

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 18 August 1983

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

MINISTERIAL ASSISTANTS

The **PRESIDENT**: Before asking for questions I want to explain that the area that I suggested to the Attorney-General has now been provided for one secretary per Minister to take notes during Question Time—not to act as advisers, but to take notes which hopefully will facilitate answers to questions asked during Question Time. The provision is, I believe, a concession and hopefully it will be one which will be observed as a concession. The concession will be withdrawn if it is abused and it will terminate when the Chamber is amplified and speakers are provided in the various offices.

CUMMINS AREA SCHOOL

The **PRESIDENT** laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Cummins Area School (Library/Resource Centre relocation and fire damage restoration).

QUESTIONS

ST JOHN AMBULANCE SERVICE

The **Hon. J.C. BURDETT**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about the St John Ambulance Service.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.C. BURDETT**: In the Council yesterday, during the no-confidence motion which I moved against the Minister of Health, the Minister referred to the issue of volunteers in the St John Ambulance Service; although I did not raise it, he mentioned it in passing. In particular, he referred to negotiations that had allegedly taken place between the St John Council and volunteers on the recommendations contained within the Opit Report. The Minister claimed that negotiations were proceeding satisfactorily (to use his words). He also said:

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.

He went on to say:

Some fears were expressed that the agreement might be the first step in eliminating volunteers. However, the meeting was persuaded by senior representatives, and the package was finally accepted unanimously.

As is always the case, the Minister managed to throw in a few words of self-praise when he said:

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.

The Minister clearly intended the Council to believe that this so-called meeting of volunteers was a large and representative meeting which freely resolved the issues in the way the Minister wanted them to be. Last night I raised the question of the numbers on the basis of information which had been given to me. I suggested that there were no more than 12 to 15 people. In fact, my further inquiries have

elicited the fact that the number was 17: there were 17 volunteers present and they were all from the metropolitan area, which supplies only 600 of the 5 000 volunteers in the St John Ambulance Service.

I am also advised that the unanimous acceptance of the package (which the Minister claims) was more the outcome of a Russian roulette-style approach by the Manager of St John than a free and frank consultation between the parties. In fact, it is alleged that the Manager indicated to those present that, if they refused to accept the package, the Minister could withdraw the use of volunteers within the St John Ambulance Service. First, is it true that the meeting of volunteers to which the Minister referred comprised only 17 representatives? Secondly, does the Minister consider that to be a true reflection of the view of the 5 000 volunteer members of St John? Thirdly, is he aware of indications given by the Manager of St John to the volunteers present that the Minister could withdraw the use of volunteers within the St John Ambulance Service if the package was not accepted?

The **Hon. J.R. CORNWALL**: This is becoming terribly tiresome. The honourable member seems to be heavily into the politics of boredom. The meeting to which I referred did take place on Tuesday night. There was no attempt whatsoever, nor was there any intention on my part, to mislead the Council or anybody else—that is not my style. I may have many faults but a lack of frankness and a lack of honesty and integrity are not amongst those faults. I repeat: it is spurious nonsense for the honourable member to even suggest that there was any attempt whatsoever to mislead the Council. I told the Council last night that the meeting was attended by district supervisors in the metropolitan area who, between them, represented about 80 per cent of all volunteers involved in the ambulance service in the metropolitan area. As to whether the General Manager or anybody else told the meeting that, if it refused to accept the propositions, the Minister could withdraw volunteers from the service, I do not know, as it is not within my knowledge. I cannot comment on whether the General Manager or anybody else made those statements.

However, I can say that I have never, at any stage, told people that I would withdraw volunteers. I cannot, for the life of me, imagine how I would be in a position to withdraw volunteers. I have said to this Council on many occasions that, even if it were my desire to withdraw volunteers from the system (and I have stressed a dozen times that it is not my desire), I could not do it. There are several practical reasons why I could not. One reason is that in this matter I would not have the support of my colleagues, either in Cabinet or in Caucus. The reality is that we simply could not find the money to do it. At least I have given 6 000 000 good reasons, in terms of dollars, why I could not do it. In terms of policy, nobody has ever suggested that the Government wants to withdraw volunteers. These continuous, boring misrepresentations frankly are not getting to me, I hasten to add, but I do not think they are doing the Council or the Parliament any good. Most assuredly, they are not doing the shadow Minister or his colleagues on the Opposition benches any good in terms of credibility.

Specifically referring to the question relating to the meeting of volunteers, if the honourable member says that it was attended by 17 people, I am perfectly happy to accept his word. I do not know that it is a matter of great moment. I never suggested that it was a mass meeting of hundreds. Certainly, it was a meeting at which the representatives of the volunteers attended specifically to consider a range of proposals which had been hammered out in ongoing negotiations between the Ambulance Employees Association, the Miscellaneous Workers Union, and the St John Council, representing both management and volunteers.

The meeting was called, as I am informed, by Dr Jim Davies of the St John Ambulance Association. Frankly, if one cannot negotiate with those people at those sorts of levels and be assured that once agreement has been reached one has an arrangement that will be reasonably binding, then one cannot negotiate at all. I am happy to say that after what I know was a long meeting—I am told that it finished at 12.40 a.m.—my information from one of the senior Health Commission officers was that there was agreement; the exact phrase used in the report to me was that there was 'unanimous agreement' to the propositions that I outlined at some length yesterday to the Council.

The Hon. Mr Burdett makes reference again to the fact that it represents only 600 of the total 5 000 volunteers, those 600 being the people involved in ambulance duty in the metropolitan area. That is correct. The whole package of proposals applies only to volunteers in the metropolitan area, and no-one has ever suggested in their wildest moments that it applied to any other persons except those officers, both professional and volunteer, who are involved in the metropolitan ambulance service. The third question, about whether I could withdraw or would withdraw volunteers from the service, I have already answered.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: URANIUM MINING

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Today the Honeymoon joint venturers were advised that their request for compensation has been refused. The reason for that decision is absolutely clear. The Mining Act confers on the Minister of Mines and Energy a discretion to grant or refuse a mining lease, and that discretion is not fettered by the fact that the applicant may hold existing tenements. There is therefore no legal obligation to compensate.

The joint venturers' decision to proceed to a pilot operation is evidence of their recognition of the commercial risks associated with the project. These risks derive from a number of sources including technical feasibility, economic viability, market potential, environmental acceptability, ability to meet operating safety standards, and changes in Government policy, whether State or Commonwealth. Any costs associated with such commercial risks should be borne by the proponents, not the State.

Cabinet also took a decision to refuse an application for a retention lease to the joint venturers at Beverley which incorporated a request for conditions which would permit the construction and operation of a semi-permanent, skid-mounted pilot plant. The Government can see no justification for permitting activities under a retention lease which it would not permit under a mining lease. However, the Government is still prepared to recognise South Australian Uranium Corporation's interest in the deposit through a retention lease subject to appropriate conditions.

The Government has now formulated clear guidelines for both retention leases and exploration licences which will be applied to all companies engaged specifically in exploration for uranium. Retention leases over any uranium deposit will be available for the maximum permissible term of five years. There will be a right of renewal but it will not be unconditional.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: There will be no requirements for further development work. Exploration including additional drilling to define an ore body will be acceptable.

Pilot operations or push-pull tests are prohibited. Other work will be considered on application.

There will only be minimal reporting requirements where projects have been placed on care and maintenance basis. Since the Honeymoon decision in March, several companies have requested release from or reduction in work commitments over their licence areas. While it is quite reasonable that these companies would want to maintain their interest in the more prospective areas which they have identified, particularly where they have found mineralised intersections which are not ore grade, it is not in South Australia's interest for a large area of the State's prospective mineral lands to be tied up indefinitely without work commitments because while these areas may be prospective for uranium they are also prospective for other minerals.

Under the guidelines, explorers who have applied for a reduction or release from work commitments will be given until 31 December 1983 to evaluate their leases to determine which prospective areas they wish to retain. Explorers who make applications in the future will be given three months or until 31 December 1983, whichever is the longer, to make this evaluation. The Government will then negotiate realistic commitments for the reduced area on a case-by-case basis. Any application for the renewal of an exploration licence where the primary target is uranium will be treated in exactly the same manner as an exploration licence where the primary target is any other mineral.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

ST JOHN AMBULANCE SERVICE

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Health a question about the St John Ambulance Service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: We have heard the Minister of Health respond to Mr Burdett's question regarding the St John Ambulance service and the role of volunteers, which was discussed at the meeting which took place on the evening before last. The Minister's response and his comments yesterday raised grave concern about his idea of consultation and about his true support of the volunteers within our community. I ask the Minister the following questions:

1. Has he ever indicated to the Manager of St John that the withdrawal of volunteers would be an option considered by the Government if the volunteers were unprepared to accept the Government's proposal?
2. Did he ask the Manager to raise this at the meeting?
3. Does he consider the withdrawal of volunteers an option if there is any breakdown in relations between St John, the volunteers and the union?
4. Did the Minister authorise the Manager to state, as part of the package, that if the proposals were accepted by the volunteers the remaining areas referred to in the Opit Report recommendations (that is, the use of one volunteer with one paid member on all ambulances; that four metropolitan centres be crewed by paid staff over the weekends; and that there be incorporation of the services and formation of an ambulance board) would be buried forever and not just deferred as an interim measure pending further action by the Government at a later stage?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The honourable member's first question was whether I have ever indicated to the Manager of St John that the withdrawal of volunteers would be an option considered by the Government if the volunteers were unprepared to accept the Government's proposal. I have no recollection of ever indicating that to Mr Jellis at

any time. In my recollection, there have been some wild rumours going about in recent weeks. One of those wild rumours which, as far as I am concerned, was completely unsubstantiated, was that at one stage the volunteers might have been considering withdrawing their services. I believe that that is one of the wilder rumours that was going around. It was indicated that in the event of that happening the professional officers would be prepared, in the event of any crisis arising, to work the necessary long additional hours to make sure that the metropolitan ambulance service was maintained.

I stress that that was one of many wild rumours going about, some of which have been quite mischievous and have been stirred up by the Opposition in this place. The honourable member's second question was 'Did I ask the Manager to raise this matter at the meeting?' Of course I did not. Indeed, on my recollection (and again, I do not have total powers of recall) I have not spoken to Mr Jellis personally for some weeks. Indeed, the last time that I tried to contact him, following a fairly wild story in the *Advertiser* early last week, he was on a tour of the Mid North. More recently, during the negotiations (in which I was not involved, incidentally) Mr Jellis was interstate. I have certainly not spoken to him in these terms: I have not spoken to him personally in recent days and I most certainly would deny completely any suggestion that I asked him to raise this or any other matter at the meeting.

The honourable member's third question was, 'Do I consider the withdrawal of volunteers an option, if there is any breakdown in relations between St John, the volunteers and the union?' I presume the honourable member is referring to the Ambulance Employees Association because, of course, more than one union is involved. I am not sure what the honourable member means by 'the withdrawal of volunteers'. The withdrawal by whom? It is not clear to me—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: By you.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I cannot withdraw the volunteers; that is an absurd notion. Quite frankly, I would not waste the time of the Council canvassing that point. If the honourable member means that we would consider imposing some sort of conditions to compel the St John organisation to get rid of volunteers, I answered that at some length not only yesterday but more recently again today in replying to a series of questions from John Burdett. It is not the intention of the Minister of Health, the Health Commission or the Bannon Government to seek to disband volunteers at all. I made a lengthy Ministerial statement (I think on Tuesday, from memory) which made my position, the Government's position and the Health Commission's position very clear in relation to a number of matters, including our support for volunteers. The honourable member's fourth question was:

Did the Minister authorise the Manager to state, as part of the package, that if the proposals were accepted by the volunteers, the remaining areas referred to in the Opit Report recommendations (that is, the use of one volunteer with one paid member on all ambulances; that four metropolitan centres be crewed by paid staff over the weekend; that there be incorporation of the services and formation of an ambulance board) would be buried forever and not just deferred as an interim measure pending further action by the Government at a later stage?

The use of one volunteer with one paid member on all ambulances is certainly not a matter to which the Health Commission or I as Minister accords any real priority whatsoever. The suggestion that four metropolitan centres be crewed by paid staff over weekends is not a proposal that I have put forward at any stage. I cannot recollect that as being a specific proposal in terms of the Opit Report (that is, specifically referring to four metropolitan centres). Really, that is a non-question, I think, in real terms, which does not merit a specific reply. In relation to the suggestion, and

this is important, that there be incorporation of the services and formation of an ambulance board, I have never suggested to anyone that that ought to be buried. That is a question that we will most certainly have to address in pre-Budget negotiations early next year.

Professor Opit has suggested, quite firmly and without equivocation, that in order to get financial accountability for the very large sum of money (something in the order of \$6 000 000) that the taxpayers of South Australia, through the Health Commission, put into the St John Ambulance Service each year, a State ambulance board or a St John Ambulance board, or whatever one likes to call it, is a preferred option. He also suggested that that board should be incorporated under the South Australian Health Commission Act. In that way, we would have a degree of accountability that is similar to the sort of accountability that we have in regard to all of our incorporated health units, including the very many hospitals throughout this State.

