

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday 21 September 1983

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

## QUESTIONS

## URANIUM

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** The question of Roxby Downs was raised in the election campaign last year, but any criticism was countered in the Labor Party's policy speech. At page 10 of the policy speech it was stated:

We had some criticisms of the Roxby Downs indenture when it was before Parliament last June. We believed that there were unresolved safety issues. But now it has passed and the project is going ahead. Once the indenture was passed by Parliament, Roxby Downs ceased to be an issue for this election. So let me make it quite clear. No matter what you are told by our opponents Roxby Downs can and will go ahead under a Labor Government.

Since then, there have been a number of further commitments, including a commitment made by Mr Hawke recently when he stated:

The Roxby Downs mine in South Australia would go ahead despite strong protests from conservationists.

The policy of his Party and his Government was that the mine should and would be developed. Last week at a meeting of Federal and State Labor M.P.s in Victoria, there was unanimous support (I gathered from press reports) for a motion that would mean, effectively, that no further contracts for uranium exports could be entered into.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** Where was that?

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** It was a meeting of Victorian Federal and State Labor M.P.s. The motion was supported unanimously, even by Ministers in Mr Hawke's Government. Of course, the result would be that Roxby Downs could not proceed, and that would be counter to the policy commitment and to the commitment made before the last election by the present State Labor Government. In view of the importance of Roxby Downs to this State, will the Attorney say whether a meeting of South Australian Federal and State Labor M.P.s has been held to ensure that they support unanimously not only the policy that they expressed prior to the last State election but also the present situation in regard to the Roxby Downs proprietors by approving exports of uranium that is mined at Roxby Downs? If not, will the Labor Government in this State convene a meeting of South Australian Federal and State Labor M.P.s (in the same way that it obviously convened a meeting of Labor Senators to support the opposition to a wine excise measure) with a view to expressing unanimous support for the export of uranium from Roxby Downs? As we all know, unless that uranium is exported, Roxby Downs will cease to exist.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I think the honourable member is pre-empting Federal Government consideration of certain matters relating to uranium policy. The State Government made its position on Roxby Downs absolutely crystal clear at the last election, and it has been made clear on a number of occasions since then. If the present feasibility study at Roxby Downs is positive, in the sense that the joint venturers decide that the Roxby Downs project is economic and viable (and that is still in the process of being determined by the

joint venturers), the situation as far as the State Government is concerned is that Roxby Downs will go ahead.

The Labor Party's position in relation to uranium mining and Roxby Downs was put at the time of the last State election: it was completely consistent with and was supported by the Federal Conference decision of the Australian Labor Party taken in early July last year. It was on that basis that the State Government made a firm commitment in relation to Roxby Downs. Nothing has occurred since then which alters the State Government's view about Roxby Downs. At the moment, the joint venturers are in the process of determining whether Roxby Downs can proceed economically; if it can, then, as far as the State Government is concerned, that decision will be supported.

To my knowledge there has been no meeting of South Australian Labor members of Parliament. Whether or not such a meeting should be held is not my decision. The Federal Government, the Prime Minister and other Ministers are fully aware of the view taken by the South Australian Government in relation to Roxby Downs. I do not think that there can be any mistake about that. At the moment, I cannot give a positive response in relation to whether there is any need to convene a meeting. However, I will certainly discuss the matter with the Premier.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Is the Attorney-General aware that, without the sale of uranium from the Roxby Downs project, there will be no mine? That being the case, does the State Government approve of and support the export of uranium from Roxby Downs?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I would have thought that the honourable member was somewhat brighter than that question from him indicates. What I said in answer to the question, what the State Government has been saying at present, and what it said prior to the election, was that if Roxby Downs is economically viable, as determined by the joint venturers who have the invested capital in Roxby Downs, it will be supported by the State Government. That clearly involves support for the mining of whatever minerals are in the Roxby Downs deposit—and even the Hon. Mr Cameron is aware that there is uranium, copper and gold in the Roxby Downs deposit. So, as far as the State Government is concerned, the situation is quite clear: if it is determined to be economically viable to mine the ore body with copper, uranium and gold and whatever other mineral ores may be there, that mining will be supported by the State Government.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** I wish to ask a supplementary question. Abuse will not change my determination to have the Attorney-General answer the question, which is not 'Will the State Government support the mining of uranium from Roxby Downs?' but 'Will it and does it support and is its policy clear on—and I am not sure that it is—the export of uranium mined at Roxby Downs?'

