding the community and the Parliament in contempt. I support the motion.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General):** I do not intend to detain the Council for very long on this matter: I believe that the Council has been detained far too long already, from 3.15 until 5 p.m., on an issue that has such little merit. It is unfortunate that it seems that more members of the Opposition want to get into the act on this issue. I can assure members that the Government does not intend to participate in this debate further. The Hon. Dr Cornwall has answered in so far as is required the issues raised by the Hon. Mr Burdett, and I will comment further on the motion.

However, I really think that the Opposition has a somewhat obscure and absurd sense of priorities when, apparently, all the Hon. Mr Cameron has to do is to have his research officer spend a considerable amount of his valuable time going through *Hansard* to obtain quotes, as substantive support for this motion, of things that the Hon. Dr Cornwall has said. The motion reflects more on the Opposition and particularly on the Hon. Mr Burdett than it reflects on the Hon. Dr Cornwall. I can only assume it is a publicity-seeking mechanism for the Opposition, which is clearly bereft of positive ideas to contribute to this or any other field in which it should be concerned. The motion is inap-

propriate, and the evidence on which to base significant and serious issues is non-existent. The motion should not have been moved, and it should certainly not be carried by this Council.

The motion calls for the resignation of a Minister: in effect, it is a motion of no confidence in the Minister of Health. It does not explore a particular issue by way of an urgency motion; it does not pursue issues of significance by way of questions in the Parliament; it does not, indeed, pursue issues of significance to the South Australian community by way of substantive motions in the Parliament dealing with particular issues that might concern the Opposition; it is not a matter that is pursued by an analysis of the Budget or by questioning a Minister in Committee or during Estimates debates.

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** What Budget? Do you mean a *quasi* Budget or a real one?

**The Hon C.J. SUMNER:** There have been financial debates in this Parliament—during this Government's term of office, there has already been a Supply Bill. I merely suggest to the Opposition that there are issues of substance to which it could address itself through various forms in the Council, such as urgency motions, questions, and debate on the Budget, Budget related matters, and the Supply Bill. But no! Members opposite come in with a motion, the most serious motion that can be moved against a Minister, calling for his resignation. On the evidence that has been produced, I do not believe that any person, objectively assessing the evidence, could say that any case has been made out. It is for that reason that I say that the motion should not have been moved. Further, it certainly should not be carried. The motion does not even come within the normal criteria of matters about which Ministers are called upon to resign.

The royal commission into the Australian Government administration commented that resignation was still a valid sanction where a Minister had been indiscreet or arbitrary in exercising power, in cases where the Minister had misled Parliament, condoned or authorised a blatantly unreasonable use of executive power, or, more vaguely, where the Minister's behaviour contravened established standards of morality. None of these questions has been raised in this case. Nothing in the normal criteria of no confidence calling for the resignation of a Minister has been substantiated by speakers so far.

The fact is that in this Council, at least, no-confidence motions have been moved very sparingly. In my recollection, there was such a motion against the Minister of Lands, Mr Casey, in about 1978, again on a matter of some minor seriousness, and there was one such motion in the last Parliament when the then Attorney-General was accused of misleading the Council over the then Government's proposal to introduce on-the-spot fines.

**The Hon. R.J. Ritson:** That was a very specious argument.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The fact was that at that time the Government knew that it would get some \$5 000 000 from that particular scheme but it did not provide the Council with any of that information. I do not want to rehash that debate: all I am saying is that that was a substantive issue relating to the misleading of the Parliament. These motions have been moved sparingly in this place and, indeed, during our period of Opposition, the Labor Party used the motions comparatively sparingly in the Lower House. It is interesting to note that such motions are used so sparingly in this place that the Hon. Mr Cameron does not even understand the procedures. He criticised the Hon. Dr Cornwall for leaving during the debate, and all I can do on that point is to congratulate the honourable member for leaving the council: I wish I could leave, because the debate has been so insignificant on the part of members opposite.

I now turn to the second major charge. A lack of administrative ability is what is now alleged. The evidence for that was, if it was possible, even weaker than that on the first point. My recollection is that it dealt with certain dealings that the Minister had with certain hospital boards. Point by point, the Minister has already responded to most of those issues. Indeed, I would have thought that the Hon. Mr Burdett was commenting more on matters of policy than on administrative ability. He talked about the Minister's attitude to marihuana. In fact, the Minister has a point of view on that which he was entitled to make public, and I am surprised that the Hon. Mr Burdett has criticised him for making his views known publicly. I do not mind his criticising the views, but to come into this Council and criticise the Hon. Dr Cornwall for making known publicly his personal strongly-held views about the decriminalisation of marihuana is absurd.

**An honourable member:** Inconsistency.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** There has not been any inconsistency at all. The Hon. Mr Burdett has personal views, too. He went to Cabinet many times, and those personal views were overruled in Cabinet. Honourable members know that that happens every day of the week in Cabinet. The principle of Cabinet solidarity means that one abides by the collective decision of Cabinet. This particular issue is not a matter of specific Government policy but a social or conscience issue in the Parliament. The Hon. Dr Cornwall made his views known to the world. Apparently, that is a lack of administrative ability: that is the attack from the Hon. Mr Burdett.

What were the other issues? Some allegations of apparent interference in hospital boards—not substantiated with any credible sense. The Hon. Dr Cornwall has already refuted most of those specific allegations and referred to actions taken by his predecessor in similar situations. But, if one really wants to go through the records of this Minister since taking office in November last year, one will find that it is a very impressive administrative and policy record. One only has to look at the legislation introduced in the Parliament: the Medical Practitioners Bill, for instance, supported by the Hon. Mr Burdett, in which he said that there was a need to update the Bill—a view which the previous Minister acknowledged and which the present Minister had carried forward. There was compulsory negligence insurance: 'I certainly support this deviation from the previous Minister's Bill,' he said.

The Hon. Dr Ritson, in relation to audit requirements and reporting to Parliamentary requirements, said: 'I commend the Minister of the former Government on the drafting of those democratic controls into this statutory authority.' Referring to some matters on which the Hon. Dr Ritson wanted further information, he said: 'The Minister has offered me the services of some of his advisers; I thank the Minister for his offer.' Is that derisory conduct? Is that disgraceful behaviour? It is a matter of the Minister's co-operating with honourable members in this House. Later, the Hon. Dr Ritson said, 'I thank the Minister for his co-operation in this matter. I asked dozens of questions of the officers whom he generously made available to me. Most of my queries were resolved.'

Apart from that, the Hon. Mr Cameron who, incidentally, has himself left, said that he found it surprising that the Hon. Dr Cornwall had got up and responded immediately after the Hon. Mr Burdett. He said that, surprisingly, the Hon. Dr Cornwall responded without hearing the whole parade of accusations from honourable members opposite, whom apparently we are now about to hear into the wee hours of the morning. The convention in the House of Assembly is for the mover of the motion to state his case; then for the Premier, if the Government is being attacked,

or for the specific Minister if he is being attacked, to respond immediately afterwards. That is exactly what happened in this case.

When a motion was moved against the Hon. Mr Griffin there were two Opposition speakers and then the Hon. Mr Griffin responded. All that I can say is that I do not quite know what the Hon. Mr Cameron was on about except that it clearly demonstrates that he does not understand the procedures of the Parliament. One would have thought, as I said, that certain substantive issues could have been raised by the Opposition: the State is facing severe economic difficulties at the moment and one would have expected the Opposition to turn its attentions to positive comments on how we can overcome those, or, if it had criticisms on particular issues, to raise them. But, to proceed in this way at this time against the Minister of Health, I believe, does very little credit to the Opposition.

To analyse just what members opposite have said, it seems to me that their comments are broadly divided into two charges: one is that the Minister has apparently made some derisory comments about people. That is what the motion talks about: 'derisory conduct and disgraceful behaviour'. Then we have an accounting of some anecdotal evidence from the Hon. Mr Burdett about certain conversations and discussions that the Minister of Health has had with people in the community. We have the relating of a few incidents: apparently the Minister of Health has had a tiff with a few people and he has indicated that he has been abrasive with certain people. Then we got from the Hon. Mr Burdett a few—not very many—anecdotal comments about these tiffs that the Minister of Health has had with certain people, and that constitutes the charge on this point from the Hon. Mr Burdett.

Then we have the Hon. Mr Cameron trying to bolster this issue by reading out a series of interjections and other statements that the Hon. Dr Cornwall has made in this Council, both as Minister and in Opposition. He collected them all together; he had his poor research officer apparently scrounging through the Hon. Dr Cornwall's speeches over the last eight years that he—

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** Not 8 years; it was eight weeks.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:**—has been in the Parliament to try to give us a very entertaining recollection of all the statements that the Hon. Dr Cornwall has made. I have no doubt that if we went through *Hansard* and did the same analysis of the Hon. Mr Cameron's remarks one could no doubt put a very—

**The Hon. R.J. Ritson:** No. You know that.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** Well, apparently the Hon. Mr Cameron has checked, and I am pleased to hear that. No doubt, if one contracted every statement that someone had made in the Parliament one could get quite an interesting list. Nevertheless, all I am saying is that that was the basis of the Opposition's attacks—*anecdotal evidence* from the Hon. Mr Burdett about a few tiffs that the Minister had with people in the community and a list of statements made by the Minister in the Parliament. That is the evidence. I ask the Council to examine that evidence and determine whether that should lead the Minister to resign. I suggest that any fair-minded person would consider that to be a ridiculous proposition and, indeed, verging on the laughable.

That is commendation from the Hon. Dr Ritson. There was support from the Hon. Mr Burdett about the Medical Practitioners Bill and in regard to the Transplantation and Anatomy Act and the Death (Definition) Act—again, significant legislative action and reform. The Hon. Mr Burdett stated:

I am pleased that this Government has continued the initiative of the previous Government and has introduced this Bill.

A compliment for the Minister. The Hon. Mr DeGaris stated:

I am pleased to support this Bill and I am also pleased that the Minister has introduced the recommendations made by the Australian Law Reform Commission, but with some changes.

The Hon. Dr Ritson seemed to be overwhelmingly enthusiastic about this Minister of Health, because he stated:

I applaud the Government on the provisions in the Bill and the obvious concern which the Bill expresses for the rights of young people.

The Hon. Mr Davis stated:

I commend the Government for the introduction of this important legislation.

Other significant legislative action is also in the pipeline, including the Controlled Substances Bill, the details of which have been announced; and a Food Bill, new legislation based on model uniform legislation developed at the request of the Australian Health Ministers' conference, is also in the pipeline. South Australian Health Commission Act amendments are also in the pipeline, as is a review of the Dentists Act, and legislation to replace the existing Act will be introduced subsequently.

Certainly, they are significant legislative matters which the Minister has, with the compliments of the Opposition, already introduced or which will be introduced. In addition, the Minister has taken a number of significant administrative actions. The planning for the Lyell McEwin health village and the health village proposal for Noarlunga has already begun. A mental health inquiry was established by the Minister, and a review of the South Australian Health Commission's administrative management structure has also been initiated. Further, I refer to the Sax Inquiry into Hospital Services. All these matters have been commenced by this Minister since the Labour Government took office in November 1982.

My personal dealings in respect of migrant health issues will also be of interest to the Council. After three years of inaction by the previous Government, this Government determined to establish a task force in each Government department comprising representatives of people from ethnic minority backgrounds or health people (depending on which department was involved) to ensure that policies were implemented in departments. The first area with which we dealt was the health area, and a joint task force was established by the Minister of Health, with myself as Minister of Ethnic Affairs. That task force has already reported to the Government, which is considering what action should flow from it.

Certainly, the actions that I have outlined are not the actions of a Minister who, according to the terms of the motion, demonstrates a lack of administrative ability. It is nonsense to suggest that. A significant series of administrative reforms and legislative measures will be initiated and will continue to be pursued under the administration of the Minister of Health.

I oppose the motion and refute the allegations against the Hon. Dr Cornwall contained in it. I reiterate that it is unfortunate that the Council finds itself debating an issue of such transparent inadequacy in terms of evidence. I have said before that, in effect, the evidence comes down to this: in terms of conduct there has been a tiff with some people in the community plus some comments in the Council which the Hon. Mr Cameron did not like—hardly evidence that one would expect the Hon. Mr Burdett to use to move a motion of no confidence, especially when such a motion is the most serious motion that can be moved against a Minister in regard to a lack of administrative ability.

Even if the Minister has had a tiff with some people in the community and even if the Hon. Mr Burdett finds that a bit unfortunate from his point of view and he prefers that

the Minister should have behaved in a slightly different way, how the honourable member come into this Council and claim that the Minister lacks administrative capacity is beyond me.

It is an absurd proposition in the light of the significant matters that the Minister has set in train, and in many cases completed, in the short nine months of his tenure of office. The motion deserves no more time in this Council. It deserves the treatment that I hope it will get: I hope it will be thrown out at the earliest possible opportunity so that the Council and the Opposition can get on with some constructive and sensible comments about the running of this State.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** I am not convinced one bit by the arguments launched by the Attorney-General. I enter the debate because I am concerned that the Minister has been guilty of disgraceful behaviour and derisory conduct and that the standards of that behaviour and conduct are, in my view, unacceptable from a Minister of the Crown. I have taken those words from the motion moved by the Hon. Mr Burdett, and I dwell upon that aspect as one who has long been deeply concerned in local government in South Australia. When I heard and read of the comments in public directed by the Minister towards one of the most senior people in local government in South Australia, I thought that it was disgraceful behaviour. The criticism that he made of Mr Jones at Port Pirie has already been mentioned, but I refer to some of the phrases and sentences. He said of Mr Jones:

one of the most irresponsible persons in public life in South Australia.

He stated:

At least I am not a middle-aged ocker larrikin.

He then referred to Mr Jones and a 'mob of middle-aged bully boys', and I presume that some of the bully boys, according to the Minister, were members of Mr Jones's council. However, the worst insult of all was the reference to the character of Mr Jones when he mentioned the 'preposterous pig ignorance of Mr Jones'.

**The Hon. J.C. Burdett:** It's disgraceful.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** It is disgraceful for a Minister of the Crown to speak like that in public.

**The Hon. G.L. Bruce:** What did Mr Jones say back?

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** I do not know. Apparently, there was some comment where someone called the Minister an idiot. Nevertheless, a Minister of the Crown must not conduct such discussions like that in public. If the Minister felt strongly in relation to criticism of Mr Jones, it was his job as Minister of the Crown to take Mr Jones aside and have some firm words with him, but not in public.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Tell us about the kids in Port Pirie.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** Never mind the kids in Port Pirie—the Minister has had his chance in this debate. The point is that not only is conduct like that unbecoming of a Minister but also, if a Minister cannot control himself and makes such utterances, frankly, he is not fit to be a Minister. Of course, those insults sent shock waves through local government, and people have been talking to me about it ever since. Local government is insulted by it, and I have had a long association, as the Council knows, with local government. I would think that the Hon. Mr Milne, who also has had a long association with local government in senior positions, must also have been insulted.

My experience goes back to 1959, when I became a member of a fairly large council. I have years and years of experience as Opposition spokesman on local government in my nearly 18 years of service in this place and five years as Minister

of Local Government. I know very well those involved in local government throughout this State. I cannot reconcile allowing a motion like this to pass without being involved in its discussion. I have had a deal of experience in Port Pirie and know the standards that are maintained in public life in that city. I went there on many occasions during the former Liberal Government's last period in office from 1979 to 1982 and was involved with the opening of the complex where the new council chambers now stand.

I also stood on a public platform side-by-side with Mr Jones during the ceremony when the old town hall was formally closed. We stood together at the commemorative service which recognised the beginning of the new Northern Regional Cultural Centre Trust building. I have been to Port Pirie on occasions for festivals involving the Italian community and have marched in their procession alongside the Mayor of Port Pirie.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** And me.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** I think that there was an occasion when the Minister made it up there for the march but not for the church service or the ball at night.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** I have been there for the church service and the ball.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** The Minister was not at the ball or church service when I was there.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** I was there.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** The Hon. Mr Keneally was there, but I did not see the Attorney—he must have been hiding at the back. That is not the point. The point I am making is that, as a great supporter and believer in local government, I was hurt by the Minister of Health when he made his insulting remarks about Mr Jones. It must be recognised that public utterances by a Minister of the Crown were directed at one of the State's outstanding citizens, a man who was last year honoured by the Queen. Mr Jones has made a complete success of his municipal and public life.

I recall the story told to me (I have never checked with Mr Jones but I understand that it is true) that he began as a junior reporter in the council chamber at Port Pirie. He went there with pencil and pad as a young man, surveyed the position, saw the service that the councillors and Mayor were extending to the community at the time and developed an ambition to serve in local government. As the years went by he made his way up the ladder of local government. No doubt Mr Jones suffered setbacks from time to time, as most people do when they enter local government, but he eventually made it as a member of the council and then, later, as Mayor. It is the Dick Whittington story of local government in South Australia. This is the man whom the laughing Minister opposite insulted publicly—the man to whom he has not had the decency to apologise in this Chamber during this debate.