I believe that that is the preferred option for a responsible Government. This is 1983, we are approaching 1984 and beyond, and I do not believe that I have to apologise for the fact that I have called for a high degree of accountability in our health units. We will spend about \$400 000 000 in 1983-84 on hospitals, and quite clearly there has to be accountability.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: So in other words you intend to replace St John or make it subject to the directions of the Health Commission?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: One of the preferred options is incorporation of a State ambulance board, or a St John Ambulance board, whatever one likes to call it. Preliminary investigations have been undertaken in this regard. One of the other options that would be available to give us financial accountability is to impose conditions of subsidy.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Which option do you prefer?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I do not prefer any option at the moment. I have an open mind. It is not a matter, at this moment, that needs to be addressed.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: It will be.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Of course it will be: it not only will be addressed, but it must be addressed, because I come back to the notion of accountability. I do not believe that any longer, directly or indirectly, the taxpayers of South Australia should be putting in excess of \$6 000 000 a year into the ambulance service by way of subsidy without—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It is the best in Australia.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: —its having a degree of accountability to the Health Commission, to the Government and, most importantly, to the South Australian Parliament.

LEAD LEVELS

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about lead levels.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Last year, some parents of children at Glenelg primary and junior primary schools expressed concern about the level of use of Diagonal Road by heavy transport vehicles and their speed past the school. Glenelg school is on the north-eastern corner of the junction of Diagonal Road with Brighton Road, both very busy roads: heavy transports use both roads. Adjacent to the school on Diagonal Road is a pedestrian crossing controlled by lights. The matter of concern at that time was the speed at which heavy transport vehicles, particularly, approach the crossing from the south-east around a sharp bend in the

road. It must surely be only a matter of time before there is a serious accident at that crossing because of excessive speed of vehicles.

The previous Minister of Transport (Hon. Michael Wilson) viewed the problem with the Commissioner of Highways and other officers. As a result, a report was requested as to what may be the solution. At the time of the inspection, the then Minister of Transport raised a question about lead levels at the school, because he thought that the density of traffic was such that there may be a problem with excessive lead levels and that the health of children at the school may be at risk. He requested the Commissioner to take up this matter with the Health Commission for a report. It was only a short time before the November 1982 election, and as a result no report had been presented. I ask the following questions:

1. Has the South Australian Health Commission investigated the matter of lead levels at Glenelg school?
2. Has a report been received? If not, when is a report expected?
3. Will the report be made public?
4. Will the Minister consult with the Minister of Transport as to the solution to the traffic problem at the school and provide a report to the Council?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The fourth question is quite clearly in the domain of the Minister of Transport, and may be peripherally in the domain of the Minister of Education. It clearly has nothing to do with me in my portfolio in the administrative sense. As a concerned member of the Government, of course, I would naturally be worried if the description given by the honourable member is accurate.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Well, it is accurate.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Well, one wonders, the way the Opposition has been carrying on these days, if anything it says is accurate. Naturally, if the position is as described, I would be concerned. I will refer it to the appropriate Minister or Ministers and bring back a reply in the fullness of time.

In regard to the question of lead pollution because of exhaust emission, I am sure that the honourable member, who was the minder of his colleagues in the Tonkin Cabinet, would be aware that the then Minister of Transport was the prime mover in having ATAC (Australian Transport Advisory Council) adopt a recommendation on an Australia-wide basis that we would go to lead free petrol and vehicles with catalytic converters that use lead free petrol exclusively (from memory) from 1 January 1985. So, naturally, we are now, I am happy to say, starting to move down the track, which will mean that within a decade we will have a very significant degree of control over lead emission from motor vehicle exhausts. Specifically, regarding questions 1, 2 and 3 (has the South Australian Health Commission investigated the question of environmental lead pollution at the Glenelg school; has the report been received; is it my intention that it be made public?), none of those things have been drawn to my attention, and are not within my knowledge at the moment.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You will find out?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The honourable member can rest assured that I will find out, as a matter of urgency, and bring back replies to his questions.

POLICE ACTION

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, a question about police action.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I asked a question of the Chief Secretary, through the Attorney-General, on 31 May. I have received a reply by letter, but as it is now a different session of Parliament I have to ask the question again in order to get the reply printed in *Hansard*. My question on 31 May concerned the fund raising dance held at the Norwood Town Hall on Friday 13 May, organised by the National Organisation for the Reform of Marihuana Laws. A large number of police officers entered the hall. I understand that six arrests took place, not one of them for a drug offence: they were charges of loitering or such. But, specifically, I asked a number of questions which I will now ask again so that replies can be given.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: I have them here; I will read the questions.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: This would not be a Dorothy Dixier?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: No. I want the answers in *Hansard*.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Incorporate them.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Attorney will read the questions and answers.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The questions and the replies provided to the Chief Secretary by the Police Department are as follows:

1. Q. Who authorised the police deployment at the Norwood Town Hall on 13 May at the dance promoted by NORML?
 - A. The operation was authorised by the duty inspector responsible for the district concerned.
2. Q. How many police officers were detailed to attend and from what squads did they come?
 - A. Thirty-two police members were involved in the operation. They came from the following squads:
Drug squad, 7.
Special tasks and rescue force, 7.
Adelaide C.I.B., 4.
Burnside C.I.B., 2.
Region B, 8.
Technical services, 2.
Commissioned officers, 2.
3. Q. How many were plain-clothes and how many were uniformed policemen?
 - A. There were 15 members in plain clothes and 17 members in uniform.
4. Q. If STAR Force officers were present what was the justification for using an anti-terrorist squad to attend the dance?
 - A. STAR Force, when not required for special assignments, acts as a reserve group and can be employed in a wide variety of tasks as required. The STAR Force is not an anti-terrorist group, *per se*, although they do have a role in current anti-terrorist planning.
5. Q. How far in advance was the action planned and by whom was it planned?
 - A. As a result of information coming into possession of police, planning for the actual operation commenced at approximately 11 p.m. on the night of 13 May 1983. This was approximately one hour prior to police arrival at the function. The operation was planned by the regional duty inspector.
6. Q. What was the justification for the police action?
 - A. Again, as a result of information coming into possession of police, responsibility was taken at a regional level to mount the operation in an endeavour to detect offences which were reported to be taking place.
7. Q. Had any complaint been made to the police to justify the operation and, if so, what was the complaint?
 - A. No specific complaint was made to police.
8. Q. If the police were acting on information, what was that information and could the police produce any evidence to support that information?
 - A. Information was received that patrons of the dance were freely using marihuana and that suspected drug dealers were present at the function. It was necessary for police to attend the function to obtain evidence regarding the offences which were reported to be taking place.
9. Q. In view of the fact that about 25 dances have been promoted by the marihuana law reform groups over the past five years, can it be confirmed that no complaint or arrest has ever arisen from these previous events?

- A. Any action which may have been taken against persons attending functions previously organised by marijuana law reform groups would not have been separately recorded. Therefore, it cannot be confirmed that no complaint or arrest has arisen from previous events.
10. Q. Is it not usual practice for police to make a low key appearance at such public functions, usually by sending only one or two pairs of officers to ensure no disturbance is taking place?
- A. It is usual practice for police to cause the minimum possible disruption to functions when they check whether a disturbance is taking place. However, the primary objective of this operation was to detect persons reported to be committing offences against the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act. In view of the nature of the function and the large number of persons present, it was considered that it would be unwise for a small number of police to attend for the purpose of taking action against offenders. Therefore, a special task force was assembled.

FARM MACHINERY

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Has the Minister of Agriculture an answer to a question that I asked yesterday on farm mechanisation services?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It is true that one of two officers previously employed in the Department of Agriculture in the area of farm mechanisation has taken up another appointment. That officer's service, however, has not been lost to the farming community as he is now working in the education field with emphasis on skills training. As to the longer-term aims of this Government it is acknowledged that the most desirable situation would be to have a farm mechanisation officer in each region. This must, of course, be considered along with the difficulties of stringent budget controls and reassignment of duties of existing personnel. These problems were outlined by me in the Legislative Council yesterday.

One piece of bright news is that approval has already been granted for a position of farm mechanisation officer to be advertised for Central Region. Emphasis will be on direct farmer liaison and development of a suitable extension service. As the honourable member is no doubt aware, a great deal of machinery information has for a long time been promulgated through the Agricultural Bureau system. This work will complement any developments in Department of Agriculture extension. In addition, we saw, early this year, the formation of the Agricultural Equipment Liaison Committee under the chairmanship of Mr Peter Trumble. This body will firm up the relationship between the Department of Agriculture and the machinery industry.

RIMMINGTON REPORT

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Ethnic Affairs a question on the public release of the Rimmington Report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: An answer given yesterday in this Chamber by the Minister related to this matter and caused me and many others great concern. I must confess that I have had no time as yet to study the report in full detail but, taking into consideration what the Minister stated yesterday, it appears clear that he is now expecting more submissions from interested groups and individuals. That simply means that the Minister will make no immediate plan for action based upon the recommendations put forward by the Rimmington Report. I am therefore immensely concerned, and I wish to ask several questions.

Will the Government release the action plan recommended by the Equal Opportunities Branch of the Public Service Board, and does the Public Service Board intend to act upon the action plan? I understand that the present and previous Governments have appointed senior officers in major Government departments as equal opportunities officers with skills, expertise and interest primarily in women's affairs. I support that greatly. Does the Government also intend to appoint officers of equal seniority concerned with equal opportunities for ethnic minorities? Would the Government consider it appropriate that, in order to implement the recommendations of the Rimmington Report, it is essential that a person at executive officer level be appointed to the Public Service Board to be responsible for carrying out the recommendations? Finally, when will the Government consider extending the equal opportunities approach to all public sector areas, which employ many thousands of migrants?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am interested to hear that the honourable member has not yet studied the report. I take it that after studying the report he will be able to reconsider the matter.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will then be interested to hear his and any other member's view on the report and the recommendations contained therein. As I stated yesterday, the report was prepared by the Equal Opportunities Branch of the Public Service Board and will now form the basis for the preparation of an action plan as far as the recommendations are concerned. The honourable member seemed to suggest that there will be a call for more submissions: of course more submissions will be called for. The report was of a limited kind. Whether it should have been broader is a matter that we can debate but, with the resources available to the inquiry as allocated by the previous Government, both the inquiry and the report were of a very limited nature. Whether or not we like it, the conclusions in the report are far from firm.

I indicated yesterday that, although statistically there is a discrepancy between the proportions of people of ethnic minority origin in the Public Service and in the community generally (and, in particular, there is a lack of representation in the higher levels of executive and administrative officer range), the report does not come down with any firm conclusions as to why that has occurred or, indeed, whether it has occurred as a result of discriminatory practices. Nevertheless, on the statistics collected by the report, a discrepancy exists. It is on that basis that the report recommends that a number of actions be taken. They are outlined in the report and will be considered by the Equal Opportunities Unit of the Public Service Board for the preparation of an action plan. The action plan, it is now suggested, should be made public and I will certainly take up that matter with the Public Service Board to see what it intends to do in that regard.

The second question was whether there should be equal opportunities officers, similar to women's advisers, in various Government departments and also whether the Government intends to appoint officers of equal seniority concerned with equal opportunities for ethnic minorities. That can be considered by the board and the Government as a result of the report. However, the Ethnic Affairs Commission has some degree of oversight relating to policies involving ethnic minority groups and a review of the Ethnic Affairs Commission is proceeding. That review has had the report made available to it and will no doubt consider such report and any action that should flow from it. The Ethnic Affairs Commission has the task of promoting equal opportunities

in the Government sector for people of ethnic minority origins.

Furthermore, an inquiry is proceeding to recommend an amendment to the Racial Discrimination Act and to place complaints under that Act with the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. That will provide the Commissioner with the statutory power to receive and conciliate on complaints of racial discrimination, just as she now has that statutory power in relation to matters of sexual discrimination. That initiative is under way. In due course, when the review of the Ethnic Affairs Commission is completed and when the committee has reported on the role of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity in racial discrimination matters, and when the Equal Opportunities Unit of the Public Service Board has completed its analysis of the report and its plan, further action can be considered by the Government.

In regard to the third question, consideration of the report can await the action that I have already outlined in response to the second question. Clearly, the question of equal opportunities ought to apply to the whole public sector. The report merely collects and collates statistical information relating to those people employed under the Public Service Act. The reason for that was that the resources given to the committee were limited and it could not have been a broader inquiry. The Hon. Mr Hill may be able to correct me but, to my knowledge, despite the way it turned out, it was not meant to be a comprehensive analysis of everyone employed in the public sector.

It was merely a pilot survey of certain areas where people were employed by the Public Service Board in order to provide a basis for future action. That is what the report does. I do not think that honourable members or the community ought to place any greater significance on the report than what it is. It indicates certain areas for concern that should be the basis for future action, recommendations in the report and other action that I have outlined yesterday and today.

PRIVILEGE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: My question relates to today's statement by Mr Justice Hope that he requested the Federal Attorney-General, Senator Evans, to investigate statements made yesterday in the House of Assembly by the member for Elizabeth. According to a report, Mr Justice Hope wants to determine whether the privilege of this Parliament prevails over Federal legislation. Two weeks ago Mr Justice Hope made a statement about contempt of his commission and on 4 August he stated, in part:

Any statement which attempts to lead to or to induce a pre-judgment by members of the public as to the view the royal commission should reach or the conduct or credit of a witness before it is a classic, well-known, well established form of contempt.