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** That clearly has been answered. There is not much point in mining the ore if one cannot sell it. That, I would have thought, would be patently obvious even to the Hon. Mr Cameron. So, the situation is that any determination about the export of uranium is a determination that is to be made by the Federal Government. That is clear. However, the South Australian Government supports the Roxby Downs venture. The South Australian Government therefore supports the export of uranium that is mined in the Roxby Downs deposit. That was clear from what I said in answer to the first question which the honourable member asked. It was made quite clear prior to the election that the South Australian Government supported the Roxby Downs project proceeding for the mining of whatever minerals are there if it is economically viable, as determined by the joint venturer. That statement has been reiterated since the last election. I have reiterated it today and, obviously,

there would be little point in supporting it if it could not be sold. So, I think that I have adequately answered the question.

#### BARMES REPORT

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** On 16 August 1983 I asked the Minister questions in relation to the Barmes Report heading 'Oral Disease Data'. I asked what was the standard deviation of all the averages or means in subsection 3 'Oral Disease Data', or alternatively whether the Minister would supply all the raw material for the whole of the subsection. The reply given on 13 September was that the South Australian Dental Service did not have access to the information and that, therefore, the Minister could not supply it. On 16 August the Minister suggested that Dr Barmes, as chief of the oral section of the World Health Organisation, was beyond question.

However, as I suggested in my explanation to the question on the same day, a statistical analysis can have no credibility unless its basis is available for critical examination. As the South Australian Dental Service does not have the answer, I ask the Minister to obtain from Dr Barmes the standard deviation of all the averages or means in subsection 3 'Oral Disease Data' or the raw data. It should not be impossible to obtain the latter, that is, the raw data, but surely it would be very easy to ask Dr Barmes what was the standard deviation from the mean. I ask whether the Minister will pursue this matter.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** The Hon. Mr Burdett is lining up with some very strange company to try to denigrate the School Dental Service, it seems. If he wishes to embark upon that course, be it at his own peril. The honourable member is quite clearly being fed information from the small lunatic fringe in the dental profession, the Dental Practitioners Association. The honourable member would not know the difference between standard deviation and any other sort of deviation. He is clearly being fed information by, as I repeat, the small lunatic fringe represented by the Dental Practitioners Association, and not the official body of dentists in this State, the Australian Dental Association (S.A. Division).

The honourable member is lining up with this small number of disreputable people to try to discredit the School Dental Service. As I said, he is embarking upon that course at his peril. He is, in the process, attempting, by inference, to discredit the chief of oral health in the World Health Organisation, Dr David Barmes, who came to South Australia at my express invitation to review the South Australian Dental Service. He found and said, quite unequivocally, that it was among the best in the world. I would have hoped that that would have put to rest for all time any allegations that the School Dental Service was other than one of the most efficient and one of the best, not just in this country but in the world, and something of which we can be quite rightly proud.

In regard to the standard deviation about which the shadow Minister is expressing such a great and recent, albeit coached, interest, the answer that I gave indicated that the data were supplied to Dr Barmes by the School Dental Service and the South Australian Dental Service; they did not have access to the analysis to which the honourable member was referring. If the honourable member, like the small coterie of the right-wing lunatic fringe in the Dental Practitioners Association wishes to continue with this course and take

up even more time of these dental officers, then I would be willing to discuss it with them.

I want to make it clear that an inordinate amount of time of those dental officers has been wasted by these people who have been attempting to discredit the School Dental Service. Throughout the life of the Tonkin Government they were just as big a problem to the then Minister (Hon. Mrs Adamson) and the same dental officers as they have been during the period in which I have been Minister.