**The Hon. R.C. DeGaris:** Are you sure Dick's cat is not the Minister?

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** I have not made any mention of Dick's cat. This is the person about whom the Minister said, 'He has preposterous, pig ignorance.' They are, frankly, words of the gutter. This gentleman who was so insulted became Port Pirie's first citizen and is held in high esteem by all people in that city. This was proven last year when he was challenged for the office of Mayor by an active young candidate, he defeated that candidate by a large majority. That proved Mr Jones's popularity and that he holds the respect of local people for his role in civic and community leadership. I repeat that, in that large local government area of South Australia, Mr Jones is an outstanding citizen of the State. He is the man whom the Minister went for in this insulting fashion. For those reasons, I support the motion.

The Minister's remarks were not a reflection upon the Mayor only, because if one reflects upon the Mayor of any Council, as the Hon. Mr Creedon knows as a local government man, one automatically casts aspersions on members of the council. The standards of local government practised by the Port Pirie City Council in recent years under the leadership of Mayor Jones have been excellent. They have new council chambers now. Council members gave excellent evidence to the select committee, as the Hon. Mr Bruce will recall.

**The Hon. G.L. Bruce:** I was not on the committee.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** No, the honourable member was not. At the time the select committee into the boundaries of Port Pirie was taking evidence the council showed itself as a responsible local government body. A city municipality of this kind does not deserve the Minister's insults. It does not stop there, because not only did the Minister in his inexcusable way insult the mayor and the council but also thereby he cast reflections upon the city and its people as a whole because they are represented by the Mayor and the council in this third tier of local government. Of course, as most of us know (although I do not know whether the Minister knows this), life has not been easy for the people of Port Pirie, and they do not deserve insults of this kind. They have been battling for years to keep the town and the community spirit welded together, both socially and economically.

Included in the overall population of the town is the ethnic population. The largest group within the ethnic population is Italian people. Therefore, they have been insulted by this Minister of the Crown. They are not Italian migrants who have come to Adelaide in recent years but older people of Italian descent who came here from Molfetta, as the Hon. Mr Feleppa would know, in the mid-1920s. These people have grown up in Port Pirie. Although some have left and gone to other parts of the State, many of them, their children and their children's children, still live in Port Pirie and are excellent citizens. These people are insulted when a Minister of this Parliament goes to their city and speaks publicly to the municipal leader of the town in the way that this Minister did.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** You do no mind a Minister of the Crown being physically threatened and intimidated?

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** Oh, come on! All I have read—

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Never mind what you have read; I am telling the honourable member what happened.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** There was no mention of physical threats. All I have heard is that a voice came from the crowd calling the Minister an idiot, which is not a pleasant thing to hear. However, nothing printed or said, and nothing that the Minister has said, justifies his conduct in Port Pirie on that fateful day, 19 June this year. That is the reason why the Minister was taken to task by the Premier when he got back from Port Pirie and told this kind of conduct must stop.

I believe that the conduct of the Minister justifies the action taken by the Hon. Mr Burdett in moving this motion. I support one point that the Attorney-General made, which was, in effect, that the Council must always be cautious in moving and supporting a motion as serious as this. Nevertheless, certain standards must be maintained by Ministers of the Crown because, if they are not maintained, it is a reflection not only on the Minister and his Government but also on the House in which that Minister sits and the Parliament as a whole. That matter, therefore, should be redressed. It was in the Minister's hands to redress matters, but naturally he did not do so.

I think the Premier went almost the full distance towards redressing the matter, but he did not go far enough. The Hon. Mr Burdett has taken a responsible course of action.

I appeal to the Council for full support for this motion. It is quite evident that the Minister of Health will not withdraw; therefore, this motion is the only way that the Council's pressure can be brought to bear.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** In his valiant contribution, which sought to justify the actions of the Minister of Health, the Attorney-General observed that it was unusual for a no-confidence motion to have so many speakers. The number of speakers reflects the degree of concern felt by members of the Opposition. We are not simply going through the motions of a no-confidence motion as a political stunt. We are reflecting the widely held views of health professionals who are concerned about the Minister's behaviour, his inappropriate and egotistical attitude and the insensitive manner in which he conducts his portfolio.

This debate is not about whether or not the Minister of Health is intelligent. I concede immediately that the Minister of Health is one of the more intelligent Ministers in the Bannon Government. The level of intelligence, the intelligence quotient of a Minister, is not the measure of his success in a portfolio. The Minister of Health presides over an enormous Budget allocation, and we heard him boast about that this afternoon. The Minister of Health presides over a sensitive portfolio, and he should deal in a sensitive way with the people and problems associated with his portfolio. The Minister of Health has failed to do that. In fact, the Hon. Dr Cornwall has the sensitivity of a bull in a china shop, and that is on a good day.

The Hon. Mr Sumner attempted to justify the Hon. Dr Cornwall's behaviour, which has been described in some detail by the Hon. Mr Burdett and the Hon. Mr Cameron, by saying that the Minister of Health has made the odd statement or two and has cast a few reflections on people. I suggest that, if the Hon. Mr Sumner said that the lawyers of, say, Mount Gambier were legal leeches or if the Hon. Mr Blevins said that the farmers of, say, Farrell Flat were fools, there would be justified uproar in the legal and farming communities. I have never heard the Hon. Mr Sumner or the Hon. Mr Blevins come even close to statements such as that. To hear and read about the Hon. Dr Cornwall describing the doctors of Port Augusta as 'medical mafia' is fairly typical of the level of behaviour that he has adopted.

The Hon. Dr Cornwall's behaviour amounts to conduct unbecoming of a Minister of the Crown. His behaviour demeans the institution of Parliament and can do nothing to improve the public's perception of Parliament and its members. The Hon. Dr Cornwall said that the Hon. Mr Burdett did not refer to the community when moving his motion and that that was strange because health touches on the lives of everyone in the community. Surely, the very point of this motion is to demonstrate that the Minister's behaviour, such as it has been described, does not improve people's perception of the health system; nor does it improve the workings of the health system.

The Minister of Health has consistently demonstrated disgraceful and derisive behaviour towards health professionals. The Hon. Dr Cornwall has treated health professionals in a most unprofessional manner. His rages are well known amongst hospital staff, professional bodies and other groups in the health area. They all have a story to tell. Most members on this side have heard those stories, which were unsolicited, through telephone calls and by discussion. Many of those stories are second-hand and, therefore, I accept them with some reservation. However, I have heard enough first-hand accounts to be concerned about the Hon. Dr Cornwall's conduct in his capacity as Minister of Health. The Hon. Dr Cornwall has adopted a sneering, snivelling style, not only in this Chamber but also in dealing with health professionals.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Give us a few examples.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** The Hon. Dr Cornwall asks for some examples of where he has crossed health professionals, attacked them and raged against them. As he well knows, that is difficult to do. Public servants in the health area already have a difficult role, and it is made even more difficult by the antics of the Minister of Health. The Minister does not really believe that those people would be prepared to come forward and have their names touted around this Chamber, because they have a career to maintain and they have a responsibility to the institutions that they serve. There are enough public demonstrations of the Hon. Dr Cornwall's performance as Minister of Health to show that the stories from sources within the health area are most certainly true.

The Hon. Mr Burdett forcefully demonstrated the Minister's conduct by discussing his unjustified attack on the medical profession at Port Augusta, Port Pirie and at the Julia Farr Centre. Certainly, there may have been problems in those areas, but that is no excuse to approach those problems in such an unprofessional and unbecoming manner. The Minister of Health does not like to be crossed, and he has demonstrated that in this Chamber. If any member attacks the Minister or gets under his skin he gets mad.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** You're right, I do not tolerate fools easily. I have never tolerated you for that reason, and that is why you get under my skin.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** Need I say any more? When he became a Minister, the Hon. Dr Cornwall said, 'I will be a Minister of consensus; I will seek common ground and we will go ahead together'. The Hon. Dr Cornwall may be a man of good will, but with a very foul mouth. The Minister of Health has clashed with professionals—

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Mr Davis's comment is unparliamentary and I ask that he withdraw. The honourable member said that I have a foul mouth. I ask that he withdraw and apologise.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Minister has asked the Hon. Mr Davis to withdraw. I suggest that that is the easy way to deal with this matter.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** Mr President, I do not wish to contest your suggestion, but I would not have thought that the words 'foul mouth' were unparliamentary.

**The Hon. G.L. BRUCE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr President. The words 'foul mouth' were used in reference to the Minister in general and not in reference to anything reported in *Hansard*. The honourable member used the words in another sense and I think that a withdrawal is justified.

**The PRESIDENT:** I believe that a number of speakers are putting me in the hot seat. I am not sure how to interpret the words 'foul mouth' in the context that they have arisen. I understand what the Minister means, and I understand what the Hon. Mr Davis meant. I believe it would be appropriate if the Hon. Mr Davis withdrew.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** In deference to you, Mr President, I will withdraw, and in so doing I hope to set an example for the Minister in regard to the use of language in the Council and outside the Council.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Mr President, with respect, I ask that the honourable member withdraw and apologise. I submit to you, Sir, that, in the context in which the words were used, to say that the Minister was 'well known for his foul mouth' would suggest that I was into all sorts of obscenities and profanities. That is highly objectionable, Sir.

*The Hon. C.M. Hill interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** The words 'foul mouth' are used, as you know, in the understanding of the reasonable, average citizen, as a term that would suggest—

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** What about 'pig ignorance'?

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** 'Pig ignorance' is not—

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** Is it a pleasant expression?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** It has nothing to do with 'foul mouth' in the normally understood sense of the term.

*The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I have the floor, if the honourable member does not mind. In the normally understood sense, the term would suggest that I was heavily into the use of obscenities and profanities in the conduct of my public life or in public, and quite clearly I am not into that.

**The PRESIDENT:** I take the point of order. The point I am not quite sure on is whether or not in actual fact the Minister asked for an apology. He asked for and received a withdrawal.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I asked that the honourable member withdraw and apologise.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** I have already indicated that I withdraw that remark in deference to the Chair at your suggestion, Mr President, but I still seek to make the point by saying—

**The PRESIDENT:** In actual fact, what the honourable member is supposed to do is to explain what he actually meant. The Standing Orders provide that a member has the right, of course, to make an explanation. As far as I am concerned, the honourable member has withdrawn the remark. I accept that, and, if the honourable member continues without any further explanation of what he meant, he may proceed.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** The Minister has used inappropriate language on many occasions. This was demonstrated by the Hon. Mr Cameron and the Hon. Mr Burdett earlier. I intended to make the comment that the Minister has demanded apologies from people who have crossed him. He has had significant clashes with professional bodies in the health area. Staff at hospitals look forward to a visit from the Minister of Health with the same degree of enthusiasm with which they go to a dentist to have their teeth extracted without an anaesthetic.

In fact, I know that, when the Minister is due to visit two particular hospitals, strict instructions are issued that staff should be compliant and should be very careful of everything they say. One might say that that is a fairly common procedure, no doubt, when Ministers are on an official visit, but in this case it is rather more than that. The key people in hospitals and in other health areas know full well the ability of the Minister of Health to be easily upset, to have cross words, and to take it out on them subsequently. That is the very nub of the argument. We are talking about one of the largest portfolios that is administered by the Government. The Minister has a responsibility, as he said himself, for a budget of \$600 000 000 per annum, and it is important that that budget be administered sensitively and properly.

The Minister has claimed that there has been little discussion of the second leg of the motion of no confidence, namely, that he has demonstrated a lack of administrative ability in performing his Ministerial duties. Quite frankly, it is not easy to look at the financial side of the health budget at this stage because, of course, we are just ahead of the Budget papers, but it was interesting and perhaps instructive to note the Minister's answers of only last week, when he said that he has managed to provide 300 additional jobs in the health area. One would imagine that that would involve \$6 000 000 plus. He is a Minister in a Government that has pledged to maintain employment levels at the July

1982 levels. It will indeed be interesting to see whether that promise has been fulfilled.

The one thing that we can say with certainty is that the Treasurer's May 1983 statement of the financial position in South Australia indicated that there were over-runs in the health area of about \$17 000 000, and total over-runs of \$26 000 000 in all departments under the control of the 13 Ministers in the Bannon Government. One may well presume—

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** On the expenditure budget, we came in spot on.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Why isn't this bloke—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** One may well presume, in regard to the initial information we received, that that demonstrates a singular lack of administrative ability. There is no question that previously in the health area there was sensitive and competent financial administration, but there has been no great show of that by the Minister, notwithstanding the huffing and puffing that we see occasionally. I have demonstrated—

*The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Minister will desist.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** I have demonstrated that certainly there is a case to answer in respect of the Hon. Dr Cornwall's dealings with people in the health area. Indeed, there is a case to answer for the behaviour of the Hon. Dr Cornwall within the Council. Those of us who have been here for three or four years revered the knock-about style of the late Hon. Jim Dunford and the Hon. Norm Foster. It is one thing to have a knock-about style such as that, with good intentions, and it was entered into in a good spirit; however, it is quite another matter to take on the egotistical, sneering, and sniffing style of the Hon. John Cornwall, who attacks members of the Opposition personally and with relish.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** I hold you in contempt, as you know. I don't suffer fools.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** There we go again. That is an excellent demonstration.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** I can't help it: I am in contempt because you are a gaggle of geese.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** When I raised the issue of the Minister's behaviour in the Council and his constant misbehaviour, I was not talking about the Harry Truman adage, 'If you can't stand the heat in the kitchen, get out'. When one comes into Parliament, one should expect a bit of rough and tumble. That is fine, according to members on this side: we can take it. However, real men do not carry on as the Hon. Dr Cornwall carries on.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Real men don't eat quiche.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** I conclude that the public image of Parliament and the institution of Parliament are not enhanced or maintained by the attitude of the Hon. Dr Cornwall. I have seen with my own eyes that the Hon. Mr Blevins pulled the Hon. Dr Cornwall into line when he got into a rage. That occurred only last week. We saw the Hon. Mr Sumner pull him into gear. We all know what happened behind closed doors when the Premier took to him with a cane for the disgraceful behaviour that he exhibited to Mayor Jones of Port Pirie.

My final plea is for the people of South Australia to see with their own eyes the behaviour of the Hon. Dr Cornwall. If they do not belong to the staff of a hospital or a professional health body they can get a free demonstration every day Parliament is sitting. My only consolation, in concluding, is that yesterday, by introducing and giving a notice of this motion of no confidence, the shadow Minister of Health

(the Hon. Mr Burdett) at least achieved some sanity from the Honourable Dr Cornwall, because his behaviour at Question Time yesterday was quite the best we had seen for many weeks. One can only hope that perhaps if we put a motion like this on the books more regularly at least we might make him more accountable in his dealings in the Council. What he does outside as Minister of Health is another matter.

*The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** I support the Hon. Mr Burdett's motion. It is clearly demonstrated by a large number of examples that have been given today that the Minister of Health has demonstrated disgraceful behaviour and derisory conduct towards citizens in the health area, towards the community at large and in this Parliament.

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** I have no doubt that the Minister has the intelligence and education to grasp his portfolio. I have no doubt that he does not suffer from the lack of wit and articulate speech which, unfortunately, characterises about two of his Cabinet colleagues in another place. He does from time to time propose policy with which I disagree and which I deal with within the context of the Bill or resolution which embodies the point of disagreement. It is true, as the Attorney-General said, that there are occasions when I publicly agree with some of his policies, but that is not the issue here today. The issue here today is the unfortunate issue dependent upon the fact that regrettably when the Minister is under stress he reverts to a kind of abusive behaviour and uses language which offends prominent citizens and which is undignified and unbecoming to a Minister of the Crown. For that reason I support the motion.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I was personally disappointed this afternoon with the Minister's response, particularly with respect to the way he heaped personal abuse on the shadow Minister. I hoped that the very serious motion that had been moved this afternoon could have been handled without personal abuse of the Hon. Mr Burdett. As I said, I was personally very disappointed to see that the Minister responded in that way rather than responding to the precise nature and detail of the allegations about his behaviour made by the shadow Minister.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** I was on my feet for fifty-five minutes and could not do everything.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** Most honourable members would accept that the Honourable Mr Burdett is one of the most honest and honourable members in this Chamber, and it does the Minister no credit to heap on an honest and honourable politician—a member of this Council—the amount of personal abuse which the Minister displayed this afternoon. That has been a further example, as other members have indicated in this debate, of the Minister's whole performance in his eight or nine months in the Health portfolio. I do not want to take up any further time in detailing some of the disturbing and—I think, certainly in one respect, the incident in relation to Mayor Jones—disgraceful incidents in which the Minister has got himself involved.

*The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** The Minister cannot drag that red herring—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** —across this particular debate. All members in this Chamber are concerned, as the Minister obviously is, with the health problems in Port Pirie.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** You could have fooled me; not one speaker has mentioned it.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** But this is not a debate about the health problems of the children of Port Pirie; it is a debate about the performance of the Minister in his portfolio over the past eight or nine months.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** It was very kind of you to bring it on. It was a wonderful forum.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I call on the Minister to refrain from interjecting. We have got this far without any real hassles.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** I am being perfectly prudent.

**The PRESIDENT:** You are being of no help to anyone. I ask you to listen to the debate.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** That disgraceful incident for a Minister of the Crown to involve himself in (a public brawl with a leading member of local Government—Mayor Jones) gained publicity not only throughout South Australia but nationwide. I certainly had three or four calls from interstate from people wanting to know who this fellow Cornwall was and what he was about.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.45 p.m.]