In the light of today's report, will the Attorney investigate whether or not the Commonwealth Royal Commissions Act, 1902, overrides absolute privilege of members of this Parliament to make in the Parliament such statements as they think fit about the conduct of commissions constituted under that Act?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not think that that is an appropriate matter for me to inquire into. In fact, it is a matter involving the privilege of another place.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: It is also the privilege of the Parliament.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is a matter which involves the privilege of the House of Assembly *vis-a-vis* a Federal royal commission.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: But it has wider ramifications.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As I understand it, according to what the Hon. Mr Griffin said in his statement to the Parliament this afternoon, certain action was being taken in another quarter by Mr Justice Hope. I have not seen any report or any details of the action contemplated at this time. If Mr Justice Hope has asked the Federal Attorney-General for advice or to take action on the matter, that is a matter for Mr Justice Hope and the Federal Attorney-General. Also, the matter relates to the privileges of the House of Assembly, as that is where the statement was made. As honourable members opposite are always keen to point out, this is a separate House and this is a bicameral Parliament.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: We have the same privileges, though.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: They may have the same privileges, but the fact is that the statements made by the member for Elizabeth were not made in this Council: they were made in the House of Assembly. It may be that similar privileges apply to the Parliament, but the issue of contention (if there is one) in this case involves the privilege of the House of Assembly. That is quite clear. In so far as it relates to the privilege of the House of Assembly, it seems to me that it is not a matter of concern to the Executive.

Should Mr Speaker in another place consider that there is an issue involved (and it should be noted that during the speech made yesterday by the member for Elizabeth, Mr Duncan, another place apparently did not consider that there was a problem, because no *sub judice* point of order was taken by any member of that House) it—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: And there was no point of order.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No point of order was taken by any member, including Liberal Party members, and the Presiding Officer at the time did not take any action about that matter. So, it seems to me that the correct procedure to adopt is that, if Mr Justice Hope has made comments and asked the Federal Attorney-General to carry out certain investigations, it is for the Federal Attorney-General to conduct them. Should there then be any question of the privilege of the royal commission *versus* the privilege of the House, then that is a matter for the House of Assembly.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: But you have set up a joint select committee to investigate the power of Parliament.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Indeed, I did.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You are backing off on this one.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not backing off at all: I am saying that at this point of time it is not a matter for the Executive—it is a matter for the Parliament—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The House of Assembly.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: And, in particular, the House of Assembly, because that is where the statement was made. As the honourable member keeps telling us, this is a separate House.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: But it has wider ramifications.

The PRESIDENT: Order! We understand the question.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: If a request is made by the Speaker of the House of Assembly for some advice on this matter from the Attorney-General or from Crown Law officers, that can be considered, but at this time it is not a matter that involves the Executive of this State.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: I am not asking the Executive—I am asking you as an officer of Parliament.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not believe that any case has been made out at this stage for me to respond to and obtain the information that the honourable member seeks. If the matter is considered by the House of Assembly, which is where the problem (if there is a problem) exists, the

matter can be considered by me as Attorney-General. However, for the moment, I do not intend to obtain an opinion on the matter that the honourable member has raised.

ETHNIC MUSEUM

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Ethnic Affairs a question about the ethnic museum.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Before the 1979 election the Liberal Party made a promise that it would try to establish an ethnic museum in this State. During the period of the Liberal Government from 1979-82, planning was put in train and arrangements were being concluded for this museum to proceed. The responsibility for establishing the museum was given to the History Trust of South Australia, which as an instrumentality came under the responsibility of the Minister of Arts.

A working party was established, a project officer appointed and the name 'Museum of Migration and Settlement' was preferred to the name 'ethnic museum'. The venue for the proposed museum was to be the old Institute Asylum Building that was to be part of the proposed museum development.

Just prior to the election last year a curator was appointed to continue this planning and to establish the museum. Much of the work comes under the general umbrella of the Minister of Ethnic Affairs, and I was fortunate, of course, in holding those two portfolios, but now they have been separated by this Government. I do not in any way criticise that—it is a fact of life.

I ask the Minister whether the Ethnic Affairs Commission has been consulted or been involved in this planning over the past nine months. If it has not, will the Minister try to establish communications between the planning group and the commission so that proper liaison can be maintained? In any case, does the Minister know the present state of planning that exists for the proposed museum?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The first question was whether the Ethnic Affairs Commission has been involved in discussions and planning relating to the Migration and Settlement Museum. I cannot specifically say but, if they have not been, they should have been. The situation, as I understand it, is that planning is proceeding, as it was under the previous Government. As the honourable member has mentioned, a curator has been appointed. Certainly, no action has been taken by me, or I believe any other Minister, to slow the programme that was in place prior to November 1982.

The only problem that has arisen (it has been the subject of consultation between the Ethnic Affairs Commission and other bodies concerned) involves the interim site for the museum which, I understand, was to be in the library building. This has caused some concern as to whether or not that is appropriate, and whether the space is satisfactory or, indeed, available. This matter is the subject of discussion at the moment and is certainly a matter that is, as far as I am concerned, proceeding. I hope that the Ethnic Affairs Commission has been involved in the discussions.

HEALTH SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Health a question about health sector employment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: On 10 August 1983, when answering a question, the Hon. Dr Cornwall stated that as at 30 June 1983 there were about 300 more people employed in the health area than there were as at 30 June 1982. First, will the Minister advise the Council whether the 1982-83 Budget provided for an additional 300 employees in the health area? Secondly, what was the cost of employing 300 additional health employees in the financial year 1982-83? Thirdly, can the Minister provide details of where the main increases in employment have been in the health area in the 1982-83 financial year?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The additional employees came into the system in crisis after the election of the Bannon Government in November 1982. They were specifically provided for in a Budget supplement of \$4 800 000. The honourable member who asked this question, and Opposition members generally, ought to recall that we injected that money into the system within weeks of coming to Government. This was funded primarily by an increase in hospital charges in February 1983. The cost, as I have pointed out, was \$4 800 000, and the increases were across the board.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Fisheries) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Fisheries Act, 1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It seeks to provide that the Minister may, by notice in the *Gazette*, implement fisheries management measures. Speed and flexibility are important elements in the implementation of management decisions in this State's fisheries. For example, due to seasonal conditions there may be a delay in the growth of prawns, and an extra two weeks closed season may be required at short notice to improve the yield. Past experience has produced clear evidence that the period from recommended management decision to proclamation is unacceptably long. Extensive consultation has taken place with the Australian Fishing Industry Council, representing industry, and the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council, representing recreational fishing interests. These bodies and the Department of Fisheries strongly support the concept of Ministerial notices.

This Bill provides that the Minister may, by notice in the *Gazette*, implement fisheries management measures presently provided in the following sections of the Act: section 25, declared waters; section 46, closed seasons, closed waters, protected species; section 47, undersize fish; section 49, use of devices; section 51, bag limits; and section 55, noxious fish. Speedier gazettal by Ministerial notice will achieve a more reasonable and efficient fisheries management regime for South Australia. 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 amends the definition of 'undersize fish' in section 5 by substituting for the reference to a proclamation a reference to a notice published in the *Gazette*. This amendment is consequential to clause 6, which amends section 47 so that any declaration determining the minimum size of fish may be made by the Minister by

notice published in the *Gazette* rather than by the Governor by proclamation. Clause 3 substitutes for present section 6 a new section providing for the power to vary or revoke proclamations and notices under the Act and for the date at which they came into operation. The proposed new section also provides a transitional provision under which any proclamation in force under sections 25, 46, 47, 49, 51 or 55 immediately before the commencement of this measure shall, on and from that commencement, continue in force as if it were a notice published in the *Gazette* under that section as amended by this measure.

Clause 4 amends section 25 of the principal Act, which provides that the Governor may by proclamation declare any waters to be declared waters in which it shall be an offence to deposit any substance or matter or carry on any dredging operation or other operation that disturbs the seabed. The clause amends the section so that the declaration may be made by the Minister by notice published in the *Gazette* rather than by the Governor by proclamation. Clause 5 amends section 46 of the principal Act, which provides that the Governor may by proclamation declare that it shall not be lawful to take fish or specified fish from specified waters, or from any waters or specified waters during a specified period. The clause amends this section so that the power may be exercised by the Minister by notice published in the *Gazette*. Clause 6 makes the amendment to section 47 explained in the explanation relating to clause 2. Clause 7 makes an amendment to section 48 that is consequential upon the amendment proposed by clause 6.

Clause 8 amends section 49, which provides for the making of proclamations controlling the use of devices for taking fish. The clause amends the section so that such controls may be imposed by the Minister by notice published in the *Gazette*. Clause 9 amends section 51, which provides that the Governor may by proclamation limit the number of fish that may be taken in any day by the use of a specified device. The clause amends this section so that such 'bag limits' may be fixed by the Minister by notice published in the *Gazette*. Clause 10 amends section 55 which empowers the Governor, by proclamation, to declare any specified fish to be a noxious fish which it is unlawful to keep, hatch, convey or release into waters. The clause amends the section so that the power may be exercised by the Minister by notice published in the *Gazette*. Clauses 11 and 12 make amendments that are purely consequential on amendments made by other clauses of the measure.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Meat Corporation Act, 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill proposes amendments to the South Australian Meat Corporation Act, 1936, relating to several disparate matters. The Bill proposes that section 33 of the principal Act be replaced with a new section setting out the basis of assessment of the lands of the South Australian Meat Corporation for local government rates. Under the existing section, the assessment is required to be made according to a percentage of 5 per cent of the capital value of the land disregarding buildings and erections used for or incidental to the performance of the corporation's functions other than

offices or dwelling-houses. This provision was appropriate to local government rates that were charged upon the annual value of land.

However, since amendments made to the Valuation of Land Act and Local Government Act in 1981, local government rates have, in the case of most of the corporation's land, been charged upon the capital value of the land, thereby causing a significant reduction in the rates payable by the corporation to the councils concerned. Accordingly, the Bill proposes a new section that will restore the previous position by providing, in effect, that where rates are charged upon capital value, improvements by way of the buildings or erections used by the corporation other than offices or dwelling-houses are to be disregarded in assessing the value of the land. It is proposed that the new provision will apply for the 1983-84 financial year and succeeding financial years.

The Bill proposes an amendment to section 55, which established the South Australian Meat Corporation Deficit Fund. This amendment is consequential to the arrangement that is proposed to be made with the new South Australian Government Financing Authority under which that authority will take over the liabilities of the Minister in respect of moneys borrowed for the purposes of the South Australian Meat Corporation Act. The Bill also proposes an amendment to the principal Act extending the provision for the corporation to have a lien over stock and meat for unpaid charges for slaughtering and delivery to charges imposed by the corporation for other services rendered under the Act. 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 substitutes for existing section 33 a new section providing that, where improvements to land of the corporation by way of buildings or erections used by the corporation in carrying out its functions would, apart from the section, be taken into account in assessing the value of the land for council rates, then, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, no account is to be taken of those improvements other than the buildings used as offices or dwelling-houses. Existing section 33 provides that the assessment of the corporation's lands for council rates is to be made according to a percentage of 5 per cent of the capital value of the land disregarding improvements by way of buildings or erections used by the corporation in carrying out its functions other than the buildings used as offices or dwelling-houses. The new provision is to apply for the 1983-84 financial year and succeeding financial years.

Clause 3 amends section 55 of the principal Act. This section provides for the establishment of the South Australian Meat Corporation Deficit Fund. Under section 54, the Minister was authorised to assume the liabilities of the corporation in respect of moneys previously borrowed by the corporation. The Minister, in fact, assumed such liabilities, and under section 54 (4) provision is made for payments to be made out of the deficit fund to meet the liabilities so assumed by the Minister. It is now proposed that these liabilities will be met by the new South Australian Government Financing Authority. This will mean that the moneys in the deficit fund will be applied not in payments to the lenders to the corporation but in payments to the new Government Financing Authority. The clause amends section 55 (4) so that it reflects this proposed new arrangement.

Clause 4 provides for the repeal of section 91 (2). Section 91 (2) presently provides that the corporation shall have a lien on all of an owner's meat and stock in the possession of the corporation for charges for slaughtering or delivery owed by that owner. Clause 5 inserts a new section 91a

which provides that the corporation shall have a lien on all of an owner's meat and stock in the possession of the corporation for charges owed by the owner in respect of any services rendered by the corporation, that is, not just slaughtering and delivery services.

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

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE ERADICATION FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Act, 1958. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In 1958 the Foot and Mouth Eradication Fund Act, 1958, was passed to provide compensation to people whose stock or property was destroyed because of, or whose stock died of, foot and mouth disease. Since then the Act has been amended to take into account a Commonwealth/States agreement on cost-sharing in the event of an outbreak of the disease. The definition of 'foot and mouth disease' includes 10 other serious exotic animal diseases all of which have an Australian Agricultural Council approved contingency plan for eradication.

In 1982 Australian Agricultural Council, having noted that provisions for payment of compensation for exotic diseases varied from State to State, approved a set of uniform guidelines. The existing South Australian legislation satisfied most of these guidelines. However, there were three aspects which could not be met without amendment to this Act. The first of these amendments is to increase the time available for lodging a claim for compensation from 60 to 90 days. It has been recognised that, with the stresses and altered circumstances which would prevail in the case of a foot and mouth disease outbreak, 90 days would provide claimants with a far more equitable time limit.