I think that it is quite disgraceful for the Hon. Mr Burdett to be taking up cudgels on behalf of these people (who can be counted on the fingers on one hand), but he has a democratic right, I suppose, to represent minority, lunatic fringe groups. I will, therefore, be pleased to take his request to the dental officers. If it is not going to take up too much of their time, will not divert them from the business of running first-class public dental services in this State, and will not divert them from running the best school dental service in the nation, I will give due consideration to asking them to seek this information from Dr Barmes.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I want to make it clear that I was not making allegations about anything when I asked my question but was simply asking for information. Also, I am not taking up cudgels on behalf of anybody, be it a lunatic fringe, or anybody else. I simply sought information which was necessary to enable part of this report to be critically examined. It is perfectly obvious that when a person makes a statement in a report concerning statistical data the basis for it must be made available. I was not attacking the report or supporting anybody; I was simply asking for information, and that was the basis for my asking the question that I asked.

#### ADULT MIGRANT EDUCATION

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Ethnic Affairs a question about adult migration education.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** Earlier this year, just prior to the Federal election, I had the pleasure of being present at the opening of the Adult Migrant Education Centre in the Renaissance Centre in Rundle Mall. I was pleased that that venue had been chosen as the place, and the appointments and the accommodation generally appear to be first rate.

During the opening ceremony a clear indication was given by State and Federal politicians that some teachers in languages at the centre would have their employment arrangements changed from being contract teachers to full-time employees. Also, as I recall, an indication was given that volunteer teachers would be given more security by being offered more permanent employment arrangements. There has been some industrial unrest within the staff at the centre, and that unrest has been publicised in the daily press. It arose, it seems especially as it appeared that the promise of ultimate full-time work was not being honoured by either the State Government or the Federal Government. As a result, migrants cannot obtain the best possible service and have the best possible opportunity to learn the English language, as they seek to do at a centre of this kind, unless the teaching staff is satisfied and happy in its working arrangement.

Therefore, can the Minister say whether or not he or the Ethnic Affairs Commission has been involved in sorting out the employment difficulties at the centre and, if so, in particular whether contract teachers are now being given

full-time employment? Also, if the Minister has not concerned himself with these adult student migrants who attend the centre, will he consult with the Minister of Education in another place and obtain this information from him?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** Obviously, this is not a matter that comes within my specific responsibilities. Of course, I am involved in a general sense in regard to Government policy. General propositions were put forward by the Minister of Education prior to the last election in relation to the transfer of some contract employees to permanent employment—something, I might add, that had not been done by the previous Government. However, the actual details of the honourable member's question in relation to the action taken by the Government in this matter is something that comes within the knowledge and responsibility of the Minister of Education, and I will refer the question to him and bring back a reply.

### TREE CUTTING

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a series of questions about tree cutting.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** Honourable members will have heard the fears expressed by a large section of the public about the tree cutting programme being undertaken by the Electricity Trust of South Australia. I have seen one example of what ETSA men are doing at Mount Barker, and it is obvious that some restraint or guidance is necessary. I understand, however, that ETSA can prune, lop or chop down trees at will and that it is not bound by environmental or other legislation. I am assured that the Trust policy is to consult the local council on council roads, and to consult residents when trees requiring attention are on private property.

The Trust has a tree cutting programme every year, designed to prevent fires or to minimise the risk. After the dreadful experience last year and the pressures placed on the Trust (and criticism, fair or unfair), the Trust has a much greater tree cutting programme this year—almost double, I understand—to try to take even more care. This means that the treatment of trees is more severe than before and that more mistakes are likely to be made. Indeed, I would say that the cutting down completely of two very old gum trees at Mount Barker was unnecessary, and the residents' anger is probably justified. My guess, from counting the growth lines, is that both trees were there before the white settlers.

What happens, I think, is that, after ETSA has consulted the council and received approval in principle, there is a difference between what the council agrees to and what the ETSA team actually carries out. It therefore seems to me that it would be beneficial to all parties if the guidelines or rules for the Trust were strengthened in some way. My questions are as follows:

1. Will the Minister take the necessary steps to bring ETSA under environmental controls?
2. Will the Minister ensure that the tree cutting crews have advice from the Department of Environment and Planning in the execution of the programme?
3. In view of the very recent adoption by this Government of regulations under the Planning Act requiring private citizens to obtain permission from the Department of Environment and Planning before clearing native trees and the consequent practice of the department to properly investigate the need to clear, will the Minister ensure that ETSA carries

out an investigation, at least as thorough, before any more mature trees are removed?

4. Will the Minister give an undertaking that, when the findings of the coronial inquiry into bushfires become known, the resolution of any conflict between electricity supply, fire prevention, environmental protection and the preservation of aesthetic values is the subject of a proper public environmental assessment procedure?