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** A number of members have spoken before in this Chamber of the cynical view that members of the public take in regard to their Parliamentary representatives, including Ministers of the Crown. Members from both sides of this Chamber have bemoaned that we are held as a group in such low esteem by members of the public.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** It's not helped by moving motions like this one.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** It is not helped by performances such as that indulged in by the Minister in a public brawl with the Mayor of Port Pirie. It demeans the Parliament and the office of a Minister of the Crown, as well as members from both sides. We have a vested interest in the attitudes and views of the electorate of us as a group, and the performance of the Minister in that public brawl, which was publicised not only in South Australia but nationally, does nothing at all to help the situation. In fact, it does the reverse and does not improve the standing of elected representatives in South Australia. I am genuinely concerned about that, and I know that it concerns members from both sides of the Chamber.

Certainly, I hope that we will not witness a Minister of the Crown (and, if the Minister survives the motion, I hope that we will not witness him) indulging in such an exercise which can serve only to give credence to the very low view of members of Parliament by the public.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** You've not had any little old ladies get up and congratulate you?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** The Minister claims that he had support. In a group of 1 300 000 people I do not doubt that one little old lady may have congratulated him on his stance on one issue or another. That is not in dispute. We are talking about a broad cross-section of people who have a low opinion of us as a group, and I say genuinely that the exercise that the Minister allowed himself to be brought into in Port Pirie does not do him, his office, Parliamentarians, and Parliament any good. I hold that view strongly, which is why I support the motion.

If the Minister survives this motion I hope that he will be suitably chastened and will not indulge in such an exercise in the future. I found the Government's response to the motion most interesting, particularly as the Leader of the Government in this Council did not seek to use a common Parliamentary tactic to amend the motion to a vote of confidence in the Minister. That is extremely significant.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** All right—we will.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** It is too late if, under the pressure of debate, the Attorney decides to adopt that Parliamentary

tactic, which many a Government has done to defend a Minister in the past. It is significant that the Attorney did not have the confidence to move such an amendment to turn the motion into one of confidence in the Minister's performance. I am not going over all the matters that have been well raised by other members, although I refer to one item that has not been raised so far in the debate. In particular, I refer to the Minister's performance in the Chamber this week when on Tuesday, under intense pressure and questioning in this Council, it was revealed that the Minister, without putting the contract to tender, had given a contract for market research to the polling company that undertakes—

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** You are wrong. I did not give a contract to anyone.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** Then he is about to—is the Minister denying that he is about to?

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** It will be all done in the proper way, according to Hoyle.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** If it were permitted, I would offer the Minister a small wager: I am sure that Mr Rod Cameron's A.N.O.P. will get the contract that the Minister is about to let through the Health Commission.

**The Hon. Barbara Wiese:** It should get it—it is the best such company in Australia.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** According to the Minister, Mr Cameron is the best pollster in Australia. As I said this week, I do not criticise the professional competence of Mr Rod Cameron or his company, A.N.O.P.

**The Hon. Barbara Wiese:** Then what are you talking about?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** What I criticise is the fact that a Minister of the Crown can put out a significant contract, costing taxpayers many thousands of dollars, without seeing whether other companies equally competent can do the job at a lower cost to the taxpayer. I was very disappointed to see on Tuesday that the Minister besmirched the reputation of a competent national market research company, McNair Anderson. The Minister in this Chamber besmirched its reputation as a market research company. He is on record and I am sure he will not resile from the comments that he made in saying that it was 'bodgy research done by a crook company'.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** On a point of order, Mr President, I am being grossly misrepresented, and any reading of *Hansard* will prove it. I did not say that the McNair Anderson survey was bodgy work done by a crook company: I said that I was not in the business of having bodgy work done by a crook company. I criticised the company as not standing up to the challenge by another company.

**The PRESIDENT:** It is a valid point of order, if I had *Hansard* here to check it. However, I cannot do that. I ask the Hon. Mr Lucas to proceed.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** However the Minister tries to wriggle out of the situation today, there is no doubt that on Tuesday he said certain things in this Chamber. I will not reveal what he said to me privately as he strolled across the Chamber, but there is no doubt that on Tuesday the Minister, while in this Chamber, criticised the reputation and work of a national research company, McNair Anderson, without giving one shred of evidence to back his criticism. I think that that was grossly improper. I hold no particular brief for the McNair Anderson company. It is not a company that we as a political Party used when I was with the Party organisation, so the Minister cannot say that we are linked with that company.

I do not know personally the principals of McNair Anderson, but I do know that their research is held in as high esteem as that of A.N.O.P. and other similar national companies in Australia. It does the Minister no credit to besmirch



their reputation in this Chamber. I will not go over the whole matter, but I hope that the Minister, if he survives this no-confidence motion, will be suitably chastened, and that we will not see similar examples of personal abuse being handed out by him not only to members of local government, the community and health professionals, but to members of the Opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I support the motion.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Agriculture):** I enter this debate briefly and with a great deal of reluctance. The exhibition we have witnessed today can best be described by one word—'pitiful'; it was absolutely pitiful. I think that sufficient has been said about this motion by the Hon. Dr Cornwall and the Attorney-General. However, I want to answer the final point made by the Hon. Mr Lucas, who I thought would have had more sense than to become involved in such a pathetic exercise. However, I was wrong and he chose to enter this debate with what he thought was a fresh and telling point. I suggest that, if the Hon. Mr Lucas wants to play the smart Alec, he should do his homework a little better.

In the past two years one motion of this kind has been moved in this Chamber and one was moved recently in the House of Assembly. When the motion was moved in this Council by the Labor Party (then in Opposition) against the Attorney-General, the Hon. Trevor Griffin, the Liberal Party did not attempt to amend the motion but merely voted it out, which is precisely what we are doing now. If the Hon. Mr Lucas is suggesting that in some way that is not defending the Hon. Dr Cornwall, then he must also, in fairness, accuse his own colleagues of not defending the Hon. Mr Griffin when a similar motion was moved against him. The fact is that in neither case was the member not being defended properly and it is merely the Hon. Mr Lucas, who wants to be a smart Alec without doing his homework, who thinks that they have not been protected. I thought better of him, and I have been sorely disappointed. I think that he has been sitting too close to the Hon. Mr Davis for too long.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I was quite astonished to hear the Minister refer in his reply to the St John debate, because when I spoke I did not refer to that matter except in passing.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** The honourable member had a couple of words to say about it yesterday.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Yes, I did, and I will have further words to say today.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** The honourable member wants to make a few more cynical, stupid political points.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Minister is only delaying the debate and holding up proceedings each time he interjects.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** The Minister referred today to a meeting of St John volunteers held last night. He said that that meeting unanimously upheld the package deal put forward by him.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** That is what he said.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Yes, that is what he said. I got the impression when he spoke that he was talking about a meeting of between 200 and 500 volunteers to whom the proposition was put and who all held up their hands to vote.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** That was the impression I got.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** That was the impression. In fact, that is not the case. I am informed that there were 12 or 15 people present at that meeting and that they were not all volunteers.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** He has misled the Parliament.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** He has misled the Parliament.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I rise on a point of order, Mr President. I cannot cop that. Sit down! I have got the floor. My point of order is that this fellow is trying to grossly mislead the Parliament. What I said today was that there was a meeting held last night at which the proposals that had been developed as a result of the propositions I put forward—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! What is the point of order?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** That I have been grossly misrepresented by the honourable member in his speech.

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** Under what Standing Order is the Minister taking a point of order?

**The PRESIDENT:** The Minister must say what point of order he is taking because if he wishes to make a personal statement regarding this matter I do not see why he cannot do that at a later stage. That is hardly a point of order.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I am taking this point of order because the member on his feet is grossly misrepresenting what I have said. He is not allowed to misrepresent any member of this Chamber. I do not know what the Standing Order is, because I do not memorise the Standing Orders. What he has said is a gross misrepresentation of what I said today. I know that the honourable member has had a coach in the gallery all day, but he has got his facts wrong again.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** The facts of the matter are that at the meeting last night there were between 12 and 15 people.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Is the honourable member speaking to my point of order, or simply carrying on? If he is, that is a gross discourtesy to the President. The honourable member has debased this place enough today, so why does he not let us get back to normal?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The relevant Standing Order is 175, which states:

A member who has spoken may again be heard, to explain himself in regard to some material part of his speech on which he has been misquoted or misunderstood, but shall not introduce any new matter or interrupt any member in possession of the Chair.

I call on the Hon. Mr Burdett to continue.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** There were between 12 and 15 persons present at the meeting last night. They were not all volunteers, but some were. Some were divisional or floor superintendents of the St John Ambulance Brigade. When the meeting was held the Manager of the St John Ambulance Brigade told those present that the alternatives were to either accept the package deal or the Minister would withdraw the volunteer service.

**The Hon. H.P.K. Dunn:** Is that what was said?

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Yes, that is what was said. Following that, I am informed, some of the volunteers criticised the brigade management and did not accept what was said. There was not a unanimous vote and, in fact, there was no vote at all. It is quite incorrect and misleading to suggest that there was a unanimous vote. The Minister has misled Parliament, and that is another reason why he should resign. Thousands of volunteers were not consulted or invited to the meeting. What was said at the meeting was not an expression on behalf of the volunteers. Some of those present at the meeting disagreed with what was said.

Turning to other matters that have been raised, the Minister himself has proved the case raised by the Opposition. The Minister has established the fact that he attacks people, disregards personalities, and presses on with his cause as he sees it. The Minister proved that today by attacking me, the Hon. Mr Davis, and anyone whom he sees as standing in his way. In particular, I refer to the case of the Port

Augusta Hospital. It is on record that the Minister said that the Port Augusta Hospital had the worst hospital care in South Australia and that it was run by the 'medical Mafia'.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** No longer, I am pleased to say.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** The Minister interjects and implies that I am quite right; I assume he is now saying that he did say that it was a medical Mafia. I am referring to the way the Minister of Health carries on. As I have said before, the Minister is not always wrong, and he was not necessarily wrong in regard to the Julia Farr Centre, the Port Augusta Hospital, or anything else. I am referring to the way in which he attacks personalities, and that is why he should not be a Minister. A good example of that is the Minister's description of the Mayor of Port Pirie as a 'middle-aged ocker larrikin'. That really is disgraceful.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Even if it is accurate.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** It is disgraceful in any circumstance whatever. There is no excuse whatever for saying anything like that.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Don't behave like a human being—that is what you are saying.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I am not saying that at all. I am saying that there are ways in which a Minister can behave like a human being, but the Minister of Health has not done that. In relation to the situation at Port Pirie, the Minister should have taken the board aside and spoken to it—

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Behind the toilet.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Not behind the toilet, but in the board room. In relation to the situation at Port Augusta, the Minister should have taken the board and the medical officers aside to speak to them and solve the matter before committing himself in the press in the disgraceful way that he did. As the Hon. Mr Hill said, in relation to Port Pirie in particular, a Minister does not go out in public and say the things that were said at that time. A Minister should take people aside and speak to them privately, if he is to have any credibility at all.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Or you sit down as a Minister and do as you did—watch your department as it is dismembered and decimated.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I take the honourable member's point: my department was not dismembered or decimated when I was Minister.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Talk to the P.S.A.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** It was not.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** It was.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** My department had the highest regard for me; the Minister can try and prove to the contrary. In relation to the situation with the press, the Minister referred to the previous Minister and the Health Commission. What the previous Minister said in relation to statements in the press by Health Commission officers was perfectly justified. When I was Minister of Community Welfare my statements about my department were perfectly justified. When one is running a department or even a commission there should be some vetting of what is said to the press. However, that is not what I was referring to: I was referring to hospitals which are supposed to be independent. The Minister has said that hospitals have only a residual independence. However, they do have some—

*Member interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I ask the Hon. Mr Cameron to sit down and lower his tone.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Hospitals have some sort of independence, even though the Minister says that it is only residual. This relates to what is said by hospitals and not to what is said by departments or by the commission. The Minister has carefully refrained from mentioning the main

points that have been made, including his disgraceful behaviour in relation to Port Augusta Hospital and his comments that it was run by the 'medical Mafia' and that it provided the worst hospital service in South Australia. That latter description was regarded by the nursing staff as a reference to them, whatever he said later. The Minister was involved in an appalling public brawl with the Mayor of Port Pirie, Mr Jones. The Minister simply passed off altogether the question of the Hillcrest hospital. The Minister was present in a section of Hillcrest hospital where out-patients were present and where he castigated the Chairman of the board in the presence of public servants, out-patients, and psychiatric patients who were waiting for treatment and who suffered as a result of his outburst. The Minister passed that off and did not refer to it at all.

The points that I have made include his derisory attitude in his contact with the public. In fact, at times, the Minister has gone right off. The Minister has not taken people aside to discuss things but has simply sounded off in public whenever it suited him. I am quite certain that what I said this afternoon was correct and that the Minister has been pulled into gear by the Premier, and that he has probably been pulled into gear by his Leader in this Chamber who defended him this afternoon, as was his duty.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Obviously you don't know the Hon. Dr Cornwall very well at all.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Yes I do. The Minister's conduct towards the public has been disgraceful. The Minister has sounded off, he will continue to sound off, and he should be removed.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Under Standing Order 175 I rise to point out that I have been grossly misrepresented. It hurts me a bit to call the shadow Minister the Hon. John Burdett, although I am aware that that is the correct term of address in this Council, and I have far more regard for it than the Opposition has shown today.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Minister can speak only to the point that he is making.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I thank you for your indulgence, Mr President. The member said that I had grossly misled the Council, and that that was yet another reason why I should resign. I am afraid he has run off at the mouth today, and I will point out the facts. In relation to my statement about St John, I do not play politics with that organisation because patients' lives are too important for that. I said today that, as a result of propositions that I had developed and had taken through the St John organisation (and I was referring primarily to the management of St John and the St John Council), which were developed sensitively and sensibly from the Opit recommendations, we are very close to achieving peace. As I understand it, there will be an afternoon shift and there will be a guarantee—

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I rise on a point of order, Mr President. Standing Order 175 states:

A member who has spoken may again be heard, to explain himself in regard to some material part of his speech on which he has been misquoted or misunderstood, but shall not introduce any new matter or interrupt any member in possession of the Chair.

The Minister was not misquoted or misunderstood: he is simply trying to introduce new matter.

**The PRESIDENT:** I think that the Minister is getting around to the point where he was misrepresented, and I will give him time.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** As in regard to all of the matters that have been canvassed this afternoon by the Hon. John Burdett, that is simply a matter of opinion and, like most of his judgments, it is wrong. The matter to which I referred (and I was simply explaining) was a culmination of a series of negotiations emanating from the Opit Report,

through my office, through the Health Commission, to the St John management, the St John Council, thence to the association, and more particularly to the brigade. The meeting last night was, basically (and this is quite consistent with what I said earlier), a meeting of representatives from the volunteers. It is my understanding that up to 15 people attended. That is perfectly correct. Each of those people was a supervisor from the metropolitan regions of the brigade, and altogether they represented, I am told, about 80 per cent of the volunteers involved in the ambulance service in the metropolitan area.

The meeting was convened and conducted by Dr Glyn Davies of the ambulance brigade and, as I said earlier today (and I read direct from a memo that was sent to me this morning), some fears were expressed that the agreement was the first step in the process of eliminating volunteers from the ambulance service. Further, whether or not they were told that I had said, 'You either accept this or I do away with volunteers,' I do not know.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I rise on a further point of order. This is going very much further than the Standing Order allows. Standing Orders provide that a member may not speak more than once: a member may explain himself in regard to some material part of his speech. I believe that the Minister has done that, and I think that that is the end of it.

**The PRESIDENT:** I am almost to the point where I believe that the Minister has explained his concern to my satisfaction. However, I ask the Minister to conclude.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I was almost finished. I have been told that the honourable member is pretty testy, but he has made an awful fool of himself today, so I can understand that. I was merely saying that it was a representative meeting. The supervisors were invited by Dr Glyn Davies from the St John brigade. They represented, in total, about 80 per cent of the volunteers in the metropolitan area, and they ultimately agreed. If they were—

**The Hon. J.C. Burdett:** They didn't agree.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I do not know where the honourable member gets his information, but my information happens to come from the senior health officer who was in charge of negotiations.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I believe that the Minister is branching off now.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** With respect, I am not branching off, Mr President. I am saying precisely what happened.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** The Minister is straying right outside the bounds of the Standing Orders.

**The PRESIDENT:** I ask the Minister to conclude. He is repeating himself.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I am not repeating myself, Sir—with no disrespect. I am simply saying that the meeting, contrary to what the member said, was very representative of the volunteers; it was convened by Dr Glyn Davies, who is the number one man in the St John brigade; and after lengthy discussions (the meeting went to 12.40 a.m.) they agreed that they should accept the package. That is what I put today, and that, in fact, is what happened. There is no suggestion whatsoever that I misled the Parliament in any way.