The second amendment concerns the case where animals die from an exotic disease as opposed to animals which are destroyed. The Act as it currently stands only allows compensation to be paid where an animal dies and the property is already under quarantine. When foot and mouth disease was the only proclaimed disease this did not matter as foot and mouth disease rarely kills an animal. However, some of the other 10 proclaimed diseases, such as rinderpest, Newcastle disease and African swine fever, can be 'killer diseases', and the first sign of an outbreak of one of these diseases may be massive mortalities. Under current legislation an owner might find his herd decimated overnight and would not be eligible for compensation. The Bill seeks to remedy the situation by removing the need for the property to be under quarantine at the time of death of the stock.

The third amendment concerns the obligations of an owner to comply with all laws relating to eradicating the outbreak of the disease. The Australian Agricultural Council guidelines included a provision for prompt reporting to be a prerequisite for compensation. When considering current legislation, it was realised that owners can be penalised for convictions for past unrelated offences under State Acts relating to exotic disease control no matter how long ago those offences may have been committed. The Bill seeks to remove this unfair aspect and instead impose a requirement for compliance with all laws relating to exotic disease control relevant to the outbreak in question.

The question of prompt reporting is thus taken into account by a requirement of the Stock Diseases Act, 1934,

for an owner to report the presence or suspected presence of an exotic disease 'forthwith by the quickest practicable means'. Industry views support the amendments contained in the Bill, and its passage will provide for uniform implementation of exotic disease eradication procedures throughout Australia as other States have made or are making comparable amendments to their 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 amends section 7 of the principal Act. The Acts Interpretation Act, 1915, provides that a reference to 'this Act' in an Act includes reference to regulations made under the Act. The words removed from section 7 of the principal Act by this clause are therefore otiose words because of the phrase 'this Act' which precedes them. Clause 3 amends section 9 of the principal Act so that, in future, it will not be necessary for the land on which an animal dies to be under quarantine to give rise to an entitlement to compensation. The words removed by paragraph (a) of this clause no longer serve a useful purpose since the amendment earlier this year of the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915. New section 14b (2) of that Act provides that a reference in an Act to a section of another Act shall be deemed to include a reference to regulations made under that section.

Clause 4 amends section 13 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) extends 60 days to 90 days the period in which an application for compensation may be made. Paragraph (b) replaces paragraph (b) of section 13 with a provision that empowers the Minister to refuse or reduce the amount of compensation where the applicant has caused or contributed to the loss by failing to comply with the Act, the Stock Diseases Act, 1934, or any other law providing for the control or eradication of foot and mouth disease. The existing provision gives the Minister a similar discretion only if the applicant has been convicted of an offence against those Acts. However, after such a conviction, the Minister retains his discretion to refuse compensation in relation to subsequent outbreaks of disease even though those outbreaks may be unconnected with the outbreak in relation to which the offence was committed. This seems unfair and is not repeated in the new provision. Clauses 5 and 6 amend sections 14 and 17 of the principal Act for the same reason as the amendment made by clause 2.

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

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 17 August. Page 285.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: This Bill sees us on the road to yet another broken promise made by the Bannon Labor Government. In the Australian Labor Party policy speech, as has already been mentioned during the course of debate on this Bill, Mr Bannon's Labor Party quite clearly promised:

The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes, nor increase existing levels of taxes during our term of office.

This Bill is the first of four massive increases in State taxes and, in fact, it is a completely new tax. It is a package

which, in a full year, will amount to a rip off of the public to the extent of \$84 000 000.

The credibility of Parliamentarians not only in South Australia but also around Australia has been dealt two body blows, by both the Bannon Government and the Hawke Government. Both Governments engage in massive confidence tricks: both Governments are guilty of breaking significant promises as though that was going out of fashion. They both fooled the electors with blatantly false promises of no new taxes and no increases in taxes. In fact, Mr Hawke promised a reduction in taxes.

I remind the Government that it cannot fool all the people all the time. By introducing this Bill, along with the other Bills that make up the package of new taxes and tax increases, the Bannon Government is signing its own death warrant, slowly but surely, because the public of South Australia will not tolerate the deception of this A.L.P. Government. In this State, the Bannon Government has given the phoney excuse that it was not aware of the financial affairs of this State. The only comment to be made in this regard is that it is rubbish. This Parliament, on the admission of the Bannon Government when in Opposition, has more information about the Budget than has any other Parliament in Australia. It has programme performance budget papers, and Estimates Committees were established by the Tonkin Liberal Government. If the Bannon Government when it was in Opposition could not use the Estimates Committees or read the programme papers, it has only itself to blame for not understanding the financial position of the State. In fact, during the course of the Estimates Committees we saw that on a number of occasions those committees were used not to elicit information about the Budget and the future financial affairs of the State but to attempt to score political points. If you make promises, you have to honour them to retain credibility, and the A.L.P. Government ought to be setting a lead in integrity.

However, that is not to be. Quite diligently, during the three years of the Tonkin Government, we set about honouring our promises. In fact, the Tonkin Government reduced the tax level on South Australians to the point where in 1981-82 the South Australian tax base per person was the lowest of any in Australia. The Tonkin Government pulled in its belt, because there was a need for financial constraint: it reduced the size of the public sector work force by some 4 500 people. We were diligently honouring our commitment to reduce the size of the public sector and the impost on the public of South Australia, and we kept our promises to cut costs below those of other States to encourage industry and development in South Australia.

However, historically, Labor Governments do not pull in their belts. They do not cut staff, reallocate resources according to priorities, or reduce services: but they bleed the taxpayers. If one does not have enough money to do what one is doing, according to the Labor Governments of Australia, one gets the money from the people.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: And they care for the workers!

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Perhaps they should ask the workers about that, in view of the recent announcement of increased State taxes. Labor Governments around Australia appear to believe that there is a bottomless pit of taxpayers' hard-earned money, which they can bleed. It is too bad if each citizen in South Australia is on the dole or on fixed superannuation, a pension, or a wage or a salary that is not keeping pace with inflation or cost of living increases. It is too bad about that. The Bannon Government's clear position is that Governments are in a different position from the citizens of South Australia.

This Government has the philosophy of not setting an example of constraint to the community. It considers that each person has to pull in his or her belt and, in my view,

Governments should do that. Governments should not put themselves above the people. They are elected by the people, to govern for the people. Governments should have no more latitude than has the ordinary citizen in respect of house-keeping, raising money, and expending money. History demonstrates that Governments can easily be seduced by power and tend to put themselves in a position that they believe is different from that of the people who have elected them. This Labor Government has demonstrated quite clearly that that is what it is doing: in effect, it is treating the people of South Australia with contempt, as though the ordinary person does not understand what is happening to the Government that the majority of South Australians elected.

I merely want to say to the Labor Government in South Australia that judgment day is not far around the corner and, when it comes, the people of South Australia will not be fooled by the higher taxation imposts and 'big government' policies of the Bannon Labor Government. It is not the Opposition's job in this Council to save the Government from its own folly and, while I oppose the Bill (and I have no doubt that most, if not all, South Australians would equally oppose this initiative to increase State taxes), the fact is that undoubtedly the people of South Australia will feel the consequences of this Government's policies: they will feel the Government's pincers tightly around their property and their income as the most recently announced increases in taxes, new taxes, and increased charges are brought into effect. That package of increased taxes, new taxes, and increased charges will amount to \$174 000 000 in a full year.

I also want to put on record that the Hon. Lance Milne had a good point when he suggested that the Government should be under some obligation to index the contributions raised by this Bill to ensure that the amount that is credited to the Highways Fund escalates in accordance with cost of living increases over the next three years and, after that time (by which time the Government will have had an opportunity to get its house in order), the total amount of the funds raised by this legislation should be appropriated to the Highways Fund.

However, while I do not support the Bill, as I have indicated, it is for the Government to bear responsibility for its action and it is for the people of South Australia to feel exactly what it is like to live under a high-tax, 'big government' Party such as the A.L.P. I strongly castigate and criticise the Government for introducing this Bill, and I do not support it, but at the next election the people of South Australia will have adequate evidence on which to judge the follies of the Bannon Administration.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): No doubt honourable members will have the opportunity to debate the Budget in this State at great length next month when it is presented. It would seem that the discussion that the honourable member embarked on in this debate revolves around two issues, one of which is the question of broken promises regarding taxation, which has been referred to by all speakers *ad infinitum*. However, despite interjections and some cajoling from me, members have steadfastly refused to discuss the actual state of the finances.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: We will do it when the Budget comes in.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I hope that honourable members do, and I hope that they do it with a little more honesty and frankness than they have in this debate. I would expect honourable members opposite, had they any intellectual integrity on this issue, to have at least conceded the extremely difficult position that the State Government finds itself in

because of the Budget and because of the deficit. I do not mind honourable members making their political point about the statements made by the Premier prior to the last election. That is a legitimate point for honourable members in the political context. They, of course, made the point with some considerable glee and enthusiasm. One would expect them to do just that, but in doing that one would also expect them to have a little bit of objectivity about the state of South Australia's finances.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. G.L. Bruce): Order! We will have fewer interjections.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I ask honourable members to consider the situation. I do not mind having a debate about the position, provided they are prepared to make certain concessions that indicate that they are intellectually honest in their analysis of the situation. The point that I have made in this Council before is that the only member on that side of the House who has been prepared to do that in the past four years is the Hon. Ren DeGaris. That, I am afraid, is true.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Who on your side?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I think that I make a large number of concessions where arguments require concessions, and I attempt to debate the issues on the basis of the facts that are presented. There can be legitimately different interpretations of the facts, but I hope that honourable members opposite, when the Budget comes along, are at least prepared to be somewhat more objective in their analysis of it than they were during this debate. As I said, the debate revolved around the statements made by the Premier prior to the last election. No-one is contesting those statements, but I hope that honourable members opposite will try to analyse in an objective way the fact that we have on recurrent operations at the moment in this State a deficit of \$109 000 000: that is a fact of life, and the Labor Party's contribution to that is minimal.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It is your responsibility. Are you going to detail it for us?

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I told you in May. I analysed the situation for honourable members then and outlined the extent to which that deficit could be sheeted home to the actions of this Government. The fact is that it cannot be. The actions taken by the Government following the election have not added anything like \$109 000 000 to the deficit. It is ludicrous to suggest that.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: When will the answers come?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: They will come in the near future. To suggest that \$109 000 000 of deficit is the responsibility of the Labor Government since November 1978 is absurd in the extreme.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Will you itemise what is your responsibility?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: They were itemised in May and they will no doubt be the subject of further debate when the Budget is presented. My analysis of it in May indicated that it was a very small proportion of the \$109 000 000 which could be attributed to the actions of the Labor Government. In any event, the actions taken on the Electricity Trust, for instance, were also promised by the Liberal Party prior to the last election.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: That is only one. What about the teachers?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The teachers added \$3 000 000—that is \$3 000 000 out of \$109 000 000!

The Hon. L.H. Davis: And health?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member knows that the explanation of the problem in the Health Commis-

sion was not on the expenditure side. Expenditure was held in accordance with the Budget.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Isn't that expenditure?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: You will be able to ask Dr Cornwall during the Estimates debate. The Health Commission situation is not something that would have arisen out of the actions of the Labor Government, but would have been the result of the budgetary projections of the previous Government in its Budget. After all, it is the previous Government's Budget that we are currently considering, with some minor additions from the Labor Party following the election in November 1982. So, all I can say to the Council is that I expect in September, when we are debating the Budget, some objectives analysis from honourable members opposite of how they would intend the recurrent deficit of \$109 000 000 to be brought under control in the ensuing years. We have the situation at the moment where substantial amounts of capital works money have been used on the recurrent side.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: You have not answered the questions.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The questions cannot be answered at this stage because figures fluctuate from day to day and it is totally pointless to compare one month in one year with another month in the other year.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Honourable members can consider the Public Service employment levels when the Budget papers are brought down and they can then compare like with like.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: What do they say?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: We do not know, do we? The Budget has not yet been brought down. When the Budget papers are before honourable members they can consider them. I am happy for them to analyse them and make any criticisms on the basis of their analysis, provided that it is fair analysis, but let us compare (in the area of public sector employment levels) like with like, so that we are not comparing one month in one year, with seasonal and other factors that come into it, with another month in another year. Honourable members will get the full year in the Budget papers. As I said, I would also like some analysis on how the Opposition, if it was in Government, would cope with \$109 000 000 recurrent deficit in one particular financial year and how it would cope with a continuation of that deficit if it were to proceed in ensuing financial years. The State's cash reserves would be run down to a dangerously low level if that were allowed to occur.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Up to the present time we can analyse those commitments, but the additional commitments were provided as a result of the initiatives of the Labor Government which do not in any way measure up to the \$109 000 000 deficit. Anyone who looked at the figures in a sensible and objective way would see that. Treasury's advice is that, if this deficit were left unchecked, it could result in an accumulated deficit approaching \$400 000 000 by 30 June 1986. To allow that to happen would be irresponsible on the part of any Government.