**The Hon. J.C. Burdett:** You said it was unanimous.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Really, the old fellow ought to control himself or get medical attention.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I believe that the Minister has explained the point he wished to raise.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (9)—The Hon. J.C. Burdett (teller), M.B. Cameron, L.H. Davis, H.P.K. Dunn, K.T. Griffin, C.M. Hill, Diana Laidlaw, R.I. Lucas, and R.J. Ritson.

Noes (10)—The Hon. Frank Blevins, G.L. Bruce, B.A. Chatterton, J.R. Cornwall, C.W. Creedon, M.S. Feleppa, I. Gilfillan, K.L. Milne, C.J. Sumner (teller), and Barbara Wiese.

Pair—Aye—The Hon. R.C. DeGaris. No—The Hon. Anne Levy.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

## ETHNIC TELEVISION

Adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. C.M. Hill:

That in the opinion of this Council—

1. There is an urgent need for Ethnic Television to be provided in South Australia to benefit not only the ethnic and migrant communities, but the people generally, and strong public opinion on the question has been evidenced by a street march, protest meeting, and other means, and fears have been expressed that the previous Fraser Liberal Government's approved plan for Channel 0/28 to serve Adelaide in the 1983-84 year will not now be pursued by the Hawke Labor Government despite Labor Party policy.

2. In view of this uncertainty, the Hawke Labor Government be acquainted with this strong public feeling, and the particular resentment due to the fact that citizens of Sydney and Melbourne have enjoyed channel 0/28 since 1980, and people here deserve and demand equality with their fellow interstate Australians.

3. The Premier be asked to convey the substance of this motion to the Prime Minister so that the necessary action to dispel these fears can be taken, and the service provided in the 1983-84 year.

(Continued from 10 August. Page 95.)

**The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA:** It is with great interest that I support this motion moved last week by the Hon. Mr Hill for the extension of multi-cultural television into South Australia. In supporting the motion, I wish to comment on some necessary facts about which we need to remind ourselves. Perhaps it is appropriate for me now to underline or clarify the right that the ethnic community claims to have in requesting multi-cultural television and to outline briefly and re-affirm the role played by migrants towards the development of this country since the massive influx of migrant immigration in the post Second World War period.

First, I will seek to demonstrate the demographic change which has occurred in Australia since the 1940s. In 1943 the non-British population was 700,000 people, or 10 per cent of Australia's population. In 1978 it was 3,500,000, or 25 per cent. In the 1976 census one in every five persons in Australia was born overseas.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I ask honourable members to arrange their discussions a little more quietly than they are at present.

**The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA:** Statistics also indicate that by the year 2000 more than 50 per cent of the Australian population will be the direct result of this migration programme. Therefore, we can say that no other country has undergone such demographic change in such a short time. The injection of this great number of people with such diverse backgrounds and ideas has contributed to a profound social change.

What was formerly an insular community is now slowly showing signs of a more energetic and cosmopolitan society which is keeping pace with the rest of the world. Also, it must be remembered that a great many migrants have come to Australia as adults, ready to work and to produce. There has been no social cost or investment at all by Australia in their skills. The social investment which assisted migrants to become financially productive adults was made by their country of origin and, therefore, Australia has greatly benefited from that.

In conjunction with that has been the great expansion that migrants have generated through the purchase of houses, furniture, general goods, motor cars, clothing and other items. It is only when one considers these factors that one begins to gain an idea of the extent of the contribution made by migrants to Australia's economic development. Migrants are expressing themselves for a number of reasons. They are aware that they have a right to participate in the political process. They are also aware that they have a right of access to Government agencies in order to suggest policy changes and programmes which would increase their opportunity to attain equality in this society.

In addition to what the Hon. Mr Hill has said last week, I wish to add that, in 1980, 96 per cent of Australian homes had television sets, and 63 per cent of these were colour television sets. The average weekly viewing per house was 30 hours. Also, in 1980 there were 50 commercial television stations plus the national stations, indicating the immense potential of television as a multi-cultural force. To reinforce this point, a survey carried out in 1975-76 by the Australian Broadcasting Control Board further indicated that 57 per cent of viewers favoured the provision of some programme in languages other than English. It was soon after that, in 1977, that both the then Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition committed themselves and their Parties in a pre-election promise to the establishment of multi-cultural television.

So, it is clear that there is a need as well as much public support for the extension of channel 0/28 to other Australian States. Prior to that it is necessary for me to remind the Council that it took the courage and fair-mindedness of the greatest reforming Prime Minister of this country, Mr Gough Whitlam, to implement a programme which gave to the ethnic communities in the Eastern States radio and ethnic television. Now, the citizens of Sydney and Melbourne enjoy the best television programmes to be seen in Australia.

However, one cannot speak of multicultural television without making reference also to the other television stations, and, indeed, to the whole of the electronic media. The new chairman of the A.B.C., during one of his earliest statements, said that the national television channels should reflect the multicultural nature of Australia's society. One cannot but support entirely the expression of such concern. However, at the same time one cannot but equally point out the discrepancy which currently exists between the composition of our society and the composition of everything which makes up the A.B.C., for example, staff programming, presentation, etc.

My major concern is the total absence of any other language ever represented in the programmes of radio and television. One would not expect that a current affairs programme be conducted in Italian, Greek, or Vietnamese or Polish. However, there are programmes of general interest (films, documentaries, etc.) which could have easily been represented. Certainly, it would have been necessary for the A.B.C. to organise itself for sub-titling. But the fact that this has not yet happened is simply an indication of its lack of interest in this area.

Therefore, for those who argue that any of these things cannot be done, I would point out that the unchallenged success of Channel 0/28 is due precisely to its 'multicultural' flavour, both in language and content. The ABC originally rejected the request to programme for a multicultural Australia when it was asked to do so by the previous Federal Government. Now, instead, it has indicated that it would like to take over the programmes conducted by Channel 0/28. This is, of course, a clear demonstration of the success of Channel 0/28 and is also a demonstration that multicultural television is viable and can be successful. The point I wish to make very clear here is that a multicultural reflection

of our society through our television programmes should be available with or without the existence of Channel 0/28.

The rationale is in the fact that, while Channel 0/28 provides a special service for specific issues or communities, the service provided by the ABC is for all mainstream Australians and ignores the 25 per cent of our population with a non Anglo-American background, with represents part of mainstream Australia. Therefore, I am reluctant to accept that the eventual existence of Channel 0/28 throughout Australia would resolve the central issue of the responsibilities of our electronic media. Ultimately, the issue is again one of a just and proper response to the needs of our multicultural society. Nevertheless, I agree with the Hon. Murray Hill that the programmes have been proven very popular and have also gained respect for their quality. The News service, sporting and musical programmes have all proved to be of an excellent standard.

Channel 0/28 transmits programmes in the various community languages daily from approximately early evening to midnight. All programs have sub-titles in English so that everyone can follow them without any difficulty. Channel 0/28 is of particular importance to second and subsequent migrant generations, whose knowledge of the language of their country of origin is limited, but, who wish to share their parent's culture. Also, for the members of the general community, it will be a means of exposing information and thereby promoting awareness of other cultures. This exposure of the various cultures will certainly help to overcome some ignorance which often results in racist attitudes. There is also another reason why the establishment of multicultural television is necessary. We have already witnessed the imposition of large consumption of cultural products which are substantially foreign to the culture and needs of the people in Australia. These programmes, not surprisingly, are predominantly Anglo-American in outlook and almost exclusively in the English language.

So, they do very little to reflect the multicultural character of Australian society or to meet the needs of residents who have difficulty in expressing themselves in English. All this indicates not only that we in South Australia are deprived of the opportunity to see these informative, entertaining and excellent programmes, but also that our local film-makers, actors and producers are being denied the opportunity of using their talents in the production of programmes for the 0/28 Channel.

I also wish to bring to honourable members' attention the fact that in 1980 the South Australian Film Corporation commissioned a local film-maker to investigate the potential of making programmes in Adelaide for the Channel 0/28 network. As I understand, he received the full support of the South Australian Film Corporation, which, as the Honourable Murray Hill has said, has the reputation for leading Australia in creative film work. But, not surprisingly the submission was completely ignored by the Federal Government of that time.

The equality of ethnic communities can only be promoted by policy initiatives that link equality with cultural identity. As I have stated before, migrants have, in many ways, made an immeasurable contribution to the materialistic and economic development of our country. The fact that migrants in this State are prepared to express and struggle to improve their cultural development is a sign of the increasing maturity and sense of contribution that they can give in this other area of social and community life.

I must agree with other honourable members that, in the light of the huge Budget deficit which the Federal Government is prepared to bear in this financial year, the cost of the establishment of Channel 0/28 in this state represents a mere drop in the ocean. In conclusion, I hope that this Council, my Leader in this Chamber as Minister of Ethnic

Affairs, and my Government, will continue to give their strong support to this matter, and request that the Federal government immediately extend ethnic television to South Australia—in the current financial year. I support the motion.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I commend the Hon. Murray Hill for moving this motion which seeks the bipartisan support of this Council for a message to be sent to the Prime Minister outlining our belief that there is an urgent need for ethnic television to be provided in South Australia. I must admit, as an aside, that I prefer the expression 'multi-cultural television' used by Mr Feleppa and will continue to use that expression, although the motion refers to 'ethnic television'.

It is proposed, also, that the message should highlight the extent of public support for this move and call on the Federal Government to abide by its election pledge of March this year to proceed with the programme initiated by the former Fraser Government, which would have seen multicultural television here in Adelaide this financial year. I thus welcome Mr Feleppa's contribution to the debate and strong endorsement of the motion.

The Hon. Murray Hill dealt at some length with past efforts in this State to secure the extension to Adelaide of a multi-cultural television service through Channel 0/28. These efforts involved members of Parliament of all persuasions, community groups of all origins, and the media through specific articles, programmes and editorial comment.

Therefore, I do not propose to retrace the ground comprehensively covered by the Hon. Mr Hill. However, I emphasise that, when one considers the extent of past efforts to gain the agreement of both major Federal Parties to extend multicultural television to Adelaide, the suggestion that the present Federal Government may renege on its election promise of March last year is an affront to all concerned. Furthermore, such a suggestion serves to highlight the discriminatory nature of the present service, which is confined to Sydney and Melbourne. The Fraser Government indicated its commitment to establish ethnic television in 1977. On this point I correct a statement made by the Hon. Mr Feleppa. It was under the Fraser Government that this commitment was made and honoured. In fact, the commitment was honoured on 24 October 1980, when Channel 0/28 commenced transmission from Sydney and Melbourne. In the intervening period the Galbally Report on Migrant Services and Programmes of May 1978 had endorsed the proposal, recommending that a small task force be authorised to proceed with the establishment of a pilot multicultural television station. The Galbally Report noted:

We are anxious that it should be of value to the community as a whole by promoting tolerance and appreciation of cultural diversity. For this reason, even though ethnic television will naturally involve the production and broadcasting of programmes of interest to specific groups of migrants, the aim should be to present such programmes so as to attract a multilingual audience, and the community generally.

There is no doubt that, since multicultural television was introduced in Melbourne and Sydney, the hopes expressed by the Galbally Report have been realised. Multicultural television in those cities has increasingly attracted a multilingual audience and the community generally.

A report by the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs evaluated the implementation of the Galbally proposals for post-arrival programmes and services and noted the following findings in relation to multicultural television audience levels:

- Within a month of the channel's first transmission, 92% of Sydney and Melbourne's populations had heard about multicultural television channel 0/28 and 59% had watched it (Dix Report 1981).
- MuTS found that in May/June 1981, 94% of persons of non-English-speaking background (NESB) and 50% of those of

English-speaking background (ESB) reported watching Channel 0/28 in the previous month.

- A special analysis of August/September 1981 ratings data provided for the institute by McNair Anderson indicated that 30% of NESB people and 7% of ESB people had watched MTV in the past week.
- Ratings measure the number of people viewing particular programmes. Using the results from all programmes, a measure can be derived called the 'share of audience,' which reflects each channel's average ratings.
- In early 1981, the Special Broadcasting Service commissioned McNair Anderson to survey ethnic audience viewing in Melbourne. The results indicated that MTV had a 15% share of the night-time audience. This was not as high as the three commercial channels' share (22%, 27% and 32%), but was far higher than the ethnic audience of the ABC (4%).

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** What are the ratings?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** It received a 15 per cent share of Melbourne's night time ratings, but the channel only operates for a specific period at night. The findings prove conclusively that multicultural television in Melbourne and Sydney is proving to be a most popular alternative to commercial television and in both cities is fulfilling a need among ethnic communities and the community at large. The principal draw-back to date has been of a technical nature. Inadequacy of transmission sites and the low power of the transmitters themselves have affected the quality of reception and in Melbourne in particular has led to the interruption of programmes. These problems have been acknowledged and are being addressed.

There have also been complaints that for a number of languages the range and balance of programmes has been uneven. However, I do not consider that to be an insurmountable problem, and it is certainly no reason to condemn this initiative. In fact, it does not surprise me in the least that such a problem has arisen, even though on the few occasions that I have watched multicultural television in Sydney and Melbourne the rich diversity of programmes has impressed me. Multicultural television is, after all, Australia's first experiment with public television and in the short period since its establishment I believe it has excelled in its endeavours to realise the many expectations made of it and the many problems that it has been asked to address.

I can only suggest that, when one looks at the extensive range of objectives that have been approved by both Governments for ethnic television, Channel 0/28, if it achieves half of those objectives it would have to be deemed to be a success. To date, the channel's coverage of overseas events (and Channel 0/28 has the highest proportion of news and documentary/information programmes of any Australian television service) has been acclaimed as an important means of keeping people in touch with the countries from which they or their families have migrated. The channel's community service announcements (on average, one every three hours of transmission), its English language teaching programmes and its bulletins of advice and information on migrant rights and obligations, services and institutions, have been recognised as assisting migrant settlement by breaking down the sense of isolation many feel on losing contact with the language and culture of their countries of origin.

It was also considered by the Institute of Multicultural Affairs Evaluation Report that the channel's efforts to programme material about the multicultural nature of Australian society were an important initiative in promoting tolerance and understanding in our society. A further positive aspect of multicultural television often overlooked is the use of captions or sub-titles, which is a point that the Hon. Mr Feleppa mentioned. I refer to the pleasure that this initiative has given to the many deaf and partially deaf people in our community who to date have been excluded from enjoying the option of watching television. I acknowledge that these people over the past few months have had the opportunity

to pay for an attachment to their television sets and thereby receive captions on their screens for a limited number of commercial programmes. By contrast, and this is the aspect of multicultural television that I welcome, multicultural television does not discriminate against the deaf or partially deaf and provides captions free of charge.

The other disadvantaged group for which multicultural television has a potential to provide much assistance is migrant women.

The Galbally Report and the Institute of Multicultural Affairs Evaluation Report both concluded that more specific attention should be given to migrant women. The Evaluation Report, for instance, noted that a number of difficulties within the initial settlement programme have a particularly adverse impact on migrant women and quoted, for example, the inadequacy of arrangements for contacting migrants who enter the community directly rather than through a hostel. The report went on to suggest that the women in this group who did not seek employment or who were unable to find employment may not learn of programmes such as language classes that might assist their settlement.

Multicultural television has the potential to assist these women enormously. Equally, it has the potential to help those migrant women who are unable to attend adult migrant evaluation programmes because of the lack of child care facilities at the centres where these programmes are conducted. For a host of reasons, some of which I have outlined previously, I support the Hon. Murray Hill's motion which calls on the Federal Government to honour its commitment to fulfil a promise by the former Fraser Government to extend multicultural television to Adelaide this financial year.

**The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN:** I want to spend a brief moment in support of this motion, but I wish to refer to an aside, to which the Hon. Mr Hill also referred. I believe that ethnic television is a very essential part of our community, as is the multicultural background of ethnic people in our community. In our community ethnic people number from 20 per cent to 25 per cent. I have had only brief experience in this regard: when I was in Hong Kong, I was quite confused when I watched television because I could not understand the language. Even though I could see pretty pictures, it was quite useless my watching that television. I can understand that people are confused if they have come here with just a smattering of English and they try to understand our television when we speak so quickly and when we use considerable slang.

I have also had the pleasure of hosting students from overseas through both Rotary exchange and the American field scholar programme. In one instance, a Japanese boy stayed at my house; he could not speak a word of English when he arrived, but after six months he had a very good grasp of the language and used the vernacular very well. However, television was one thing that he and my children could not sit down and watch together, because he just could not understand it. After about nine months, he was still having great difficulty in understanding the television programmes, because he could not keep up with our language. The Hon. Mr Hill stated:

We are not merely dealing with ethnic television for South Australia for ethnic communities but dealing with the entry of multicultural television to South Australia for the benefit of all South Australians.

I wish to emphasise that—it is for the benefit of all South Australians. The area in which I live is not serviced by television, and I wish to make a point in that respect. Although I agree that ethnic television should be introduced into Adelaide and the surrounding area, there are other areas, with populations of 1 000 to 1 500, that have no

television service at all. I am aware that Telecom intends to put into orbit a satellite with a transponder that will pick up signals from the major television networks in Australia and retransmit them into those vast, unpopulated areas.

However, it is very expensive for an individual to buy an antenna in order to receive television. Wudinna and Elliston on Eyre Peninsula, with about 500 and 300 people respectively, and their surrounds, have no television at all. If extra channels are to be introduced into the city, those areas that have no service should also be considered.

West of Wudinna there is a small transmitter which serves an area with a radius of about 20 miles. However, that has completely ruined any television service that Wudinna once had. Wudinna received a service for only a minimal number of months during the summer. The signal bounced off the ionosphere, and there was an inferior picture—often an Adelaide picture with Brisbane sound. It was very confusing. However, even that picture is not received now because the small transmitter, some 50 miles west, upsets the signal. The only television that that area receives is by video cassette, and I might say that they are used a great deal.

Those two communities are now considering raising money to erect their own transmitters because they have had a poor deal from Telecom and from successive Governments. Prior to the last Federal election, I attended a meeting at Wudinna. It was held in an institute hall that seated about 300 people, and along one wall were copies of the promises that had been made by successive Governments throughout the history of television in this fair land. Let me say that that exhibition was most impressive. It appears that those areas are destined not to get television. I believe that those communities will be very sore if they see another channel opening in another area when they have been given very little consideration.

However, that does not mean that I do not support what is being put forward by the Hon. Murray Hill and what the Hon. Mario Feleppa said. I believe that the honourable member touched on the point exactly. I do not wish to pursue that point further except to say that, while we are considering ethnic television in South Australia and the introduction of another channel (perhaps a channel that is similar to Channel 0 in the Eastern States), we should also consider those areas that have no television service at all. I understand that more than 50 areas in Australia do not have a television service. While considering multicultural television, we should give strong consideration to those areas. I support the motion that asks the Federal Government to honour the previous promise, and I congratulate the Hon. Mr Hill on moving this motion.

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

#### SHOP TRADING HOURS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 10 August. Page 98.)

**The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN:** I support the Bill, which seeks to extend shop trading hours to allow for the sale of red meats. This simple and straightforward Bill does not need much further explanation.

**The Hon. J.C. Burdett:** It's a very good Bill.

**The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN:** It is a very good Bill, but this matter should have been cleaned up earlier. We have about 8 000 rural producers of red meat in South Australia, and these people have been disadvantaged because shops have not been able to trade in red meat during late shopping hours in recent years. If it was set out in a graph, we would find that since late night trading was introduced there had

been a reduction in the consumption of red meat from more than 75 kg per year per adult to less than 50 kg.

The argument suggesting that this is caused by other than shop trading hours may be sustainable but I believe that, because red meat is not available when people want to shop, this has contributed to the decline in consumption. People like late night shopping, because it has become an enjoyable family exercise. For working families, young people and people travelling long distances to work it offers a convenient shopping time. Thus, late-night Thursday shopping is an excellent way of filling a need for consumers. Naturally, if red meat is not available during those hours people will not buy it. Honourable members will be aware of the absurd situation in supermarkets where the so-called white meats are readily available yet a grid covers red meats. That is a cynical position.

Some butchers have suggested that a change in their hours will make it difficult for them to compete against supermarkets, but I believe that argument is quite false. Butchers would be able to regulate their own hours. If they have early customers, they can meet that need—there will be no restriction. If they wish to open at mid-day and be involved in late-night trading hours, that would be a sensible way of doing it. I doubt that penalty rates would be that high and it would not involve selling that much more meat to offset penalty rates. Further, butchers offer specialised advice, and many consumers seek that advice as to cooking a chop, a crown roast, a leg of lamb or boned shoulder. Many people like to talk to their butcher and ask him to specially prepare their meat. For supermarket shoppers that advice is not available, and it is a strong inducement for people to shop at their local butcher so that they can avail themselves of that advice.

Another factor in favour of the purchase of red meat from a butcher is that the butcher always has fresh whole meat: he has a side of lamb or beef and he breaks it down in the shop, cutting off fresh meat for customers. Surely that is more wholesome and is fresher and more appealing for consumers than having packaged polyurethane-covered meats. I am convinced that these arguments make the use of butchers popular with the general public and, once people get into the habit of dealing with them, they will continue to do so. True, I do not have much contact with butchers as I do my own slaughtering on my property (as I have always done) but I believe that the butcher offers a real asset to the housewife because he can advise on the product he sells. Supermarkets cannot give that advice, as they sell packaged products which are often prepared out of sight of the consumer without the pleasant visual charge of watching the butcher cut up meat.

The later opening of butcher shops will offset the problem that butcher shop proprietors have raised about paying penalty rates. True, it will not totally offset the difference, but I am sure that there are some butchers and their employees who would rather have the morning free for shopping and other activities and then carry on normal trading into the evening for one night a week.

**The Hon. G.L. Bruce:** Would you not prefer to approach the Industrial Commission for a change in shop trading hours rather than proceed with this Bill?

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** That is buck passing.

**The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN:** True, that is passing the buck—being light on one's feet! Relaxed trading hours would increase the sales of red meat. We heard the specious arguments today about why one should not eat red meat. Indeed, whenever I go to a health shop (I hope that I am not offending anyone) it seems that the customers are the most miserable specimens of humanity that I have ever seen, often looking pallid and thin. I am not sure that food reforming is good. A strong feed of red meat is what is

needed. Such people would cut an extra 10 seconds off every mile they ran if they ate some red meat. I am a great believer in a good feed of red meat at least once a day. I believe that this would cure many of the problems we encounter in these times. Meat is a very cheap form of protein, containing all the nutrients that we need for good body building. Therefore, if it is not available to the public, we must have a sicker society.

Red meat is cheap in Australia; it is the cheapest meat in the world. If we can sell it on overseas markets, as we do, then our product must surely be cheap, good and fresh. I am a great believer in the consumption of red meat, which I believe should be increasing, not decreasing, as it is today.

Many supplements such as chicken and fish are sold in the place of red meat but, if the cost of licences to catch fish continues to increase, red meat consumption may increase because of increases in fish prices. I do not suggest that that should happen, because I believe that red meat consumption will increase as long as we have access to it.

Much shopping is done on late night shopping nights, and if butcher shops were open during that period there would be an automatic increase in the sale, and therefore consumption, of red meat. I admit that red meat is not as easy to package as some other products and that some research might need to be done in relation perhaps to selling crumbed chops, steaks ready for the barbeque, or partly-cooked meat. If someone was to pick that up, considering the way in which we see it happening in chicken and fish shops, it might benefit the community and the red meat industry.

I believe that late night shopping is convenient, popular and enjoyable for families. In fact, it is a facility that is used by some people as a form of entertainment. This being the case, if no red meat is available while people are shopping, we are surely limiting the availability of fresh red meat to older people who do not work and who can shop during the day, as well as to the young and the unemployed, while perhaps limiting it for the great mass of people who want it.

The present system allows the purchase of almost any article on Sundays. One can buy anything from a pin to an anchor but not red meat. The same applies during late night shopping hours. I support this Bill and hope that it passes this Council, because I am sure that there are a number of producers and consumers who would be pleased if fresh red meat could be purchased during late night shopping hours. The Opposition Leader stated that pork is not a red meat, but that is incorrect as it appears under the official designation in the Bill as fresh red meat. So, it, too, would be available to consumers if this legislation was passed.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** Being of slim build, I will take the nutritional advice just given by the Hon. Mr Dunn. Obviously, a good dose of red meat every 24 hours will do wonders for the Lucas physique. This Bill seeks to amend the Shop Trading Hours Act to allow the sale of certain types of meat during usual shop trading hours. The debate on this measure has been referred to as the 'red meat late night trading Bill'. I think that the Hon. Mr Dunn said that it is not quite as simple as that. The present Shop Trading Hours Act defines meat as follows:

The flesh of a slaughtered animal intended for human consumption but does not include bacon, cooked meat, frozen meat, fresh poultry, rabbits, sausages and other smallgoods or any other prescribed or prescribed product derived from meat.

Clearly those items such as bacon and cooked meat can already be sold during late night shopping hours, but red meat and pork cannot be. I will continue to use the common phrase 'red meat' rather than 'certain types of fresh meat'. Perhaps 'carcass meat' might have been a better definition.

As the Hon. Mr Cameron has pointed out, fresh meat will be able to be sold between 5.30 and 9 p.m. on Thursday and Friday nights in the suburbs and central shopping districts respectively. The unfairness of the current situation is, I am sure, obvious to most members of this Council and to most members of the public. That is, quite clearly, that fresh red meat cannot be sold at present during late night shopping hours but its major competitors can be. I refer here particularly to chicken and fish.

The Hon. Mr Cameron outlined in detail many of the arguments in support of this Bill, so I will not traverse the same ground in detail. However, I want to highlight a number of those arguments and to offer one or two additional ones. I know from personal experience the inconvenience of the present antiquated restrictions on trading hours. My wife and I, as a newly married couple who both worked, did most of our shopping on Thursday nights in the Norwood area where there was a good supermarket and number of small businesses. It was quite ridiculous to be able to buy everything we wanted except fresh red meat.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** When were you married?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** In December 1978. Before our children arrived, and as a two-income family, we shopped on Thursday nights, as many working couples do. It is a most convenient time to shop. The other possible time is Saturday morning, but most two-income families have houses to clean and other chores to perform around the house on weekends. They also want to recover from the rigors of whatever they do throughout the week. Therefore, Thursday night is the shopping night for people in that situation. However, it was quite ridiculous to go into Woolworths on Thursday night and be able to buy everything we wanted, to walk through the Mall, and then down the Norwood Parade, where a pharmacy, fish shop, fruit shop and a grocery shop were open but the butcher was closed.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** What was your job?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** It was an important one in the Liberal Party organisation.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Did you have much influence in the Liberal Party?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I think that we are straying from the provisions of the Bill.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Was all this inconvenience experienced during the three years of Liberal Government?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable member does not have to reply to the Minister. Interjections are not intended to help him.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** Thank you, Mr President, for protecting me from the persistent questioning of the Minister about matters not pertaining to this Bill. It was quite ridiculous that we could buy our fruit and vegetables, fresh fish and almost everything else but we could not buy any fresh red meat. In our situation it meant that we either had to shop quickly after work or on Saturday morning. I was lucky because my wife was a teacher and finished work earlier than I in my position with the Liberal Party organisation and my attempts to move the Liberal Party in Government to follow directions and policies that I might have personally wished to support.

For us, it involved shopping hurriedly after work or on Saturday morning, which required another trip to Norwood Parade from where we lived at Tranmere, to obtain our red meat. I provide that information as a personal anecdote. I am sure that many other two-income families or working couples experienced similar problems at that time. I suspect that this certain member of this Chamber would come under considerable pressure from his spouse if he did not support this legislation.

In consideration of this Bill, I think we must acknowledge the changing nature of society and heed those changes that occur in society. We must heed the increasing number of working couples of the 1970s and 1980s. Society has changed significantly from the society that the Hon. Mr Blevins may have known in the 1950s and 1960s. We must also heed those changes which bring about different buying patterns and different consumer preferences in society.

The different buying patterns and different consumer preferences are evidenced by a whole series of opinion polls and surveys over recent years, but I will not bore honourable members with their precise details. For the benefit of the Minister of Health, those opinion polls were not conducted by McNair Anderson. Significant numbers of people surveyed supported late night trading in fresh red meat. In fact, between 65 per cent and 80 per cent supported sales of fresh red meat during late night trading hours.

One of the major arguments used by supporters of this Bill is that sales of red meat have fallen significantly over recent years. During that same period, sales of chicken in particular have risen. I agree with that argument. Figures indicated a decline in the per capita consumption of fresh red meat over previous years. I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* two statistical tables which show the per capita consumption of the various products including red meat, poultry and fish in recent years.

Leave granted.



TABLE 1. APPARENT PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION OF SELECTED FOODSTUFFS, AUSTRALIA  
(kg per year, except where otherwise stated)

	Average 3 years ended					Current year 1980-81
	1938-39	1948-49	1958-59	1968-69	1978-79	
<b>MEAT—</b>						
<b>Carcass meat—</b>						
Beef and veal	63.6	49.5	56.2	40.0	64.4	44.9
Lamb	6.8	11.4	13.3	20.5	13.8	16.2
Mutton	27.2	20.5	23.1	18.8	4.3	4.0
Pigmeat	3.9	3.2	4.6	6.7	4.3	5.7
<i>Total carcass meat</i>	<i>101.5</i>	<i>84.6</i>	<i>97.2</i>	<i>85.9</i>	<i>86.7</i>	<i>70.8</i>
Offal and meat, n.e.i.	3.8	4.0	5.2	5.1	6.5	5.0
Canned meat (canned weight)	1.0	1.2	1.9	2.2	1.6	1.5
Bacon and ham (cured carcass weight)	4.6	5.3	3.2	3.6	6.0	6.8
<b>Total (converted to carcass equivalent weight)</b>	<b>118.5</b>	<b>103.0</b>	<b>112.4</b>	<b>98.8</b>	<b>103.5</b>	<b>86.8</b>
<b>POULTRY—</b>						
Poultry (dressed weight)	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	8.3	17.2	20.1
<b>SEAFOOD—</b>						
<b>Fresh and frozen (edible weight)—</b>						
<b>Fish—</b>						
Australian	}	2.4	{	1.4	1.6	1.7
Imported				1.4		
Crustacea and molluscs	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.8	0.9	1.0
<b>Seafood, otherwise prepared (product weight)(a)—</b>						
Australian	}	1.4	{	0.4	0.5	0.5
Imported—				1.9		
Fish	}	1.4	{	0.8	1.8	1.8
Crustacea and molluscs				1.0		
<b>Total seafood</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>7.4</b>

TABLE 2. TOTAL APPARENT CONSUMPTION OF SELECTED FOODSTUFFS, AUSTRALIA

	Available for consumption—						Apparent per capita consumption—					
	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81
MEAT—	—tonnes—						—kg—					
Carcass meat—												
<i>Beef and veal</i>												
Beef	936,352	975,724	963,989	794,817	676,814	661,425	67.6	69.7	68.1	55.5	46.6	44.9
Vcal	873,301	897,884	883,690	745,297	639,874	626,845	63.1	64.2	62.4	52.0	44.1	42.6
Lamb	63,050	77,840	80,298	49,520	36,940	34,580	4.6	5.6	5.7	3.5	2.5	2.3
Mutton	231,545	188,164	195,130	201,622	229,966	238,769	16.7	13.4	13.8	14.1	15.8	16.2
Pigmeat	97,496	65,984	52,467	65,685	73,384	58,399	7.0	4.7	3.7	4.6	5.1	4.0
<i>Total carcass meat</i>	60,655	61,135	64,561	55,119	71,008	84,113	4.4	4.4	4.6	3.8	4.9	5.7
Offal and meat, n.e.i.	1,326,048	1,291,007	1,276,147	1,117,243	1,051,172	1,042,706	95.8	92.3	90.1	77.9	72.4	70.8
Canned meat (canned weight)	92,721	97,338	99,787	80,597	68,143	74,354	6.7	7.0	7.0	5.6	4.7	5.0
Bacon and ham (cured carcass weight)	23,127	23,907	24,516	20,578	20,669	22,387	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.5
Total meat (converted to carcass equivalent weight)	71,783	77,663	86,087	93,192	91,337	100,413	5.2	5.6	6.1	6.5	6.3	6.8
	1,545,159	1,522,662	1,523,258	1,350,052	1,265,140	1,279,154	111.6	108.8	107.6	94.2	87.2	86.8
POULTRY—												
Poultry (dressed weight)	201,373	221,547	239,492	270,722	295,345	295,529	14.5	15.8	16.9	18.9	20.3	20.1
SEAFOOD—												
Fresh and frozen (edible weight)—												
Fish—												
Australian	20,729	20,149	23,394	23,479	21,244	24,813	1.5	1.4	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.7
Imported	22,834	22,938	23,571	21,940	27,418	30,425	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.9	2.1
Crustacea and molluscs	13,643	13,043	12,510	14,193	12,747	14,091	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.0
Seafood otherwise prepared (product weight)—												
Australian	9,380	7,162	7,464	8,105	7,792	6,639	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5
Imported—												
Fish	19,445	27,495	26,319	23,299	28,102	27,024	1.4	2.0	1.9	1.6	1.9	1.8
Crustacea and molluscs	5,600	6,864	5,997	4,807	4,261	5,814	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4
Total seafood	91,631	97,651	99,255	95,823	101,564	108,806	6.6	7.0	7.0	6.7	7.0	7.4

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I refer to the last five years for which figures are available, from 1975-76 to 1980-81. The tables indicate that the total carcass meat consumed per capita was 95.8 kilograms in 1975-76 and 70.8 kilograms in 1980-81. In that same period, sales of poultry increased from 14.5 kilograms to 20.1 kilograms. There has been a decrease in sales of carcass meat in that period and an increase in sales for other products. If one looks back even further to 1938-39 and compares the average for three years with the three-year average for 1980-81, one sees that the trend has been quite consistent. In 1938-39 we consumed an average of 101.5 kilograms compared to an average of 70.8 kilograms in 1980-81.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Do you think that allowing sales at night will reverse that trend?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I am coming to that. That is one of the major arguments used by supporters of this Bill. I do not accept that argument in its entirety. The decline in red meat sales cannot be traced solely to the inability of red meat producers to sell their product during late night trading hours. The trend has been quite consistent over the past five or six years and it has been quite consistent going back to 1938-39, with a few 'blips' where sales have increased. I do not think it is a solid argument to say that the decline in red meat sales has occurred because of a lack of access to late night trading. I accept that it is a factor, but to argue that by supporting this Bill we will reverse the decline in per capita consumption of red meat sales is, I believe, a spurious argument and certainly not solidly based. For example, there are many possible reasons for the increase in sales of competitive meats such as poultry.