The alternatives are to continue to set aside capital funds in increasing proportions to finance the recurrent deficit with the consequent adverse effect on urgent capital works and employment opportunities, particularly in the private sector. The other alternative is to take the difficult and unpalatable decision now and increase recurrent revenue so that the recurrent deficit is eventually eliminated. I make it clear that no-one is suggesting that that transfer of capital funds can be eliminated overnight. The end result this financial year was that \$51 900 000 was transferred from capital works to recurrent expenditure in order to prop up

the situation. That is a totally undesirable situation. An amount of \$42 000 000 was budgeted for. The fact that we had a \$57 100 000 deficit after the transfer of \$51 900 000 from the capital—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: In May you said there would be a \$42 000 000 surplus on the capital account.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In May, the figure was based on Budget projections.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not mind honourable members carrying on like this but it does them no credit. I wish they would provide us with some facts and figures.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You answer the questions—they were only asked in May.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will answer the questions. The honourable member will have the Budget to consider and he can consider the issues when they come—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Do you get a briefing from Treasury?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes. The figure is \$109 000 000.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is nonsensical to say that that was known before the election. All that was known was that a \$42 000 000 deficit had been covered by a capital works transfer. That recurrent deficit of \$42 000 000 has now expanded to \$109 000 000.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There is little point in my continuing to debate with people like the Hon. Mr Burdett, who refuses to recognise the facts. He was a member of the Cabinet that allowed the situation to deteriorate over a period of three years. He knew that that happened. He agreed to the transfer of over \$140 000 000 in three years from capital to recurrent activities—the first time in the history of this State on a continuing basis. He knows it, the Hon. Mr Griffin knows it and, I would hope, the Hon. Mr Lucas knows it. If he has any intellectual integrity, he will analyse what happened in those Budgets and what happened before 1979. He will find out whether that has ever happened before in the history of this State and he will find that it happened on very limited occasions. He will find that, when it did happen, it was corrected the following year. He will find that in the Budget for 1979-80 (the Labor Budget) there was able to be a transfer from recurrent activity into the capital account. He will find in the first Liberal Budget that that situation had been turned around to the extent of \$50 000 000. That is what he will find. If he is prepared to come into this Chamber after analysing those facts and make those concessions, I am prepared to have a reasonable debate with him.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Will you answer the questions? They were asked in May.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member has asked that question 10 times during this debate.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have said that the questions will be answered.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: When?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In the near future. That is all that the honourable member can parrot.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: How can I debate if you will not answer the questions?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member does not need those answers to see what happened to the deficit over the past three years.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You have no economic knowledge at all.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I have more economic knowledge than the honourable member is displaying. I invite him to go back and study those Budgets.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Answer the questions!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: When?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: What is the point of trying to debate with someone who has come into the Parliament as the whiz-kid on the backbench and who tells us about his economic expertise, when all he can do is parrot, 'Answer the questions.' I have invited the honourable member, in addition to studying the answers which he will get (if he wants to become economically literate on the finances of this State), to study what, in fact, happened. If he studies some of the contributions I made in this place over the past three years and also the contributions made by the Hon. Mr DeGaris, he may be able to make certain concessions. If he is prepared to make those concessions, I am prepared to have a sensible debate with him.

Opposition members on the front bench—except for the Hon. Mr Cameron, who cannot take any responsibility in a direct sense—may also like to explain their role in approving the \$140 000 000 deficit in the transfer of capital funds to recurrent activities over the three years. If so, I will be prepared to debate the matter with them in future. However, they have not been prepared to make the concessions or to admit that it even happened. However, it did happen. The \$42 000 000 projected for this financial year blew out to \$109 000 000.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Burdett says that that is nonsense. He will be able to see it in the Budget. To say that we are responsible for a \$109 000 000 deficit through our errors is nonsense. I am happy for anyone to analyse that statement. It seems a pity that honourable members are not prepared to enter into a sensible debate on the budgetary position of the State.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: How can we when we have not got the ruddy Budget?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Members opposite have enough information to consider certain aspects of it.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: The second reading explanation of this Bill was about three paragraphs—what sort of information was that? It is disgraceful!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Members opposite were provided with information in December and May.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Your statement on 4 August was one column in *Hansard*.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Members opposite were provided with a paper from the Under Treasurer, tabled in this Council in December. I look forward to the debate in September. I ask honourable members to use a degree of intellectual integrity in analysing the actions of the Government.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Manner in which moneys collected under this Act are to be dealt with.'

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: In the second reading debate I raised a point about new subsection (4) and the proposal to ensure that no less than the amount paid to the Highways Fund in 1982-83 will be paid to the fund in future years. The amount was estimated at \$26 300 000 in 1982-83. New subsection (4) could mean that the Government could provide only \$26 300 000 in 1983-84 and the same sum in 1984-85. In real terms, the fund would receive less from the fuel franchise. Will the Attorney assure the Committee that the Government will consider maintaining the real level of funds allocated to the Highways Fund from the funds raised by way of the fuel franchise?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In response, on behalf of the Treasurer in another place, I reiterate that the fund will receive not less than the 1982 allocation. The Federal programme, which is substantial, will require a considerable effort to find matching grants. In view of the Government's other commitments, many affecting country districts, it is difficult to find such grants. The Government will try to provide as much finance as possible for construction of roads consistent with the demand for other State services. Additional funds beyond the 1982-83 level can be made available to the Highways Fund, and the Government will do that to the extent that it considers necessary to meet essential road programmes in the light of the matters that I have just mentioned, and other commitments which exist. The Government will take a responsible approach in this matter having regard to the importance of the road network to industry, commerce, tourism, and the community generally, but it will also have regard to priorities in all areas, including roads.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: I take it that the Government will not be guaranteeing that the real value of funds raised by way of the fuel franchise and paid into the Highways Fund will be maintained in future years.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member can read the provision. My understanding is that the Highways Fund is guaranteed no less than the sum received in 1982-83.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: I just wanted to get that on the record.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Additional grants will be made in the context of the remarks that I have already made.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 17 August. Page 286.)

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I oppose this Bill for the same reasons that I expressed in respect of the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act Amendment Bill. I do not intend to repeat the criticism that I made on that Bill, but there are several points that ought to be made. This Bill, when announced, created much confusion, particularly in the business community. We saw the tobacco companies, for whom I do not have any great sympathy, seeking to increase prices in August to accommodate the payments that would be due in October. There was a suggestion by the Premier, reported in the media, that the companies were wrong in presuming that, if the Bill was to come into force on 1 October, they would be paying the increased franchise fee or tax for sales in September. From my perusal of the Act, I confirmed that the Premier's statement was wrong and that, if the Act was to come into force on 1 October this year, it would be presumed that payments would be due on 1 October. It is clear from the Act that the amount payable in October is calculated on the value of August sales so that, in effect, what is happening is that the tobacco companies are subsidising the Government and the public to the extent of the increased duty as it applies to the August sales.

The other interesting aspect of this Bill is the fact that there does not appear to have been any consultation with any of the major tobacco companies. One would expect that, with such a major issue as a doubling of the franchise fee or tax, there would have been at least some consultation

with the major companies as to the appropriate date upon which the increases would come into effect. I suspect that because there was no consultation we had this confusion rife as to when the prices should increase.

I suspect, also, that the Government strongly threatened the companies that, if they did not reduce their prices to the then existing price in August and increased their prices only from 1 September, they would be put under price control. That is very much a major weapon when it comes to dealing with any kind of produce for which prices are increased. One cannot blame businesses for raising prices when, in fact, what they are doing is merely collecting revenue for the Government from the people—it is the citizens who ultimately pay.

The only point I want to reflect upon is the Hon. Mr Bruce's suggestion that the Government acted on Treasury advice in respect to this piece of legislation, other increased taxes, and the new taxes announced a week or two ago. I find his justification for the Government's adopting Treasury advice (if, in fact, it was Treasury advice) quite incredible. Public servants should not get the blame for increases in State taxes. It is Governments who carry that responsibility, because Governments make decisions and have to be responsible for those decisions. Public servants are there to give advice and implement decisions on an apolitical basis, not to take sides. I think that it is quite shameful for a public servant to, in effect, be blamed for decisions that the Government has taken to increase this and other taxes.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: What about Mr Becker, from the other House, attacking the Treasurer?

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I do not know about Mr Becker. I am responding to the honourable member's justification for the increases in taxes and his saying yesterday that one cannot blame the Government because it accepted advice given to it by Treasury officers. All I am saying to the honourable member is that Governments make decisions and are free to accept, reject or modify advice given to them, so do not blame public servants for an initiative like this.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: One of your members has.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I do not know what any of our members have said, but in Government I always accepted responsibility for decisions that I and my Government made. We would frequently not accept advice given because there were other implications not taken into consideration by the advisers. Governments are free to do that, if they so wish, but whatever decisions they take they have to be accountable for. The Labour Government, in respect of these tax increases, has got to accept full responsibility for the decision it has taken. It should not be passed off as having been taken on and relying on Treasury advice. It may be that in the Treasury advice that was given there were a number of options. I do not know, because the Treasury advice has not been tabled, and I am not asking for it to be tabled because that is a matter for the Government. However, it could well be that an alternative option recommended by the Public Service was to cut public expenditure and keep a tight rein on departmental expenditure, not to put extra staff on, or not to reinstate staff.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: All of those options were in the Under Treasurer's document tabled in this House in May.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: That was not stated as being the justification for this decision. I am responding to the Hon. Mr Bruce's suggestion of yesterday that the Government has accepted the advice of its officers to increase certain taxes and impose a new tax. I am just saying that I do not believe that it is proper to blame public servants for having to take these decisions.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: I hope that you will tell your own members that.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am not accepting responsibility for other members of Parliament. I am saying what my view is and what the view of my Government was when we were in office. What I am also saying is that Treasury advice may well have presented other options which may have, in fact, been harder options but nevertheless more appropriate ones in respect of the financial situation of the State Government. As I have already indicated, I have explored a number of other issues and principles in my comments on the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act Amendment Bill. I do not intend to repeat them here. However, they apply equally to this piece of legislation and to the other taxing measures which will come before us during the session. I do not accept the basis upon which this Bill is brought before the Parliament. I do not support the Bill. Nevertheless, the Government must not be protected from its own decisions, and the consequences of those decisions must be allowed to flow on to the community at large so that they appreciate that it is this Government which has made these decisions and no-one else.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): It is quite clear that it is this Government that has made these decisions. I thought that that was obvious, even to the honourable member. The question of why these decisions had to be made was canvassed during the debate on the previous Bill. I do not intend to rehash those comments but only to reply to comments from honourable members opposite, particularly those of the Hon. Mr Lucas. The question of what needs to be responded to in this debate revolves around Mr Griffin's criticism of the Governments' apparent non-consultation with tobacco wholesalers about increases in licence fees. I am advised by the Commissioner of Stamps that there was consultation with tobacco wholesalers. However, in any event, the Hon. Mr Griffin seems to have forgotten what happened and what actions Mr Tonkin took in May 1981, when the former Government announced that tobacco licence fees were to be increased from 10 per cent to 12½ per cent.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Yes, but you have doubled the tax.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not arguing about whether or not the tax has been doubled. I am talking about how the question was handled in 1981. The then Premier announced that the increased fees would take effect from 1 July 1981. However, at that time one company attempted to increase the fee prior to 1 July 1981. That caused ructions in the Government and, as a result, I understand that the Premier, Mr Tonkin, had discussions with the South Australian Manager of Statewide Tobacco Services, who apparently had indicated that his company would increase the price prior to 1 July 1981.

I do not know what Mr Tonkin said to him, but it would not surprise me if he mentioned the Government's price control powers because, as a result of those discussions, the Premier blithely announced on 18 June 1981 that he welcomed the announcement that the company would not commence collecting the new 12½ per cent tax before 1 July. He said that the company had agreed, following the Premier's suggestion on the previous day, that it would commence collecting the new tax on 1 July, so it appears that the previous Government had exactly the same problems with tobacco wholesalers in 1981 as the Government has had on this occasion. The result in 1981 was exactly the same as the result on this occasion, so it really does not give the Hon. Mr Griffin many grounds for criticism of the Government in relation to this matter.

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

SENIOR SECONDARY ASSESSMENT BOARD OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 16 August. Page 201.)

The Hon. K.L. MILNE: I will not delay the Council, but I rise to briefly express my feelings about the manner in which the Minister has handled this matter. The Minister consulted those bodies and individuals affected by this legislation, providing explanations where necessary and offering information to both my Party and the Opposition. I have read the Hon. Mr Lucas's contribution to this debate, and my Party agrees with his sentiments. The Australian Democrats share the Hon. Mr Lucas's concern that this amending Bill has been introduced before the parent legislation has been proclaimed.

I have received a copy of the Minister's replies to the questions asked by the Hon. Mr Lucas. I understand that the Hon. Mr Lucas is satisfied with the replies, as is my Party. The main object of this exercise is to obtain Parliament's approval to get on with the job, and we certainly want to be a part of that. The Australian Democrats support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—'Short titles.'

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: During the second reading debate the Hon. Mr Lucas asked several questions. I believe that this is an appropriate time to respond to those questions, for the Hon. Mr Lucas's benefit and also for the Hon. Mr Milne's benefit. I thank all honourable members for their contributions. The Hon. Mr Lucas's first question was:

Will the Ministerial committee mirror in every way the exact composition of the SSABSA Board?

The answer is, 'Yes.' All nominations to the board have been received and are currently under Cabinet's consideration. The Minister will invite the Governor appointed board members to form the interim SSABSA Board as a Ministerial advisory committee. The interim board will act as a *de facto* SSABSA Board. The Hon. Mr Lucas's second question was:

Will the Ministerial committee be the syllabus committee for the 1986 calendar year, and will it be operational prior to the proclamation of the new board possibly in February next year? Will the syllabus committees be making any final decision in relation to the 1986 calendar year?