Representatives of the poultry industry have given many reasons, and I think some of them have substance. There have been improvements in production and marketing techniques within the poultry industry, and there is a new awareness of diet and nutrition to which the Hon. Mr Dunn adequately referred. There has also been an argument, which has been accepted, that red meat is not quite as good for us as are some of the white meat products. Red meat producers must try to reverse that argument if they can. The price differential has also been a problem. The figures for the period I have mentioned indicate that fish and chicken products have been cheaper than red meat products.

When the community experiences difficult periods and difficult times, as has been the case since the early 1970s, every dollar is important, and obviously consumers will look for the most cost-effective way of spending their meagre budgets.

The fourth possible reason for the decline in red meat sales is marketing. The competitors of the red meat industry have engaged in new marketing techniques, and in this respect I refer to Kentucky Fried Chicken and various other chicken shops. Their selling techniques have left the red meat marketer behind in some ways.

Let me summarise by saying that certainly the decline of red meat sales will not be reversed by this decision. The red meat producers, marketers, and retailers will have to improve, quite significantly, their marketing approach in regard to the selling of red meat to ensure that the decline in per capita red meat consumption can be reversed. Many butchers oppose this measure, and I accept that it will cause problems for some, but not all, butchers. I believe that a growing number of butchers accept the inevitability of reform in this area and are looking forward to the challenge that a reform of this nature will bring to their operations.

Those butchers who oppose this reform argue that it will result in the demise of the small butcher. Clearly, if that is true, it is something that must weigh heavily on members

in this Council when they consider their attitude to the Bill. However, those butchers who oppose the reform must accept the need for and the inevitability of reform. Whether it happens now or some time in the future, perhaps in five or 10 years, it is inevitable: it will happen sooner or later. Small butchers will have to accept that change must come and they will have to adapt their operations to this reform. Butchers must accept changes in buying patterns and consumer preferences, as do all other small businessmen.

The swing from the small butcher or the small retail establishment to the major supermarkets has been evidenced not only in Australia but also in the United States and in many other countries in the past 10 to 20 years. Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that in June 1974 there were 812 butcher shops in South Australia, and in June 1980, six years later, the latest figures that I can obtain show that there were 436 butcher shops in South Australia, a decrease of almost half. Thus, there are almost 400 fewer butcher shops in South Australia, and that has occurred over six years.

The decline in the number of butcher shops has occurred under the present marketing system and the present system of retail shopping hours. Butchers are not able to sell red meat on late shopping nights. Those changes and difficulties faced by small businessmen and small butchers are in evidence already, and butchers in particular will have to, and are having to, adapt to changes in society, consumer preferences, and consumer buying patterns that are evident in the market in which they operate. I have also seen figures which I believe came from the A.B.S. and which show that butchers now have only about 50 per cent of the meat market whereas five years ago they had 75 per cent to 85 per cent of that market. I repeat that that decline in their share of the market has occurred under the present trading hours and laws.

As I said, butchers will have to change their whole method of operation and their marketing approach if they are to survive in this competitive environment. They must consider further alterations in trading hours, as the Hon. Mr Dunn said. If there are periods during which butchers have few customers, such as early on a Monday or Tuesday morning, they will have to close down to conserve labour costs. They may have to trade during the hours when two-income families will want to shop, and that is on Thursday and Friday nights.

Butchers will have to consider (as the Hon. Mr Cameron suggested) the possibility of pre-packaging some but not all of their products for sale during late night shopping hours, when they cannot provide the same service. They will have to consider different forms of advertising and marketing the special advantages of their products and the personal services that they can offer, as the Hon. Mr Dunn has adequately pointed out.

There is one further major argument in favour of this Bill that has not yet been enunciated clearly, and that is that small butchers at present are the only small businessmen who currently enjoy protection from the rigours of the market place from trading on late night shopping nights. They are presently the only small businessmen who are protected in this way by the current provisions. All other small businessmen have had to adapt to the changing market and the needs of consumers.

Delicatessens, fruit and vegetable shops, small grocery stores, dress and clothes shops, and boutiques that are run by small business people, in competition with the supermarkets, are open on late night trading nights, that is, Thursday and Friday nights. Those traders have as much to lose by late night shopping, and they have had to adapt to the pressure of the market place. They have survived, to a very large degree, in that market place.

I suggest that the problems of the small butcher are no different to the problems that these small business people have had to face, but they have successfully faced them and survived. When this reform is passed, whether it is now or in a couple of years (because it will pass—it is inevitable), butchers will have to face up to the problems, and they might as well face up to them now as later. For the reasons that I have given, and for many of the reasons outlined by the Hon. Mr Cameron and the Hon. Mr Dunn in this debate, I strongly support the reforms in this Bill.

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

### PAROLE ORDERS (TRANSFER) BILL

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for a reciprocal enforcement of parole orders. Read a first time.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I move:

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

The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has, since 1975, been considering questions relating to the supervision of parolees and the enforcement of orders against them when they are residing in a State other than that where the parole order was made. Parolees, like many others in the community, may have legitimate reasons for moving from one State to another, whether to seek reunion with their families, to obtain employment or otherwise to advance their interests. It was thought desirable therefore for a formal scheme to be developed to enable the transfer interstate of supervision and enforcement of parole orders. A Uniform Parole Orders (Transfer) Bill was prepared and the Bill before the Council is the South Australian revision of this uniform measure. The main features of the Bill are as follows:

1. Transfer of parole orders is to be on a reciprocal basis.
2. Transfer of a parole order will take place only on the agreement of Ministers of the transferring and receiving jurisdictions.
3. Transfer will only take place where the relevant Ministers are satisfied that it will be in the best interests of the parolee and the parolee has consented to or requested the transfer or has already transferred his place of residence.
4. A transferred parole order will have effect and be enforceable as if the order had been made under the law of the receiving jurisdiction.

The uniform Bill for the Transfer of Convicted and Sentenced Prisoners was passed by the South Australian Parliament in 1982. Provision for interstate transfer of parolees is a complementary piece of legislation. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 contains definitions of 'corresponding law' and 'designated authority' to allow for the reciprocity of interstate transfer of parole orders. 'Corresponding law' means a law of another State or a Territory declared by the Minister by notice published in the *Gazette* to be a corresponding law in relation to the transfer of parole orders. 'Designated authority' refers to an authority of another State or a Territory with powers under the corresponding law similar to those to be exercised by the Minister under the measure. Another significant definition is that of 'parole order'. A parole order is an order under

the law of this State or another State or a Territory for the release of a person upon parole. The expression includes any authority, wherever given, for the release of a person from imprisonment or lawful detention, which is to be deemed to be or has the same effect as, an order for the release of a person on parole.

Clause 4 provides for the appointment of a Registrar of Transferred Parole Orders. Clause 5 empowers the Minister to delegate any of his powers or functions given under the measure. Clause 6 provides that the Minister may request the designated authority for another State or a Territory to register a South Australian parole order only if he is satisfied that the transfer is in the best interests of the parolee and the parolee has consented to or requested the transfer or has already transferred his place of residence to the receiving State or Territory. When the Minister requests that a designated authority in another State or a Territory agree to the transfer of a parole order from this State certain documents must accompany the request, including the parole order, the judgment by reason of which the parolee was sentenced to imprisonment, certain particulars and a report relating to the parolee. These documents form the basis for determination by the designated authority of the receiving State or Territory of the proper course to adopt in relation to the transfer of a parole order.

Clause 7 provides that an order, once transferred from South Australia, ceases to be of force in South Australia. Furthermore, each sentence of imprisonment to which the parolee was subject immediately before the transfer, ceases to have effect in South Australia. Clause 8 provides that upon the request of the designated authority for another State or a Territory the Minister may direct the Registrar to register a parole order that was in force in that State or Territory. Under subsection (2), the Minister shall not so direct unless he is satisfied that the transfer is in the best interests of the parolee, and the parolee has consented to or requested the transfer or has already transferred his place of residence to South Australia. The Minister makes his determination on the basis of the documentary evidence provided by the transferring jurisdiction.

Clause 9 provides the procedure to be adopted by the Registrar when directed by the Minister to register a parole order, and includes the maintaining of a register of transferred orders. The Registrar must—

- (a) endorse upon the parole order a memorandum recording the transfer and the date;
- (b) keep the endorsed parole order in a register together with the judgment by virtue of which the parolee became liable to imprisonment;
- (c) forward a copy of the endorsed parole order and the judgment to the Chairman of the Parole Board; and
- (d) give notice in writing to the transferring jurisdiction of the fact and date of registration.

Subsection (3) provides that a parole order is registrable notwithstanding that it was originally made in pursuance of a law of this State. Clause 10 provides that upon a parole order being registered, the laws of South Australia apply as if each sentence of imprisonment to which the parolee was liable had been imposed in South Australia (whether or not it was in fact), as if the original parole order was made in South Australia (whether or not it was in fact) and as if any period of imprisonment served and any period spent on parole had been served or spent in South Australia. Under subsection (2), this section does not cease to operate by reason of the revocation under South Australian law, or the

registered parole order. Clause 11 is an evidentiary provision.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 11 August. Page 161.)

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: This Bill is just one in a package of financial measures which were introduced at the beginning of this session to raise significant sums from South Australian taxpayers. Before debating the Bill it is worth bearing in mind that the Government in its election pledge before the November 1982 State election undertook that it would not increase State taxation. Notwithstanding the natural disaster of February 1983 and the Treasurer's indications of difficulty with State finances, on 16 March this year the Premier received a question from the member for Torrens (Hon. Michael Wilson) in another place asking, 'Will the Premier give this House an assurance that no State taxes will be increased while a wage pause is operating in South Australia?' The unequivocal answer by the Premier to that question was 'Yes'.

So, we had an undertaking from the Government that while the wage pause was in place in South Australia there would be no increase whatever in State taxation. Honourable members know that the wage pause is still in place at a national level: we still have a wage pause, and we have the Premier showing his contempt for Parliament, his disregard for the people of South Australia, his incompetence as a Treasurer and, by his latest moves, adding a new dimension to the word 'integrity' by his actions in introducing these savage tax increases.

In addition to his categorical denial of any State tax increases whilst the wage pause was in place, on 3 May the Premier in a debate on the Appropriation Bill (*Hansard*, page 1054) stated:

The Government will also establish, as a matter of priority, an inquiry into the State's revenue base and its ability to raise the revenue required. . . The terms of reference have now been finalised and I expect that they, and the composition of the inquiry, will be announced within the next few weeks.

The statement was made 15 weeks ago, and the same statement was made at the time of the last election—namely, that one of the priorities would be to institute an inquiry into the revenue base of South Australia. One may have some sympathy for the proposition that State Governments are gradually being squeezed in terms of their revenue-raising capacities. There is no question that this State's share of the Commonwealth's total tax collection has diminished in recent years, but South Australia is not alone in suffering that burden.

Indeed, only last week we took note of the fact that the Victorian Government has to seek ways of making up a \$105 000 000 shortfall caused by the High Court's decision to declare the pipelines tax invalid. That tax, as honourable members no doubt are aware, enabled the State Government to collect taxes from Esso B.H.P. in relation to the pipeline transporting oil from the Bass Strait oilfields. There is no question that all members, whatever their political persuasion, would agree that an inquiry into the State's revenue base is a good idea.

Having said that, the revenue base inquiry was a high priority of the Labor Government when it first came to office. Having underlined that point again in debate on the

Appropriation Bill on 3 May, we still have not heard the details of the inquiry or the terms of reference. I find that an incredible state of affairs: here is a Treasury and a Government which claim to have financial difficulties and which are seeking ways out of those difficulties. Obviously, one of the few sensible measures it proposed on coming to office was to have an inquiry into the revenue base of this State. Having heard that the terms of reference had been finalised on 3 May we still have not heard a peep out of them about those terms of reference some 15 weeks later. What sort of financial integrity and management is that?

I suggest that the people of South Australia are entitled to know that the Treasurer, and indeed the Government of South Australia, who claim to have financial difficulties, have not got their act together to bring forward an inquiry into the revenue base of South Australia. Of course, that has led to this dreadful 'ad hockery' we now have before us of a Government raising tens of millions of dollars and introducing Bills into this House ahead of a Budget so that members opposite have had very little chance to make judgments as to whether these revenue raising measures are justified (and, indeed, I suspect that they are not, in total). It is an incredible state of affairs.

Let us look at this package of savage tax increases. These increases will raise, on my calculation, an estimated \$46 000 000 in 1983-84. That is \$100 a household in South Australia, remembering that a national wage pause is still in place. This, of course, entirely ignores the large number of charges which have already been introduced, many by regulation, in the past few weeks. So this package of tax increases will raise an estimated \$46 000 000 in 1983-84 and \$76 000 000 in a full year. That is very much an estimate. Although there can be some confidence in the estimate of figures for increased taxation from business franchise, petroleum products, liquor, tobacco and stamp duty imposts, there is no certainty regarding revenue likely to be raised from the financial institutions duty. Members will remember that, in introducing these measures and lamenting the financial difficulties in this State, the Premier said that a financial institutions duty would be introduced on 1 December 1983. We are now midway through August and there are financial institutions in South Australia which will undoubtedly bear the burden of that financial institutions duty that have not yet been contacted about what the likely burden is going to be, or about the mechanics involved with a financial institutions duty.

One does not have to be a genius to realise that a financial institutions duty is a complicated matter. Indeed, in New South Wales and Victoria the introduction of a financial institutions duty was delayed because of the complexities of the legislation and the need for subsequent amendments and consultation. This Government has neither consulted on the financial institutions duty in any great detail nor made any announcement about what the duty tax will be. We do not have legislation in this Parliament about this matter and it is unlikely that any legislation introduced is going to be passed before show week. I do not believe that a financial institutions duty can possibly be in place before 1 December 1983. If it is, it will be at the expense of the taxpayer in the sense that there will have to be an incredible amount of work done and a lot of overtime worked by the financial institutions that will bear the burden of this tax.

I want to put the tax increases into some perspective and, indeed, it is a dramatic perspective. I seek leave to have a table relating to State taxation levels incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

TABLE I  
STATE TAXATION

	1980-81 (Actual \$M)	1981-82 (Actual \$M)	1982-83 (Budget esti- mate \$M)	1983-84 (with tax increases) Tax Increase (Govt. esti- mate) \$M	1983-84 (with tax increases) \$M	Tax increases in a full year Tax increase (Govt. esti- mate) \$M	\$M
Taxation from Business franchises							
Liquor	13.9	15.9	18.9	+2	20.9	+8	26.9
Petroleum	20.2	23.8	26.3	+11	37.3	+15	41.3
Tobacco	10.7	14.6	15.5	+13	28.5	+17	32.5
	44.8	54.3	60.7		86.7		100.7
Stamp Duties	96.0	108.5	119.0	+6	125.0	+12	131.0
Financial Institutions Tax	—	—	—	+14*	14.0*	+24*	24.0*
<b>SUB TOTAL</b>	<b>\$140.8M</b>	<b>\$162.8M</b>	<b>\$179.7M</b>	<b>\$46M</b>	<b>\$225.7M</b>	<b>\$76M</b>	<b>\$255.7M</b>
Annual Increase %		15.6%	10.5%	25.6%		42.3%	
Other State Taxation	304.1	332.8	372.7		?		?
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$444.9M</b>	<b>\$495.6M</b>	<b>\$552.4M</b>		<b>?</b>		<b>?</b>
Annual Increase		11.4%	11.5%	?		?	

Source: Budget papers, Auditor-General's Reports, Premier's Ministerial Statement, August 4, 1983.

\*Estimate as details unavailable.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** This table, which I will call table 1, sets out State taxation from business franchises (namely, liquor, petroleum and tobacco taxes) in the years 1980-81 and 1981-82. Those are actual figures. It also sets out Budget estimates for 1982-83. It then goes on to detail the 1983-84 estimates of these taxes taking into account the recently announced tax increases. In addition, it takes into account stamp duties and the effect of tax increases on the stamp duties collections by the State Government. Finally, it makes an estimate of the financial institutions tax.

I should say at this juncture that it is difficult to estimate what the financial institutions tax will collect because there has been no mention made by the Government of the scope and development of financial institutions duty in South Australia. I have estimated that it will raise \$14 000 000 in 1983-84, if introduced on time on 1 December 1983, which I very much doubt will happen, and \$24 000 000 in a full year.

If one looks at this table it can be seen that the taxes from business franchises will have doubled in comparison with the period 1981-82. In other words, whereas in 1981-82 the actual collection of taxes from business franchises, liquor, petroleum and tobacco taxes was \$54 300 000, the increased taxation proposed by the current Government will result in taxation from business franchises doubling to \$100 700 000 in a full year and \$86 700 000 estimated in 1983-84. That is a mammoth 25.6 per cent increase in State taxation from those sources—business franchises, stamp duties and financial institutions tax, a mammoth 25.6 per cent increase in the period 1982-83 to 1983-84, estimated.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** What is the percentage increase in the deficit from the previous Labor Government to this Government?