Yes, to the three parts of the question. The Minister is making every effort to proclaim the Act(s) at the earliest possible date consistent with the best interests of students (and their parents) and the smooth operation of the P.E.B. As the honourable member would appreciate, the lead-in time for the 1986 calendar year will require the authority to take certain actions in 1983 and early 1984. The Minister of Education, on behalf of the new authority, is prepared to take those actions only on the recommendations of the interim SSABSA Board. Some final decisions may be necessary, such as the decision about how many and which subjects would be offered in 1986, but this is hypothetical at this stage. The Hon. Mr Lucas's third question was:

If the present legislation is not proclaimed until February next year, how can an amending Bill be proclaimed before then?

When the Hon. Mr Lucas asked that question I am sure he was aware that that could not occur. However, by assenting to the Bill, the Minister is given Parliamentary guidance in regard to the interim actions to be taken. It is possible for most of SSABSA's early work to be done through the interim SSABSA, provided that the governing legislation is ready for proclamation. The Hon. Mr Lucas's fourth question was:

What is the justification for the Minister's statements in relation to the urgency of this provision? If this Bill and the parent legislation cannot be proclaimed, does this mean that the Chief Executive Officer cannot be appointed? If the amending Bill is not proclaimed, can the Minister go ahead and appoint the Chief Executive Officer, irrespective of what has happened? If so, what is the urgency of the situation?

The Minister has no wish to act 'irrespective' of the wishes of Parliament on this matter. Given Parliament's support for the legislation, the Minister is prepared to take responsible administrative action to ensure that the spirit and intent of the legislation is properly administered. This may require, for example, the signing of a contract with the chief executive officer elect so that SSABSA's work may proceed under the guidance of its first chief officer.

Under these circumstances the Minister is in a position to consult with the interim board regarding the contractual arrangements and the selection of a person to fill the position. Whether the appointee could take up the position immediately is uncertain. However, what is certain is that the appointee would be available for consultation. In this way, the urgent work of SSABSA can be responsibly attended to. There would be greater authority and continuity under these circumstances.

If the amending Bill is passed but not proclaimed, the Minister may proceed with confidence. If the Bill is not passed, then the Minister could not have the benefit of its guidance. The matter is, therefore, urgent, if SSABSA's work is to proceed with due authority and expertise. On behalf of the Minister of Education, I express appreciation for the support given to this legislation. The Minister assures me that he will be pleased to keep honourable members as informed as they desire regarding this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that most of the Minister's summing up did not refer to clause 1, nor was it appropriate for the Minister to refer to clause 4. As there is no opposition to the Bill and because members will have an opportunity to ask questions on further clauses, I accept this summing up speech under clause 1, but it is a most irregular practice.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Thank you for your co-operation, Sir.

Clause passed.

Clause 2—'Commencement'.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I have some concern in regard to the Minister's answers. I accept the general format of the principal Act and of this clause, but I believe that it is very sloppy to regard the Bill, if passed, in conjunction with the principal Act as a Parliamentary guide for a Minister and his officers to do certain things before the Act has been proclaimed to come into effect. I recognise the technical problems in proclaiming all the Act to come into operation before the present public examinations have been disposed of, but I would have thought that there were a number of alternative ways of dealing with this matter that do not involve such a sloppy practice as the answers suggest.

I do not criticise the Minister in this Council, because he was giving responses that were provided to him, but I believe that this can be done in a couple of different ways. First, in this Bill it could be provided that the Act will be proclaimed on a fixed day in February next year, or transitional provisions could be provided in the Act by virtue of amending it in this Bill so that it becomes one Act, and those transitional provisions would preserve the present Public Examinations Board structure until the examinations and any supplementary examinations for 1983 were disposed of.

On the other hand, a new section could be included in this Bill that will have the effect of providing in the principal Act as amended by this Bill that the Act as amended shall come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation, with power to suspend by proclamation the operation of

any provision of the Act as amended. That would allow, at least, the proposed Chief Executive Officer to be appointed, because then the proposed new section 9a could be proclaimed to come into effect immediately, which would enable an appointment of Chief Executive Officer to be made now. Thus, there would not be what I regard as something of an unsatisfactory position whereby a member of the Public Service or a Ministerial officer who is perhaps appointed for a period of months as Chief Executive Officer-elect would have his position confirmed when the Act came into operation, by virtue of a fresh appointment.

From the point of view of that officer, I believe it would be desirable that the Chief Executive Officer be appointed from day one without this dual system operating whereby he is Chief Executive Officer-elect for some months and then he becomes Chief Executive Officer when the Act as amended is proclaimed. I am suggesting that it would be appropriate for the Minister to arrange for his colleague in another place to have discussions with Parliamentary Counsel about a more appropriate way of dealing with the difficulty in which the Government finds itself (and that is not a criticism—it is a recognition of a difficulty only). The Minister could provide the Council next week with some alternative proposal, which I believe would be more appropriate to allow the implementation of the programme with a greater degree of certainty than the present proposition indicates.

Further advice on the drafting aspect is required, and I suggest that it would be appropriate to defer consideration until next week. I certainly have no reason to oppose the Bill, nor the concept envisaged by the amendments, but I believe that, from a drafting point of view, and from the point of view of proper legislation, there is a need to review the mechanisms that have been adopted in the light of the answers that the Minister has presented with a view to trying to tidy it up now rather than to leave it to *ad hoc* and what I regard as unsatisfactory arrangements.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I appreciate the points raised by the Hon. Mr Griffin. I am assuming that the various options for solving this problem have been canvassed and that the Minister has decided that this is the best way, as far as he is concerned, to deal with the problem. However, the urgency of this Bill is not such that it must be passed today. Therefore, I would be happy to report progress at this stage and draw the contribution of the Hon. Mr Griffin to the attention of the Minister of Education and on Tuesday next supply the Council with the Minister's response. I see nothing wrong with that at all. I thank honourable members for their co-operation to date.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 16 August. Page 199.)

The Hon. C.W. CREEDON: In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I join with others in extending sympathy to the family of the late John Coumbe. I got to know him when he joined the Public Works Committee; he was a sincere and understanding person who served South Australia very well.

South Australia has certainly suffered from natural disasters in recent times, and I appreciate the Governor's reference and feelings on these matters. Those horrific fires, which caused so much loss of life and destruction to the life work of some people, were an immense shock to the State. Those people who were able to afford it and had sensibly insured were somewhat compensated for the terrible disaster that befell them. Added to that, of course, was the

generosity of all Australians to the appeals that were organised to raise money for the relief of those so penalised, and the Government departments were sympathetic and understanding. Even so, that disaster will have long effects and probably life-time effects on many of those who suffered. They have my greatest sympathy.

The flood disaster in the mid-northern part of the State, although on a smaller scale than the destruction caused by the fire (and we can all be very grateful that there was no loss of life), had a devastating effect on those, particularly in the Barossa Valley, who had severe damage and loss of personal property. It was extremely unfortunate for these people that it came so soon after the fires and that the amount of public money from the appeal was very small in comparison to the bushfire appeal. From that point of view these people were not assisted nearly as much financially as those who had suffered from the fire devastation. Nonetheless, the Government departments and agencies and the councils were promptly on the job.

I believe that the Governor visited the area twice, and the councils and the people greatly appreciated his expression of concern at their misfortune. A lot of the work of restoration of public property has been done with financial assistance from the Department of Local Government and the Highways Department. The Department for Community Welfare is the recipient of great praise from those to whom I have talked for its hard work and generous assistance, as is the Department of Social Security for its willingness to work with the State Government in order to alleviate as much hardship as possible.

To date, approximately \$212 000 has been contributed through the appeal launched by the Angaston District Council: \$20 000 of this was contributed by the Government. The Government has since contributed another \$100 000, and the Barossa Winemakers Association has donated a large quantity of first-grade wines from which it is expected to raise \$250 000 as the wineries contribution to the appeal. The efforts of the community and those services within the community are highly commendable and certainly restore one's faith in human nature.

Last Friday I attended the half-yearly meeting of the Mid North Local Government Association, and I think that this motion, which I will read, best expresses the view and thankfulness of the people in the areas affected. The preamble to it is this:

Executive—Mid North Disaster Relief: The executive feels that the members of the region should pass a formal vote of thanks to the Premier, his Ministers and public servants for their expeditious and sympathetic handling of the disaster relief. Councils affected by the fire and floods received prompt cash reimbursement to repair their public assets, which was much appreciated. The Government's positive reaction to the disasters should be publicly acknowledged.

The motion, which was carried unanimously, reads:

That the region convey on behalf of its members its appreciation for the genuine concern expressed by and the response of the State Government and its officers to the disasters which hit the region.

A very important and very sad matter arising from these disasters is the view of some insurance companies. It seems that fire is usually an acceptable risk to most insurance companies, whilst flooding is not, and, if my information is correct, it seems that insured people in the flooded areas were not in all cases aware that their policies did not cover the possibilities. Perhaps the need exists for all insurers to be very explicit about coverage in large red letters, if necessary, to all those seeking their services.

Another question that arises, especially when one considers life and personal possessions, is how people build and where they build. I know how objectionable it is to be directed in matters that pertain to our private lives, but as people we

do some awfully silly things. We build homes in the bushland, or we build homes and plant highly flammable trees close in all around the house with scant thought for even the most fundamental of fire protection. We build houses on low-lying land; we build houses on and over river banks and we fill in what, in the past, were natural water courses. We really must expect trouble if we continue to act in an irresponsible way. Every now and again the elements have a way of asserting themselves, and woe betide anything or anyone that stands in their way.

I do not know on whose shoulder one could place the blame, what action the authorities could take to minimise such destruction, or even whether there is a way of controlling it. I do know that we must make a great attempt to see that people are protected in every way possible, even from themselves. As a former local councillor, I am aware of how difficult people can be when they want to buy or build in such locations. Often, because of preconceived ideas, there is no way they can be dissuaded from taking the action their minds are set on. Perhaps the responsibility belongs to local government, or do they have it without using it effectively? Perhaps I could ask: what about the planning authority? Has it not got any control over how and where houses will be built, or does it need more power to enforce its will?

Does the Housing Trust have some responsibility in this matter, for, certainly, in the past at least, it constructed houses on land that in the future could prove to be very unsuitable? I could even ask developers and Governments how much responsibility they should bear in the matter. Whoever is responsible, I hope that action will be taken so that we will see a lessening of death and damage caused by heavy flooding and severe fires: fire, flooding and earthquakes will always be with us.

The Government's intended activity on small business is very welcome. Small business concerns suffer because Governments have shown little interest in its survival. The numbers employed might be anywhere from one to several hundred, and their passing into the ranks of the unemployed goes unnoticed. And, although large numbers of small employers go through bankruptcy proceedings, it is just another statistic. If by a mischance some misfortune develops around a big employer of labour, the matter is bewailed for weeks.

We are made well aware that there are many thousands of employees jobs at risk—as is the case with B.H.P. And, as we all know, the Government has come to the rescue and we are hoping that those jobs will be saved. In this State there have been other instances where the Labor Government has come to the aid of industry in order for them to continue being successful traders and employers.

Small business collectively is a very big employer, but both the employer and the employee are often individualistic and will not join their appropriate union or association. Consequently, they have no unified voice. So, to a degree, their plight is self-inflicted; they should take note that the most influential people in the community around them are those who are represented by strong organisations able to plead their case in the places where they will get the best deal. I firmly believe that any effort that improves the lot of the small business community is a worthwhile investment.

Another matter raised in the Governor's Speech relates to the Government's intention to engage in an extensive promotional scheme, aimed at our most populous States, in New Zealand and Japan to attract more tourists. I know that Mr Olsen and Mrs Adamson have published statements that the new taxes applied by the Government will tend to keep tourists away, but I do not believe this to be so.

In package deals, the tourist will have a few extra dollars added to the overall cost which, in any case, was paid before

the tour commenced. People who have made up their minds to tour select the place within their budget and proceed to make arrangements. The fact that it costs \$500 or \$520 will have no effect. The individual tourist, on the other hand, usually has a car for transport (whether owned or hired) and he or she will have to pay 1c or so a litre extra on petrol. However, there is not a great deal of difference in the price of petrol between the major cities of each State. I know there are some minor price cuts in most States. The outback is different and petrol is certainly more expensive than in the cities, but their petrol outlets are a long way from the source of supply. Tasmania, of course, has a very expensive petrol supply in certain parts.

Would Mr Olsen and Mrs Adamson suggest that the price of petrol in these places keeps the tourist away? If they do, perhaps they could explain why Tasmania and the outback are the better known and most popular tourist attractions within Australia?

It is hardly fair to compare the tourist industry in Australia with that of Europe, but I intend to outline briefly some matters as I found them. The European economic country land area may be close in size to that of Australia, but its population is about 15 times greater and there are about 15 or more national borders to cross in order to get from one country to the other. They have the extremes of cold for prolonged periods of time which we never experience, and the heat at the Mediterranean end can be as trying as Australia's more northerly climates. There are certain times of the year when the inhabitants of the colder climates migrate in droves to the warmer coasts of Spain, France, Italy, Greece and the Mediterranean islands—even the North African coasts.