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** The Hon. Mr Sumner interjects and I am delighted to respond and point out that the increase in State taxation in the last two years of the Tonkin Government on those items was 15.6 per cent in 1981-82 and only 10 per cent between 1981-82 and 1982-83 Budget estimates. In 1983-84 there will be a minimum increase in taxes of 25.8 per cent and in a full year that will be equivalent to a 42.3 per cent increase.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** What do you say about the \$109 000 000 deficit?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable member does not have to comment.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** The fuel franchise currently provides \$23 700 000 a year into the Highways Fund, from a

tax on both petrol and diesel, based on prices set by regulation, namely, 33.4c per litre for petrol and 35.65c per litre for diesel. The proposed increase resulting from this Bill will effectively raise the prices of those products 1c a litre. It will result in an increase in taxes from this source of some \$11 000 000 estimated in 1983-84 and \$15 000 000 in a full year.

It is useful to examine the 1980-81 and 1981-82 figures. In 1980-81, \$22 000 000 was raised from the fuel franchise and in 1981-82, \$23 700 000 was raised. In the year just ended, an estimated \$26 300 000 was raised. Those figures are set out in table 1. Honourable members will note that those increases have been very much in line with the level of inflation. However, this Bill will see an increase of some 40 per cent in the collection from the fuel franchise. As I have said, in the 1981-82 year, \$23 700 000 was raised from the fuel franchise. That money was directed to the Highways Fund. In the year just passed, \$26 300 000 was raised. The last clause of the Bill seeks to limit the amount of money that can be diverted to the Highways Fund to an amount no less than the amount paid into the Highways Fund in 1982-83. New section 31 (4) provides:

The contributions referred to in subsection (2) must be such as to amount in aggregate, for each financial year, to no less than the amount paid into the Highways Fund, out of moneys collected under this Act, in respect of the 1982-1983 financial year.

That means that in 1983-84 the amount paid into the Highways Fund may well be less in real terms than was the case in 1982-83. If one assumes that inflation is running at the rate of 10 per cent per annum (which may be a little high) one can see that \$2 600 000 (which is 10 per cent less than the estimated collection of \$26 000 000) will not go into the Highways Fund. In other words, there will be a shortfall of about \$2 600 000 in real terms in 1983-84 if the Government opts to direct no more than the minimum amount required from fuel franchise collections to the Highways Fund.

I seek an assurance from the Government that it will undertake to at least maintain the contribution from the fuel franchise collections to the Highways Fund in 1982-83 real terms. The actual burden of this tax falls on every motorist. It has been estimated in the metropolitan area that, assuming the average motorist travels 20 000 kilometres per year, the burden will be some \$22 per year. However, many families have two cars, so it would amount to \$44 per year. The real burden falls in country areas. I am assured by my country colleagues that those people who live on the West Coast drive up to 50 000 kilometres a year.

In their case, the burden will amount to \$50 a year and \$100 per year in the case of a family with two cars. Most rural families need two cars to ferry children to school and to cope with the other duties of farm work.

We are referring to a bundle of taxation measures that will impact on people, especially in this case, in rural areas. I am disturbed to see that whilst the wage pause is still in place people of both metropolitan Adelaide and rural South Australia are being affected in such a dramatic fashion.

My final point deals with the bundle of measures as a whole. As they have been introduced, it is inevitable that some discussion should take place on the financial proposals, arising as they do ahead of the Budget, which will outline in more detail the financial picture that exists in South Australia. Indeed, the Budget might outline in more detail

the financial competence and management of the Government, which nine months ago promised no tax increases and again in March this year promised no taxation increases while a national wage pause was in operation. As I have said, that is not an example of financial integrity.

I refer members to the Budget deficit figure to see whether these financial measures are justified. I argue quite strongly that the Government has gone for the overkill. These measures raise far more money than is justified; that is largely because of the Government's financial mismanagement and administrative incompetence. I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a statistical table setting out details of the 1982-83 Budget Estimates.

Leave granted.

TABLE II  
1982-83 BUDGET ESTIMATES

AUGUST 1982 1982-83	DECEMBER 14 1982	MAY 3	AUGUST 4 Actual
Budget Estimates			
Recurrent Account \$42 m. deficit	\$72m-\$91m deficit	\$115m deficit*	\$109m deficit
Capital Account \$42m surplus	\$42m surplus	\$43m surplus	\$51.9m surplus
Nil	\$30m-\$55m deficit	\$72m deficit	\$57.1m deficit

Including additional payments

* Net cost of bushfires	\$23m.
Additional costs of pumping from Murray	8m.
Election Promises	
Teachers	\$3m.
Pensioners electricity conces- sions	\$4m. 7m.
Additional wages	14m
Departmental Overruns	
Health	17m.
Others	9m. 26m.
	\$78m.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** This table outlines the fruity melodrama that has unfolded over the past few months of this Labor Government in relation to the financial affairs of this State. Honourable members will recall that in August 1982, when the Budget Estimates were brought down by the previous Liberal Government, it was estimated that there would be a \$42 000 000 deficit on Current Account and a \$42 000 000 surplus on Capital Account, leading to a balanced Budget. On 14 December 1982, the Treasurer announced to the House that, following an intensive review of the financial affairs of this State, the Budget estimate on Revenue Account had blown out from a \$42 000 000 deficit to a deficit ranging from \$72 000 000 to \$97 000 000, with the surplus on Capital Account remaining the same at \$42 000 000.

Therefore, whereas the Liberal Government had budgeted for a nil result in 1982-83 on the Consolidated Account, the prospect in mid-December was that there would be a \$30 000 000 to \$55 000 000 deficit. On 3 May, after the natural disasters, and of course with only two months of the financial year to run, the Treasurer announced in debate on the Appropriation Bill that the Budget had blown out to a \$72 000 000 deficit, made up of a projected \$115 000 000 deficit on the Revenue Account and a \$43 000 000 surplus on the Capital Account. That was on 3 May, with less than two months to run in the financial year.

That \$72 000 000 deficit on the Consolidated Account, a \$72 000 000 deterioration in the consolidated Budget result from that which had been first mooted in August 1982, was the result of a series of items that were discussed at the time—that is, on 3 May. They included the net cost of

bushfires (\$23 000 000), and no-one would dispute that cost. Everyone regrets the cost and the incredible loss of life and property associated with that natural disaster. There was an additional cost of \$8 000 000 for pumping water from the Murray River, there were election promises, involving maintaining teacher staff, of \$3 000 000, a commitment given by the Labor Government, which it honoured at the beginning of the year; there were pensioner electricity concessions of \$4 000 000; additional wages of \$14 000 000; and departmental over-runs in health of \$17 000 000 and in other departments of \$9 000 000. Those additional payments totalled \$78 000 000 (and I considered only the major items).

There were some off-setting increases in revenue items. However, it is important to examine those figures. We have not seen the final figures, but we must examine those figures of 3 May. The net cost of bushfires (\$23 000 000) and the additional cost of pumping from the Murray River (\$8 000 000), totalling \$31 000 000 of the proposed \$72 000 000, are once-off costs in the sense that one would presume that the same level of pumping will not be required from the Murray River and that the net cost of bushfires will largely be absorbed in the 1982-83 financial year.

The election promises in regard to additional teachers were not made by the Liberal Government and were not incorporated into our Budget but were, rather, commitments made by the Labor Government, and no-one would resile from that. There is a grey argument at present regarding the additional public servants who have been taken on. It was quite specifically spelt out on 3 May by the Treasurer (page 1054 of *Hansard*), as follows:

We have committed ourselves to maintaining employment in the public sector at July 1982 levels.

Yet, we have heard the cocky Hon. Dr Cornwall, the Minister of Health, the man who can do no wrong, say only last week that he is proud that an additional 300 people had been employed in the health area as at 30 June 1983 as against the figures for 30 June 1982. It will be interesting indeed to see whether that increase of 300 people, which in wages costs will involve about \$6 000 000 or \$7 000 000, one would imagine, is offset by decreases in other departments in order to honour the pledge that the Treasurer gave on only 3 May. We know that there have been significant over-runs in the health area, because the Hon. Dr Cornwall has admitted as much, and we know, of course, that there have been commitments in regard to teaching. So let us go back and do that final sum again.

The net cost of bushfires, the additional cost of pumping from the Murray River, costs in regard to teachers (an election promise made by the Labor Party), and an admitted extra \$7 000 000 that was spent on staff in the health area involve a total of \$41 000 000, that we know of to date, without the full details of the 1982-83 Budget figures being available. So, suddenly, one realises that the method by which this Labor Government tries to sheet home the blame for the financial deterioration of the State's budgetary situation on the previous Government is no more than a fruity melodrama.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** How do you account for the \$109 000 000 deficit? You mumbled something about \$40 000 000; what about the other \$60 000 000 or \$70 000 000?

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** If the honourable member had been listening he would realise that I have just outlined the point that on 3 May it was revealed that there was going to be a \$72 000 000 deficit. If the honourable member had been listening he would realise that I accounted for well over \$40 000 000 of that amount without having the benefit of the 1982-83 Budget details.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** What about the extra \$70 000 000—the deficit is \$109 000 000.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** I am talking about the Consolidated Account deficit of \$72 000 000.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** That is the easy bit; you just stop capital works and transfer it across to revenue.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** Right.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** The fact is that the State's deficit is \$109 000 000—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The more the honourable member interjects the longer the Hon. Mr Davis will take.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** Finally, on 4 August we had a final result for the 1982-83 year, and that is a \$57 100 000 deficit, resulting from a \$109 000 000 deficit on Recurrent Account and \$51 900 000 surplus on Capital Account. The Hon. Mr Sumner who has been one of the leading opponents of transfers from Capital Account to Recurrent Account and who has just interjected on that very point may later in the debate explain why it is that while on 3 May he stated (and the Treasurer also made this point) that the surplus on the Capital Account was going to be of the order of \$43 000 000, he suddenly finds that by the end of June that surplus on Capital Account had blown out by a further \$9 000 000.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** That is right.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** Here is a Government that is committed to righting wrong and to correcting imbalances, but that should not be done by transferring from Capital Account to Revenue Account. Not surprisingly, as I predicted during the Appropriation Bill debates in early June 1983, that \$72 000 000 deficit of 3 May proved to be a furphy

because the deficit has come down some \$15 000 000 in the final figure.

Again, it reveals that the financial position of this State had been beaten up very dramatically in the opening months of 1983 by this Labor Government, which was trying to cast a smoke screen over the fact that it was increasing the public sector which should come as no surprise to members on this side of the Council because the Government was publicly committed to it. Its platform stated unequivocally that it is committed to this proposition. That is at the expense of the taxpayer.

So, finally, in rounding off this debate the proposition that I want to leave with honourable members, especially on the Government benches, is that if one assumes that the financial institutions tax raises \$14 000 000 in 1983-84 and that is my figure, and my guess will be as good as probably anyone's, including the Government's, because I am sure that it has no idea of what is going on in that area—if it raises \$46 000 000 subsequently and \$76 000 000 in a full year, that is an overkill. The Government has been quite savage and unrealistic in imposing these enormous burdens on the people of South Australia through these tax measures in addition to all those charges that have been increased by regulation because, I believe, it has set out quite deliberately to put some fat into the Treasury so that when it comes to year three it will be in a position to hand out a few goodies for the next election.

When one looks at the one-off costs to the State as a result of the bush fires, additional pumping from the Murray and the lack of restraint on the expenditure side, which is surely one of the most fundamental points to observe in a difficult financial position, one can see that the only victims of the State's financial mismanagement by this Labor Government of only nine months are the very people that it claims to represent; indeed, the people who are most affected by the measures that we now have before us, such as the petroleum products tax, the liquor tax and the tobacco tax are the very people whom the Government claims to represent—the blue collar workers, who like a beer after work, who like to go for a drive in the country on a Sunday, and who perhaps occasionally even will have a cigarette, notwithstanding the fact that this latest measure increases the price of a packet of cigarettes by some 17 cents.

I realise and respect that this Council has limited powers in financial measures, but I want to put on the record tonight my abhorrence of these measures—Draconian as they are—because of this State's inability to grasp the hard nettle to cut back on expenditures (the example that was set so splendidly by the Tonkin Administration, an example which has been followed in all other States) and it is this State alone which is reversing that trend, which is increasing the public sector employment as a burden on the taxpayer and which has shown again that it has not learnt from their abysmal failures of the 1970s.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition):** We have to consider one of the first—but certainly not the last—of the Bannon Government's tax increases. It is extraordinary that we are expected to debate this taxation measure, and another shortly, without the Government's telling us the State's complete financial picture. It is a most amazing state of affairs. It is quite clear why it has occurred, and that is that there was an embarrassing situation for one of the Ministers in the other House, and these increases were rushed in to try to offset criticism in another place. Everyone in the State knows that. It is obvious that they were rushed in because they were really not thought through, particularly the tobacco tax. We are told that things are serious and that the Government really has no alternative but to raise taxes. The Government wishes to raise more



money straight away, but we are not being told the deficit that the Government is planning.

This means we are not being told either the net impact of their revenue measures on the Budget situation or of the Government's economic strategy and future taxation plans. This is the Government that earlier indicated that it would not increase taxes until its review of the entire State taxation structure was complete. Now we see an about face. It has always been accepted that a State fuel tax is levied to provide funds for the State's road system. That principle has now been breached. Instead of using this measure, which was first imposed in 1979 solely to fund road improvements, the Government is making it another general revenue raiser. It is not as if we do not need extra funds to be spent on roads. If extra money is going to be raised it should be spent directly on roads. It goes from a tax on motorists for the benefit of motorists to a tax on motorists for the benefit of expanded Government.

The Hon. Mr Davis has just pointed out an area where one Minister has expanded and boasted about that expansion. The Hon. Dr Cornwall clearly boasted in this Chamber that he has returned the numbers in the Health Commission to the figure of those engaged on 30 June last year. He was quite proud of doing that. If he is proud of that, he must also accept that he must take, along with the Government, the blame for the increased taxes. The Labor Party has made petrol pumps branch offices of the State Taxation Office to boost its general revenue funds. The opposition and the public have a right to know how the additional money raised will be used. The Government expects to snatch another \$15 000 000 from the motorist but refuses to say how it will be used. It would be irresponsible of this Parliament to endorse further tax increases without being given any more explanation from the Government than 'We need the money.'

It seems that unequivocal commitments from the Labor Party mean nothing. We have all heard of those three great lies: 'The cheque's in the mail,' 'I'll still love you in the morning,' and, 'I'm from the Government, I'm here to help you.' Well, the A.L.P. has introduced a fourth: An A.L.P. Government will not increase taxes. It is not just in this State that that has occurred, but in every State where a Labor Party has won an election. In fact, I will quote the Labor Leader, Mr Bannon, from page 21 of his policy speech in which he states the following:

Unlike the Liberals we will not allow State charges—like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges—to be used as a form of backdoor taxation. The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing taxes during our term of office.

There is no equivocation and no reason for backing away from that. He continued:

... and any changes to the taxation structure would come after that inquiry reported and take place in our second term.

It will happen not in the first term but in the second term of office. That came from the Premier's policy speech of 25 October 1982. One could call it a document of fudges because one cannot believe what is in it. Back-door taxation indeed! Already every one of those charges risen dramatically in less than 8 months. And now we have this new tax hike, despite the following additional promise in the Government's policy speech:

The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes or increase existing taxes during our term of office.

That is clear and unequivocal. But the Government's disregard for commitments does not rest there. In the very next sentence in his policy speech, Mr Bannon said the following:

We will set up an independent inquiry into the State revenue collections, and any changes to the taxation structure would come after that inquiry reported and take place in our second term.

Again, this Government breaks a fundamental commitment. One could be excused for thinking that the State under Labor had a new motto for it seems that for this Government a commitment made is a commitment broken. We have heard, of course, the Premier since his election plead ignorance: 'We were misled,' the Government weakly explains. The Attorney-General continually harps on that line.

Well, Mr President, what an about face! The Premier's lack of confidence in the accuracy of his pre-election planning is only relatively new. Indeed, on 4 November (just hours before the election) the Labor Leader was interviewed in an article in the *Advertiser*. Let me remind the Council of what was said:

- Q. To fund your \$29 000 000 policy programme would you run to a deficit Budget or seek to increase your revenue?
- A. We estimate that revenue collection will match the extra expenditure we propose.
- Q. Do you have any aversion to deficit budgeting?
- A. Provided they're planned, a deficit Budget is an acceptable thing, although one must be very careful at the State level.
- Q. So your answer to an increase in revenue would be an outright 'No'?
- A. In taxes? Increasing taxes, No. We believe our programme can be costed without a tax rise.
- Q. But if elected would you perhaps use the Victorian Premier's excuse, that he was forced to raise taxes after promising not to, because he didn't know the Treasury was in such a mess?
- A. As I understand it, Cain had been given certain information which proved to be wrong.
- Q. But could that happen to you?
- A. We've got the Auditor-General's Reports, the programme and performance budgeting information, the Premier's own speeches on the economy.
- Q. But it does depend on the information you've got? Are you saying categorically the problem that affected Premier Cain can't affect you?
- A. To the best of my knowledge it can't.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** When was that?