These tourists can get cheap air fares, cheap tours, cheap car hire and tourist train travel. They can purchase cheap excursion tickets for city and suburban buses and trains which permit travellers to get on and off all day, or even for a number of days. Petrol is approximately twice the price we pay for it but, on the other hand, the smaller cars will do extraordinary mileages to the gallon. In England I used a mini for a fortnight and averaged 56 miles to the gallon. Small Fords were advertised in many places guaranteeing 55 m.p.g. The General Motors Cavalier gave 50 m.p.g., as did a Datsun that was readily available. There were probably as many amongst those manufactured in Germany, Italy, France that gave big mileage per gallon. It does reduce the cost of a car holiday in that part of the world but it also raises the question of why those very same manufacturers who manufacture these economical cars in Europe have not made more progress with similar economies here.

In England and Europe costs are very high for the tourist arriving from outside Europe with little or no knowledge of the European eating habits or how to find the less expensive accommodation and restaurants. High v.a.t. and services charges in many countries of Europe readily acceptable to Europeans are certainly a shock to Australians. I found that, by pre-booking and pre-paying for a car or hotel in London before leaving Australia, I received a much better deal than I would have received had I waited until I got to London. Parts of Europe, England and Ireland did attempt to cater for the tourist in one way in particular—a system of b & b's, as they are known—through private homes with a spare room or two to let. They were usually cheaper than hotels and certainly good breakfasts were supplied, although one should always remember that the odd below-average place will be found. As far as I am aware, very little such accommodation exists in Australia. Perhaps this angle is worth pursuing. It would certainly cut the cost of overnight stops. I found this kind of accommodation in England to be a minimum of \$10 per night cheaper.

I know that Mrs Adamson is worried that a tax on wine might increase the cost to the tourist and to many Australians. The present Government is worried about such rumours for far more serious reasons than the possible slight effects it may have on tourism. Our wine is fairly cheap and is of reasonable quality.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Excellent quality.

The Hon. C.W. CREEDON: Yes, but I am trying to make a comparison between the quality here and that overseas. The honourable member will realise in a moment why I made that remark.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: The price difference is because of a lack of wine tax.

The Hon. C.W. CREEDON: Yes. I am sure that the shadow Minister for Tourism would be interested in the price of even a mediocre wine in places outside Australia. In England, medium quality wine costs \$16 or more a bottle, and often the white wine was not chilled, nor was any attempt made to cool it in an ice bucket. In Europe and Scandinavia, in particular, the cheapest price I could find was \$14, and even with more expensive wines they were not overly particular about cooling it.

As my last anecdote on costs to tourists, perhaps I should mention the price of wine in Bombay. In South Australia, a bottle of Italian Chianti costs about \$7 or \$8 a bottle and in Bombay, it is priced on the menu at 230 rp (or about \$28 per bottle). When the bill was handed to the customer another 50 per cent tax had been added. The reason for the high price was the tax applied by the country where the wine was purchased.

In talking to other outsiders whilst touring, we came across Americans who had paid \$250 for a return trip to Europe and a number to whom we spoke were only in Europe for 14 days—cheap fares were its main encouragement. Americans treat Europe like we treat Queensland's Gold Coast. Israelis can travel to England and Europe for \$300 return, yet it costs us \$A2 000 to go to Europe. So, obviously, the tourists from Europe or America would find travel costs very expensive to Australia, but all other costs in Australia would be far less expensive than any Australian tourist would find in Europe.

Having said all that, I find that I have to agree with Mrs Adamson on the lack of sign-posting. I will have to take her word about the Hills area—although I have never had any trouble in the Hills—but then, I do not travel there extensively and, rather than sightseeing, I am usually seeking a positive destination. On the other hand, it is less than nine months ago that I was a tourist in southern Yorke Peninsula and found a great deal of improvement was needed in the sign-posting. I do not know whose responsibility it is, but hopefully a great improvement will be seen before the coming summer.

There is one other matter on which I would like to spend a few moments: the Finger Point sewerage has had a fair run from members opposite—completely political and without any regard for the truth. Mount Gambier at the moment is served by a perfectly satisfactory sewerage system (initiated by the Labor Government, I must add) and drains about 25 kilometres out to sea, quite near Port MacDonnell. The Public Works Committee had occasion to examine this site nearly 12 months ago. The pollution in the way of any waste is nil, but there is some pollution of the water, although not more than a kilometre in any direction of that outlet. It could be claimed that the fish caught in that area, or those that migrate in and out of that area, could be affected in some way.

This area, of course, is a forbidden fishing zone but there may be unscrupulous fishermen who fish the area and it could be argued that their customers would be at risk—migrating fish passing through the area would shed the

pollution after a few hours spent in clean water. A great smokescreen has been raised around this particular area for it is not the coastal migratory fish we are talking about: it is well known that our southern waters and reefs are famous for crayfish and some abalone and we have export markets for these products to America and Japan. What the Opposition does not tell us is that for the purpose of sale the crayfish and abalone caught off our coastline in pooled. Now, when I talk about pooled, I do not mean that all these particular species of fish caught in water adjacent to South Australia, are pooled—I am saying that the crayfish and abalone caught in those southern waters are pooled with the same species caught around the Victorian coast and the lower eastern coast of New South Wales and the coast of Tasmania. And I am completely baffled by the Opposition's argument that contamination will affect our export trade. In regard to contamination, this is a point about which I have no doubt but that of course is not the truth of the matter.

The Opposition and the fishermen know, as well as I do, that those States owning those coastlines which I have previously mentioned, dump not treated sewage as we do, but raw sewage into the sea at every outlet. And, if there is any contamination of our export fish, it will be from other States' waters and not ours. The only reason for the clamour from the Opposition is to gain political advantage in the Mount Gambier area and not for the published reasons it so carefully and untruthfully espouses.

The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN: I thank the Governor for his Speech and the manner in which he opened the Parliament. I wish to place on record my sympathy to the family of the late John Coumbe who died on 9 February this year. I did not know the man but his record speaks volumes. To have served his electorate of Torrens for 21 years is an indication that the people he worked for certainly approved of his performance. The Governor in his Speech touched on a number of issues to which the Government is addressing itself, and on a couple of these I wish to comment.

South Australia is a large and very dry State with less than 10 per cent of Australia's total population. This small population is distributed mostly along the coast and in the high rainfall regions to the south. The north, or hinterlands, are very sparsely populated purely because of the climate and extremely low rainfall. Metropolitan Adelaide and its outer suburbs contain more than two-thirds of the State's population and this very fact has a considerable bearing on how the State perceives conditions which are less than favourable for those people living outside Adelaide and its environs.

The season spanning the past 12 months has been one of great variation for producers of primary products in this State. It is generally agreed, and by the Government as well, that the year past was one of severe drought. Both you and I, Mr President, would concur with that. However, the Government has placed great emphasis in this fact and has in its own style told the majority of the people, those living in the city, that much of their economic malaise is due to the low income of the rural community and the subsequent propping up of farmers with drought assistance funds. This excuse by the Government for its poor economic performance is quite wrong. The drought did have a considerable effect on the farming community and its allied industries and to get them into perspective we should have a look at the actual figures as produced by the Department of Agriculture.

The industry affected most was the cropping industry and the total income was 27 per cent down on the average income. Wheat was the most severely hit, with a fall of more than 54 per cent, barley had a fall of 45 per cent, oats

were unique in that their yields were down but the price doubled. A feature of oat production is that, because it is mostly consumed on the local market, it is open to high price fluctuations when low yields are evident. The growth of the equine industry has caused an upward rise in consumption and price of oats.

Livestock were not so affected and incomes remained roughly equivalent to previous years due to selling of more stock than would normally be seen in years of average rainfall. As well, there were increases in the returns for pigs and poultry.

Wool returns were still average but there is always a delayed action in this income, because stock are sold in the year of drought with the following couple of years required to build up flocks. I might add that the pastoral areas have as yet not received beneficial drought-breaking rains and it is not to be expected that their recovery will be very rapid, given drought-breaking rains at this moment. With this in mind, let me quote from the Department of Agriculture publication *State of Agriculture*, as follows:

From the preliminary figures it appears South Australia fared better during the drought than had been expected. In October 1982 the drought loss of farm income had been estimated at \$377 000 000 which would have made the multiplied effect \$940 000 000. Fortunately, the cereal harvest exceeded the October expectations and other agricultural industries have suffered less than was then feared.

This is a clear statement indicating that the Government is receiving from the rural community its fair share of income. There has been a 13 per cent or \$187 000 000 fall in revenue realised by the rural industry compared to the previous year. However, I point out that it is a fall in disposable income to the primary producer which, when added to inflation of better than 10 per cent for the past 12 months, means that the number of farmers becoming less viable is increasing, particularly in these years of drought.

The Minister of Agriculture in his opening of the U.F. & S. conference a couple of weeks ago said the average producer was now profiting by only \$2 000 per year, that is by \$40 a week, which is hardly acceptable when the average wage is more than \$300 a week. The tale does not end there. We now have a Government which in its election promises claimed that it would not increase charges and taxes using backdoor methods, yet before it had hardly warmed the seat of office it was breaking its promises by increasing fares on buses, trams and trains, which in the past nine months have risen more than 45 per cent, and water rates increased by 22 per cent. One can reel off these backdoor taxes: well drilling fees up by 100 per cent, irrigation water charges up by 28 per cent, veterinarian surgeons registration fees up by 5 per cent (that must have been a blow to the Hon. Dr Cornwall), and waste management fees went up by 25 per cent. The Council should note this, Mr President: pastoral lease rental is up by 50 per cent and most of the pastoral areas are still under severe drought conditions. Fishing licence fees are up between 33 per cent and 50 per cent, to name but a few increases that will affect primary producers' ability to remain viable in these hard drought-affected times.

Though rains have come in the southern regions of the State, it will be some time before the harvest of produce will generate an income sufficient to offset the lowered incomes of 1982-83 and the savage increases in backdoor taxes and charges put so rapidly on to the community when only months earlier the Government gave a commitment to the State as a whole that it would not do this.

The electors believed it and put it into office. I do hope the electors' memories are sufficiently retentive to be able to recall these broken promises prior to the next election.

I turn now to another subject about which I have spoken before because I believe it needs still more airing and discussion; that is, the great (and in my opinion, unjust) var-

iation in tariffs charged by suppliers of electricity. I must reiterate that we in South Australia live in a very advanced society which provides the people of this State with a great range of commodities, some of which are used by a few people and others by everyone. Electricity is a commodity that everybody uses. Few things in this society have improved our standard of living more than cheap electricity. Imagine our world without it! The industrial development of this State owes much of its success to the use of cheap power back in the Playford era. The then Government, in its wisdom, opened up Leigh Creek's coal fields, built Port Augusta Power Station and, in conjunction with Osborne Generators, supplied cheap energy to the many industries that came to Adelaide, Elizabeth and surrounds.

Gradually this power was fed throughout the State replacing the local generators as the network extended through the towns. Rural areas came later. I have previously spoken of how most of the areas supplied with ETSA-generated electricity on Eyre Peninsula pay 10 per cent more for that electricity than similar areas in the remainder of the State. There are other small communities within the State which have their power supplied by diesel powered generators: I refer to Coober Pedy, Glendambo, Marree, Marla, Kingoonya and Penong. The company which has installed, runs and maintains these units is the Cowell Electric Supply Co. Ltd based at Cowell on Eyre Peninsula. They have undertaken these operations and have run them with considerable efficiency for several years. I believe that this private enterprise organisation should receive commendation for displaying entrepreneurial foresight and engineering skill in setting up a facility that will supply a modern day need in the remote areas of this State.

These diesel units supply power at a considerably higher cost per kWh than do the very large coal, gas or oil fired stations at Torrens Island or Port Augusta; however, to run power lines from either of these stations to the remote areas I have previously named would be financially prohibitive. Information I have received from ETSA is that fuel costs alone can be as high as 20c per kWh for running diesel generators. This is understandable when one considers the price hike in fuels during the past five years. The Government's intended tax on diesel fuel now being debated in the Council will only compound this problem of high cost electricity in these remote areas.

The establishing of tariffs, which are obviously subsidies by Government, is carried out in the following manner. All costs from the previous year plus a budget for the year ahead are submitted to ETSA for review. The power plants which are of similar size and incur similar costs are put together in a block, and from this a decision on what tariff will be charged the consumer is made. However, ETSA has informed me that in making its decision it takes into account the climate, area and uses for which the power will be used. For example, the body who determined the tariff made their decision after saying that houses in Coober Pedy, Marla or Glendambo should not be without insulation and should be designed to withstand the high temperatures so prevalent in that area. It therefore appears that they set a deliberately high tariff to persuade consumers to adopt a housing construction technique which has a low power consumption. A further criteria is that solar heating of hot water was considered by ETSA when determining this tariff and, therefore, a higher rate, it appears, was set to cause people to use just such a method of hot water heating.

The tariff for these remote areas after the above considerations are approximately 10 per cent greater for the first three steps, up to a consumption of 1 300 kWh after which it climbs in 1 000 kWh steps from 7c to 13c to 16c to 22c. By comparison, the rest of the State climbs from 6c to 7c after consuming 3 000 kWh rather than 1 300 and then

remains on 7c, not climbing to 22c which is 300 per cent higher than the city rate.