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** It was on 4 November, before the last election.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** Prior to the election?

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Prior to the election, and the answer was, 'To the best of my knowledge, it can't.' It was surprising how quickly they turned around.

So, we come to the increase which this Bill proposes. Before coming to that, it would perhaps be wise to look at a few of the documents put out by various members of the Labor Party at that time. All over this State information was being spread around based on these particular fudges; 'lies'—I suppose, is the word that should be used, but we cannot use that, so we will call it 'fudges'. Listen to the sort of thing that was said by Mr Jack Slater, member for Gilles, Opposition spokesman for recreation and sport and tourism. He said, well before the election (I think it was a year before):

Week by week, the Tonkin Government has raised various charges in an endeavour to help it out of its own financial problems. Almost every possible licence, permit, registration fee has become dearer, as well as fares on public transport, water, electricity, Housing Trust rentals, public hospital charges, petrol beer, cigarettes.

We dared to put up the price of cigarettes, according to Mr Slater. He said:

... The list is endless. Look at these figures. Water and sewerage up 12½ per cent.

I bet they wish they had us back in Government now, because I believe the figures for water and sewerage are somewhat higher than that.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** Twenty-six per cent.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** And about to go up again, according to information that we have received, because of

the change in the method of charging interest rates to statutory authorities by this Government. Mr Slater continued:

... Electricity up 12½ per cent.

Again I believe that we will see a dramatic increase there in the near future, for the same reason. Mr Greg Crafter, sitting member for Norwood, said this during the election campaign:

One of the first acts of the Tonkin Government was to abolish price controls on a range of goods and services, a system established by Sir Thomas Playford. One of John Bannon's first acts as Premier will be to return to an appropriate price control system.

The only price control system that we want is on Government charges, to try to obtain some relief for the people of this State from the Government's moves in using State charges for tax increases. He further said:

A Bannon Government will also keep a tight rein on State charge increases by making sure that essential items are not used as a form of backdoor taxation.

Now we come to the quite famous man who over recent days has received a considerable amount of publicity for misleading or, to use that other term, fudging the Parliament.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** The man who answers implications?

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** He does not answer questions but answers implications—Jack Wright, Deputy Premier. He sent out a letter in October, to the electors. Let me quote what he said:

I can assure you that one of John Bannon's first acts as Premier will be to reintroduce a proper price control system in South Australia. Over the last three years the Tonkin Government has made substantial increases in State charges on such items as bus fares, water rates and licence fees. Many of those increases have been by amounts greater than the rate of inflation.

That is a mortal sin. However, I believe that the majority of charges that have been increased lately are through the ceiling and well above the inflation rate. Mr Wright's letter continues:

This is nothing less than a form of backdoor taxation. A Bannon Government will keep a tight rein on increases in State charges and will not use them as a form of backdoor taxation.

To use a horse term, the horse must have a hard mouth, because the rein has not worked too well and the horse has raced away from the Government. I believe that the Opposition probably made a mistake in taking on Mr Wright in relation to a recent matter. Instead, on behalf of the people of South Australia, we should have made Mr Wright answer for this fudge that he put out to the people of his electorate.

**The Hon. J.C. Burdett:** You mean the lie?

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** All right, I will say it, the lie.

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. C.M. Hill):** Order! I ask the honourable leader to address the Chair, because he is facing the other way and I cannot hear him.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Without a doubt, the Minister of Labour and Industry put it over the people of his district before the last election. That was a direct lie, and nothing else can be said about it. He must now apologise to the people of his district. The Attorney-General's second reading speech carefully avoids any term such as 'tax increases', preferring to talk of 'revenue measures', which that is a nice way of dressing up these measures. The Attorney and his Premier have given us a new tool in Government fiscal policy—that of the 'revenue measure'—'the tax you have when you're not having a tax'. The Opposition opposes this Bill not only because it directly contradicts commitments made by the Labor Party in an effort to capture Government, but because, if adopted, this measure will strike at the heart of our economy.

Every sector will be affected, and everybody will pay the price, not just at the petrol pumps but in increased prices, increased freight charges, increased costs to the private sector and greater demands on Government spending. There will

be those who will be more seriously affected than others—particularly those in the very outer suburbs and those who live in the country. We know that less than 10 per cent of the A.L.P.'s seats are in the country and that the Government has little interest in rural people. However, that is no excuse for this additional slug. For most country people a motor vehicle is essential. There is no public transport alternative.

Most people living in the country need a car to do the shopping, and if they wish to play sport they need a car. In almost every country area a trip to a football match requires a trip of at least 60 miles or more. Country people will have to pay this additional tax for the trip. If children in the country want to get to school, it requires the use of a car. There are many people in the country who travel 80 miles a day to get their children to school. There is no other way, if there is no school bus in the near vicinity.

Not only will rural people face direct increases because it will cost more to run their cars, but they will also have to pay a higher price for essential items as well as luxuries, because of the inevitable rise in freight charges. The squeeze does not end there. The prices farmers receive, for example, are city prices (generally lower than country prices) net of freight costs. Therefore, farmers must pay both ways.

Without doubt, the greatest impact of this tax measure will be imposed on country people. The money will not be spent on providing them with the roads that they lack. If honourable members require examples, I suggest that they talk to the Hon. Mr Dunn or visit the West Coast and other country areas. All these matters are glibly overlooked by the Premier and by his Attorney in their speeches on this matter. It is without a doubt the most blatant example of a broken promise that I have seen in my time in Parliament. The worst part is that it has come so soon after the Government came to office. If the Attorney had been present in the Chamber he would have heard what I have said.

He would have heard their arguments about what Mr Bannon said prior to the election as to how much knowledge he had on the state of the Treasury. The Government has, without a doubt, tried to put it over the people in relation to those measures.

*The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** The Government has created that deficit itself.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** That is an absolute lie.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** People outside do not know that the Leader does not know what he is talking about, so there is no point in taking exception to it. This Government has come in and has gone willy-nilly into the expenditure of funds. Now the public has had to pay for the gifts that it has handed out to its friends upon coming into Government.

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** I appreciate the difficulties in which the Government finds itself, many of which were not of its own making. It is quite unfair to say that one Government or another caused this enormous deficit and one which will be repeated. The deficit is about \$109 000 000. Let us not forget the dreadful fires, floods and drought which also contributed. It is no good hammering each other about who created the deficit. The fact is that it is there, and we have to deal with it. Money must be raised from somewhere. We should try to avoid breaking long-standing principles, if possible. The Government should be looking much harder at reducing expenses rather than simply trying to tax South Australian people out of their minds. We are going to be a very highly-taxed State. We have the highest unemployment of any mainland State. We are now 9 per cent of the population of Australia instead of 10 per cent. All those pointers show the difficulties we are in, not only financial but difficulties of all kinds.

The Bill seeks to modify a long-standing traditional arrangement whereby all State taxes raised from the motorist have been allocated to the Highways Fund for the Highways Department to use on road construction and maintenance, with minor reallocations to the Police Department, the Road Safety Division and the *Troubridge* service to Kangaroo Island. The three sources of revenue thus allocated to the Highways Fund are from vehicle registration fees, driving licences and revenue from the State fuel franchise tax. They have all been paid into the Highways Fund until now, less the cost of collection.

Clause 2 of the Bill seeks to amend section 18 of the principal Act by increasing the amount of tax on the nominated price of petrol and to increase the amount of tax on the nominated price of diesel fuel which will result in raising about 1c a litre on both. I have no great quarrel with that. I do, however, question the amendments suggested to section 31 of the principal Act as set out in clause 3 of the Bill. The present section makes quite clear that all moneys raised from motorists will go to the Highways Department monthly, after expenses of collection have been deducted. The amendment means that the Highways Department will be guaranteed to receive no less than it received for the financial year 1982-83, but the surplus of additional revenue can and will be used by the Government for general revenue purposes to help reduce the deficit.

I hope that the 1982-83 figure is not a fixed minimum: other speakers, particularly, the Hon. Legh Davis, have explained that, because of inflation, it will in fact be reducing in real terms. The point is that all State fuel tax moneys collected go into the Highways Fund, but now the Government is saying that some of that money will not go into the Highways Fund but will remain in general revenue. I suggest that if every Government department, including the Highways Department, and members of this Parliament all made a contribution, we could wipe out the deficit quite quickly and relatively painlessly. I see no reason why it should simply be the motorist, the truck driver, or the farmer who makes this contribution (and this matter was referred to by the Hon. Mr Cameron), because, without that contribution, any increase in the cost of petrol or diesel fuel would have been much less than 1c a litre, if we take history as a guide.

This tax tends to fall hardest on the lower income groups than on the wealthy. In fact, I am nervous, as are some other members, of the rather *ad hoc* method of raising these taxes. I know that it has to be done, and it is most unfortunate, but I think we might find that it is not entirely equitable when the Government's plan has further matured. Amendments of some sort might be needed. I considered suggesting an amendment whereby all moneys raised from motorists would go to the Highways Department for roads, as has been done in the past, the Government being authorised to transfer for this year \$11 000 000 to general revenue, which is the Government's own estimate of the sum required from Highways Department money for the remainder of this year. There could be an authority to transfer \$15 000 000 for 1984-85 and \$17 500 000 for 1985-86.

Had the Government done that, it would have been a better system: it would retain the existing principle while making special arrangements for the economic crisis that we are facing at present. However, after discussing the matter with the Treasurer and the Under Treasurer, I have decided to merely make a suggestion without pressing it. I hope that the Government will consider my suggestion, but I doubt whether it will do so. I also believe that there should be a sunset clause and that this amendment should operate for three years only (at the most): it should be reviewed at this time each year when contributions made by everyone else could be assessed. However, we are told that there is a deadline of 5 p.m. tomorrow, by which time this Bill must

be passed, and that if we suggest a sunset clause (which we have prepared) the procedure will be very difficult or impossible to achieve in time.

**The Hon. J.C. Burdett:** Why?

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** The Bill would have to go to the House of Assembly, where there would be another debate and possibly a conference, and I am told that the situation would be very difficult. We feel that the Government should not have changed the principle on the use of petrol taxes to operate indefinitely. Now that this new channel for petrol taxes will remain, the next Government to come into office, no matter of which persuasion, will grab at it as extra untied revenue, and so it will stay on. That is always the way with new taxes. The Government has told us that it will not accept my suggested amendment. And, having regard to the rules about the Council not amending money Bills, there is little that we can do about it. Naturally, the Democrats are less than pleased and we can assure honourable members that if we had had more time we would have pressed our point. As it is, we will support the Bill with considerable misgivings.

**The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 August. Page 162.)

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition opposes the Bill as it stands. One wonders how many times we will have to consider measures in this place that break clear and unequivocal commitments given by the Government at the time of the last election. I have detailed those commitments in a previous speech, so I will not go through them again: I am sure that the Attorney would have read them in *Hansard*. Coupled with another measure we have just considered, we are being asked to approve an additional \$32 000 000 hike in State taxes over a full year, 1983-84. These relate to two measures, but there are more to come, as the Premier has made clear. However, the Premier refuses to indicate what the hugh tax slugs are likely to be or the impact of these measures on the Budget.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I ask honourable members to cease engaging in audible conversations across the Chamber.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** As we have previously stated, the Government promised that it would not increase taxes during its first term, a promise that was discarded a long time ago. This Bill proposes to double the tobacco licence fee levied on retail and wholesale tobacco merchants. In other words, it proposes a 100 per cent tax increase. It was bad enough talking about the rate of inflation, but a 100 per cent tax increase is rather disgraceful.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** What was the percentage increase in the deficit?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** The Labor Party has peddled those two words, 'consultation' and 'consensus' a great deal lately. Although those terms are peddled, the sentiments are rarely practised. There was so little consultation about this tax increase that companies and consumers (and I suspect the Government itself) were bewildered about what was, and is, intended.

*The Hon. C.J. Sumner interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I ask the Attorney to come to order. I ask all honourable members to cease conducting their private conversations across the Chamber and to listen to the member who has the call.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** One would have hoped that the explanation given by the Government about when and how the increase would operate would be made when the Premier first advised that there would be an increase. Unfortunately, that was not to be. The Premier back peddled and tried to blame the various companies which right from the start knew the way that the tax would have to be brought in. The Government therefore brought it in quite properly so that it could cover itself when the time came for the tax to finally be paid. That was necessary so that it was not considered an excise. Surely, the Government must have known that, although it would appear from public statements that it did not.

It is apparent that the Government made a complete mess of bringing in the measure, and then it tried to blame the companies which had in fact taken what I consider to be a very responsible move (even if it was not a responsible move from the Government's point of view). The Government's move is totally irresponsible and is a total backdown from a commitment made to the people of this State before the election. I am sure that many Labor candidates who made quite a play of price rises and a commitment to there being no tax increases are sorely embarrassed by these measures.

Indeed, many members circularised their electors with a specific handbill on price control on taxes, examples of which I have already given. The Deputy Premier even sent his constituents a letter on the subject which contained a signature on the bottom (which I assume was his). I remember the Australian Democrats talking about false advertising at one stage after an election. I am quite certain that if they had looked at that document they would have deduced that it was not only false advertising but also a complete putover of the people of that electorate and of this State.

But the worst part is that it was signed by the person concerned. The electors of the State should be able to take action against that individual. The whole thing seems to have been, to use that which will become part of this Parliament, a bit of a fudge. The Premier was quoted time and time again that he would return to a proper price control system, but this has not happened. Almost every subject that has been raised by these letters has had a price increase since this Government came to office. Despite the A.L.P.'s commitments and its criticism of the former Government, almost every item has risen in price since the election. Many of these are the direct result of Government actions. It is just as well that a packet of cigarettes was not included amongst the pictures on some of these pamphlets because that item, too, will rise by 18 cents—well above the rate of inflation.

**The Hon. G.L. BRUCE:** I rise to support the Bill. It does not give a great deal of joy to rise and support it, but I feel that I must do so, on equity and good grounds, to the extent that it gives the Government, I can assure honourable members, no joy to have to put this tax on. I know that it has been done only on the advice of the Treasury, because there is no way that this State can go on without extra money in it. It is a hypocritical attitude adopted by Parties to say that Governments cannot put up taxes and that they would not do this.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Are you prepared to apologise for this?

**The Hon. G.L. BRUCE:** No, I am not apologising for this. In fact, I see on the document that the Hon. Mr Cameron had how taxes had risen under Tonkin and Fraser. It looks like a point-scoring exercise for either Government. It gives us no joy to have to put these taxes on ordinary working people who bear the brunt of them; I can see that.

It is done with great reluctance because if we did not do it we would be in trouble.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** You will not be able to hire extra teachers.

**The Hon. G.L. BRUCE:** What is one to do: put them on the dole? I have moved around the State in the last month or two. The number of people asking for extra money for projects and employment means that that money must come from taxation somewhere or other. As I understand it, our taxation base is very narrow. We cannot go into new tax fields into which other States have not gone. If we do, we are at a disability. We are doing no worse than the other States. Our taxation on tobacco is not as high as it is in Western Australia. The other States have also put on these increased taxes—Victoria and new South Wales. They are all responsible Governments, whether Liberal or Labor. I believe that the Joh Bjelke-Petersens of this world have to impose extra taxes if stable government and the employment of people are to be maintained—no matter what Government is there.

We saw exactly the same exercise when we were in Opposition in the last Parliament. We stood up and attacked the then Government on the same thing. If we are responsible as Governments and as people in this House, we realise that a tax must be imposed to stop this State going into bankruptcy, and the hypocritical attitude that is adopted by Parties, of whatever side, to me seems completely wrong.

This Government has acted on Treasury advice. If it ignores that advice it does so at its own peril. If it did and went down the plughole the Opposition would be the first to scream, 'Irresponsible! There was a need for taxation. Why didn't you do that?'

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** You'd better keep an eye on your Ministers and their expenditure.

**The Hon. G.L. BRUCE:** I do not believe that that is it. We came in with an excessive deficit in the Budget. It was there, and we were not aware of it. The previous Government had warnings from the Hon. Mr DeGaris about what was going in, and how it was transferring its loan funds. I am no expert in money, but I realise that if a State or country is going broke taxes must be increased to get it solvent.

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** We were just trying to keep you to your commitment.

**The Hon. G.L. BRUCE:** You are saying, 'Don't have taxes at all.'

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** We are saying: 'keep your promises.'

**The Hon. G.L. BRUCE:** I was away at the time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Honourable members should stop interjecting, as the Hon. Mr Bruce is a member who infrequently interjects.

**The Hon. G.L. BRUCE:** I believe that the Government is justified in this matter and is acting on the best advice available to it. The public should recognise that the Government is in an invidious position and does not like to impose these taxes, but that they must be imposed.

**The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

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

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

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

It provides for the appropriation of \$375 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until

assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. Honourable members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$320 million and was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year. This Bill is for \$375 million, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the issue

and application of up to \$375 million. Clause 3 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.8 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 18 August at 2.15 p.m.