We would all agree that the tourist industry in this lovely country is in need of great encouragement and that the industry and Government have been saying that it is the growth industry of the future. Therefore, the provision of facilities and enterprises to assist the tourist on the arteries and thoroughfares of this land is a must. While visiting the areas of Glendambo, Marla and Coober Pedy I found great concern about the extremely high tariffs being charged for electricity. I have here some examples of charges for the Marla Bore Trading Company, which runs a motel at Marla in the Far North. This motel is of moderate size and built in the modern idiom to cater for road travellers when the new road is routed through that area.

The figures I am about to use are for general purpose rates. Allowing for approximately 10 per cent above city rates for the first 2650 kWh per month the quite rapid rise in tariff thereafter has a devastating effect on the total account. The electricity account at Marla for one month, January 1983, for 30840 units was \$5 686; in the city it would have been \$2 787, a difference of \$2 900, or more than double. I, Sir, have copies of the electricity bills for this motel over a period of six months and they all show a very high total account, although the one I have cited is the extreme case, due obviously to the hot weather experienced at this time of the year. That cannot be changed and an increase in electricity consumption is unavoidable during this period each year.

The operation of this business would require a huge number of patrons to offset the extra cost of electricity, or charge the travelling public exorbitant prices for goods, accommodation and services, an obvious rebuff to tourists. My obvious concern leads me to ask the Government to rethink its policy on recovering the cost of generating electricity from the somewhat disadvantaged people who live in those areas I have named. Again, I reiterate that electrical power, in the eyes of the people in the more densely populated areas, is a right and is necessary for modern day living. Surely in this State we can share the cost burden of a few people to have what is taken for granted by the mass. I support the motion.

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON: I support the motion. I join with other honourable members in expressing sympathy to the family of the late John Coumbe.

I wish to speak first about the politics of food. This is not an issue to which Governments normally address themselves except in times of war. However, with growing concern about the links between diet and disease it is an issue that we cannot continue to ignore, as the quality of the food that we eat is steadily deteriorating. Australia should be a country that is well placed to understand the lessons of poor diet. The Aboriginal people provide a striking example of the health of a nation being destroyed by the adoption of European food and drink.

While there have been many other factors, the introduction of the European diet has been the key to many of the Aboriginal health problems. There are two opposing forces acting on our diets. First, we have the nutritional experts and medical researchers saying that our diet contains too much fat, too much salt, too much sugar, and not enough fibre. On the other hand, we have a growing dominance of large concerns in the processing and retailing field. The profits generated by these large concerns, the technical requirements of processing, and the convenience of storage and handling are now becoming the driving forces in the food chain.

It is hardly surprising that all the elements of the diet that I have just mentioned and the foods that are eaten in

excess, are the cheapest inputs for food processors. Profit margins will rise if they are used as substitutes for the more expensive elements of our diet. I will refer to a couple of examples to illustrate the way that processors and retailers now determine the composition of our diet. A local example is the processing of fruit in the Riverland. The introduction of mechanical processing required a change of peach varieties to suit the machines, not to suit the consumer through the supply of a better product. The machine also required that peaches should be picked when they were hard and green, before the development of any flavour. The processor resolved those technical difficulties by softening the fruit in cooking and using sugar to disguise the lack of flavour. That is highly satisfactory for the processor, but the consumer is left with a product that could be described as cotton wool flavoured with sugar.

In the United States, and no doubt shortly in Australia, the manufacturers of bread have reacted to the demand for more fibre in their product by putting additional fibre into their loaves. The process of manufacturing makes this addition easier than leaving more of the natural fibre in the bread. The next decision made by the boards of the bread manufacturing companies was that wood fibre (pulp for paper making) was the cheapest additional source of fibre, and that is what went into the bread. I suppose that we can only be thankful that it was not decided to put in asbestos fibre.

Even where the dieticians have attempted to fight back, the food industry has won again. I refer to that poor product of the advocates of high fibre, muesli. Muesli now comes in packets with added sugar and fat. I will discuss some of the alternative approaches that could be taken to overcome the problems associated with food and health. First, in relation to advertising, one approach would be to stop the advertising of foods that are high in dietary components of salt, fat and sugar and encourage the consumption of foods that are better balanced. Obviously, that approach is impractical and unrealistic. It is impractical because those components are not harmful except in excess.

A diet with too many hamburgers, potato chips and so on, leads to the consumption of too much fat and, therefore, heart disease. Who will point the finger at the offending foods and say that they cause heart disease? That is unrealistic because the power of the processors, even when the link with heart disease is clearly determined (as with smoking), is such that the chance of an advertising ban of this type is remote indeed. Perhaps we could look at education and perhaps the Government could counter the advertising of the food processors with its own education campaign, with courses in schools, and so on. Where would the Government find the money to match even a fraction of the advertising budgets of the food industry, and how could schools hope to imprint ideas in a few years so that people would be strong enough to withstand the lifetime of constant propaganda? That is not a realistic solution. Perhaps something could be done by regulation. It is tempting to say, when all else fails, regulate.

Would it be possible to force new standards on manufacturers through regulations? I think not. First, the power of regulations is negative: it stops certain practices; it does not encourage others. Regulations could control excessive fat, salt and sugar, but, except in the case of salt, I have no doubt that the manufacturers will find ways around these problems and develop new and cheaper fillers which may be found to be more harmful to us.

I also have no doubt that the large corporations will be successful in their ability to infiltrate the regulation-making process, as they have already done, in order to lessen the impact of their activities. One has only to look at the operations of existing Government regulatory bodies in the

food area (such as chemical additives) to ascertain how people being regulated can control the operation of these bodies through the supply of technical information.

The other danger is that regulation has an uneven impact on large and small business. Many surveys have indicated that the small business finds regulations more difficult, as a single manager has to cope with the requirements in many areas of activity. The large business has specialised managers coping with only a single area of activity, and with more time to influence the administration which draws up and enforces the regulations. Thus, regulations are more likely to prevent a farmer, for example, from selling rolled oats as a breakfast food than they are to prevent a cereal manufacturing giant from corrupting the word 'muesli'.

Regulations are quite capable of putting more power in the hands of the large concerns and making it more difficult for small concerns to provide a genuine alternative. I was recently talking to the marketing manager of a large French food processing co-operative about the morality of concentrating good ingredients into processed products demanded by the multi-national food retailing chains that have swept through France in the past decade. I think that his replies were fairly indicative of what is happening generally in the food processing area. He said, 'Look, we do not care. We are here to make a profit and, as long as the consumer puts up with the junk that the retailers push on to them, we will continue to produce it. We are in competition with Nestle, Kraft, and other giants, and we must produce the same. Being fair or unfair to the consumer has nothing to do with it. We are here, not to make a moral stance, but to make a profit and to keep the processing plants operating.' I think that that is a fair example of the attitudes of many in the food processing business.

The challenge to the consumer is to diminish that profit so that the supplier will respond with a better and more nutritious product. The person with the most power is the consumer who, to bring the transaction to finality, must part with his or her money. Until that is done, no-one makes anything. It is the realisation of this power and the use of it to force the processors and the retailers to provide good nutritious food that is the only card we have left in the supermarket game and, until we play it, we will go on losing. I support the motion.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW secured the adjournment of the debate.

ETHNIC TELEVISION

Adjourned debate on motion of the 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 17 August. Page 272.)

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I have much pleasure in supporting this motion. It is a worthy initiative and I am

pleased that members are supporting it unanimously. We believe that this is a measure that will not only offer a facility for the ethnic groups or other cultures that have joined us in Australia but also improve immeasurably the art and culture that is offered to Australians through television. I would like to re-emphasise what has been said in this Council: we appreciate the richness that other cultures and ethnic groups have brought here. Like so many indigenous Australians, I am very grateful for what these ethnic groups have contributed to Australia, and with them I look forward to a rich future in a multi-cultural society.

Unfortunately, television programming in the conventional mode has not recognised the value and the extra options that are available from embracing the cultures of people who have come from other parts of the world. Currently, all that is dished up is criticism and ridicule of ethnic minorities. That is an insult, and the time is long overdue for us to offer them the opportunity to present material that represents different cultural backgrounds: the time is also long overdue for Australians to be able to enjoy that contribution. It is essential that that opportunity be offered to those people.

I also believe that the Aborigines should be given the opportunity to share their cultural and artistic background. Those members who had the pleasure of seeing the programme *Women of the Sun* will realise how shabbily one of the most brilliant television productions was treated by, in this case, the A.B.C. That programme was shown very late on a Thursday evening. Each section deserved prime time viewing, and should have been shown on separate nights, but instead of that two episodes were shown late on a Thursday night. Quite obviously, there is a need for an extra channel so that that sort of programme can be shown and so that Australians can share the richness of culture, drama, and arts.

Those members who saw that programme will recall that one episode of *Women of the Sun* showed an Aboriginal tribe speaking in its native language. I believe that it was good to experience the need for subtitles and to hear the beauty of that language in such a good piece of drama. Having enjoyed so many of the continental films and films from other countries that use subtitles, I as an indigenous Australian look forward to the opportunity to choose to watch more of that sort of material.

Added to that would be the advantage of a wider news coverage and the sharing of culture other than the Anglo-Saxon culture. It is exciting to think of the originality and variety of material that could be used by this alternative channel when it is in operation. I am informed that South Australia has been promised a new channel, Channel 0/28, for multi-cultural television, with community access through shared listening, by both the Fraser Government and by the present Government, which reaffirmed the previous promise in the A.L.P. policy.

As well as the ethnic groups in Adelaide, the Community and Educational Television Group is depending upon the provision of this facility for access to so much of what it feels is important in modern day media broadcasting. So, those people, as well as educators, welfare groups, women's groups and service clubs, which are all dependent on this community oriented media access, must be very impatient for the introduction of this channel into Adelaide, particularly because of the fact that it is in operation already in the Eastern States. So, it was a great shock, I am sorry to say, to find after inquiring today that all of us are going to be bitterly disappointed as a result of the present Labor Government's decision.

I have been reliably informed at a meeting of the Public Broadcasting Association of Australia, at an annual conference in Sydney, by an officer of the Federal Department of

Communications, that there will be no further work in regard to channel 0/28, which is the one that will be used through the normal television receivers. That work has been stopped and put aside indefinitely. The funds that would have been available for the development of channel 0/28 have been taken from that project, which has been delayed indefinitely. I am told that those funds have been put towards other resources, such as translators and subtitlers. Therefore, the view is not very optimistic, and so the urgency of this motion is paramount. If there is to be any chance of getting a change of mind on the part of the current Federal Government, the matter must be addressed immediately. Therefore, I am pleased about the indication given by the Hon. Murray Hill that the timing in this regard is important, and that this motion will go forward as soon as possible.

I believe that it is essential that the motion be forwarded with the strong support of this Council, which has been indicated. If my information is correct, and I have no cause to doubt it, we will be expressing in the strongest terms our dissatisfaction with this decision and the fact that we feel that it is very shabby treatment of this State in regard to the provision of an essential requisite in the media service to a society which has as some of its richest parts ethnic groups and community interest groups that have been waiting and waiting for this opportunity to have access to a television channel.

The Democrats commend the Hon. Murray Hill for his initiative and we welcome the unanimous support for this matter from this Chamber. We are delighted to have had the opportunity of properly expressing our recognition of the enormous contribution that the ethnic groups and the newly arrived migrant groups make to this country. We apologise for their having to wait so long for this media access to which they are so rightly entitled. We support the motion and wish it success in the end result.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I do not wish to delay the Council. My position on this matter has been well canvassed on previous occasions. I have taken a number of actions in relation to this matter as far as the Federal Government is concerned. On 2 June 1983 I sent a telex to the Hon. Mike Duffy, Minister for Communications, in which I expressed the view of the South Australian Government and, I believe, the view of the South Australian community, including the ethnic minority communities in this State, urging upon the Minister the importance of the extension of channel 0/28 in relation to South Australia.

I participated in a meeting held on the steps of Parliament House a short time ago, and the Hon. Mr Hill was there and was aware of the comments I made at that time. On 14 July I received a response, by the way, from Mr Duffy to my telex of June, in which he indicated that extension of transmission to Adelaide was planned for an early stage of development, but that there was some consideration to review of expenditure in general terms within the Commonwealth Government, of which honourable members will be aware.

I sent a further telex on Thursday 28 July 1983 to Mr Hawke, Mr Duffy, Mr West (the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs), Mr Keating, Mr Walsh, Mr Dawkins and Senator Bolkus, again reaffirming my views and those of the Government and urging the Federal Government to give high priority to the extension of cultural television in this State. Since that latest telex that I mentioned, I have also spoken personally to Mr Duffy about this matter and impressed on him the significance of the extension of this service to South Australia.

I do not wish to canvass the merits of the matter; they have been canvassed often enough and, indeed, canvassed

in this Chamber. I merely wish to indicate to the Council the Government's view of the motion, which I am prepared to support, and the action which I have taken on behalf of the Government and other people in the South Australian community in making representations to the Federal Government on this issue. As soon as the motion is passed I will ensure that it is conveyed to Canberra at the earliest opportunity.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: You indicated in a reply to a question from the Hon. Mr Feleppa a few weeks ago that you would try to see Mr Duffy. Was that phone call in substitution for that?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I did not personally see Mr Duffy, but I made representations to him by phone; that is correct.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to inform the Council that a letter will be sent this afternoon to the Premier, transmitting the resolution and asking that the contents thereof be conveyed to the Prime Minister.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.49 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 23 August at 2.15 p.m.