5. Will the Minister ascertain at what level in the ETSA structure the decision to remove the particular trees in Sims Road and Hurling Drive, Mount Barker, was taken?

6. Will the Minister consider legislation to enforce co-operation between ETSA and the Department of Environment and Planning?

7. Will the Minister give an assurance to the citizens of Mount Barker and elsewhere where tree cutting takes place that greater care will be exercised in the future?

8. In view of the size of the programme this year, and the speed with which it is proceeding, will the Minister please treat these matters as urgent?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** The Hon. Mr Milne directed this question to me in my capacity as representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, and I will certainly refer to the Minister the parts of the question that should be directed to him and bring back a reply. However, I am sure that the honourable member will not object if I, as a Minister who has some responsibility for the C.F.S., respond briefly to the overall proposition that the honourable member put. I am sure that all members would remember the terrible destruction of Ash Wednesday this year and of two years ago. Some of the people for whom I have responsibility, namely, the C.F.S. volunteers, were actually killed in those fires.

It was suggested that some of the fires were caused by electricity wires rubbing against trees on fire hazard days. In the interests of the people for whom I have responsibility, if there is any conflict at all between the trees that all South Australians love and need very much being cut down and the possibility of loss of life, including C.F.S. volunteers, then I hope that ETSA will err on the side of saving life. If that means that an extra few trees are cut down, while that action is regrettable, it is not half as regrettable as the death and destruction that occurred earlier this year. I also point out to the Council (as all members will be aware) that the State will soon be entering a new fire season, possibly the worst we have experienced because of the incredible amount of fuel that is just waiting to go up in flames. If an accident occurs again similar to that which allegedly occurred in the past with ETSA power lines—

**The Hon. K.L. Milne:** Don't get excited.

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I do get excited. I am responsible for the C.F.S. people, and I do not like going to funerals. I appreciate the problem raised by the Hon. Mr Milne, but I believe that the question could have been asked in a more balanced way. However, as I said, I will refer the parts of the question that are properly the province of the Minister of Mines and Energy to that Minister and I will bring back a considered reply.

### ROYAL FLYING DOCTOR SERVICE

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about the Royal Flying Doctor Service.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** Yesterday, the Hon. Mr Gilfillan asked a question in this Council that related to the Royal Flying Doctor Service and to two recent resignations from the Service in Port Augusta. Despite the clear answer given

by the Minister, the Hon. Mr Gilfillan went on radio this morning and stated that he was very concerned about the resignations—

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** It was not a clear answer.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:**—and their effect on the Royal Flying Doctor Service and the service it provides throughout country areas. I wonder whether the Minister has any further information which might or might not satisfy the Hon. Mr Gilfillan but which, more importantly, could allay any fears or concerns caused by the honourable member's remarks.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** It was drawn to my attention that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan went on radio this morning apparently trying to beat up further the story that he attempted to put across yesterday. I was sufficiently gentle with the honourable member yesterday: I suggested that he ought to act responsibly and not create unnecessary fears and alarm, but apparently that message did not get through. The Hon. Mr Gilfillan was at it again this morning, and I understand that he has also been telephoning outback station properties asking questions and, in his own quiet and inimitable way, spreading a degree of unreasonable fear.

I am sure that it is uncharacteristic of the Hon. Mr Gilfillan and it is regrettable. However, the honourable member's comments were grossly irresponsible and it is time that he stopped making them. I am pleased that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan has entered the Chamber, because he will be able to hear first hand what I have to say. As I have said, the Hon. Mr Gilfillan has been uncharacteristically irresponsible, and the time has passed when he should stop trying to beat up a non-story in relation to the Royal Flying Doctor Service.

I gave a fairly comprehensive answer yesterday to the Hon. Mr Gilfillan's question. I believe that that answer should have been enough to satisfy any reasonable person. However, that seems not to be the case in relation to the Hon. Mr Gilfillan, so I will supply some further information today.

Yesterday, the Hon. Mr Gilfillan asked about two resignations from the Royal Flying Doctor Service. I said then and I repeat today that it is not my business to discuss publicly the reasons for the resignations. If anyone wants more information about that matter, they should speak to the two gentlemen who resigned. It is certainly not my duty to canvass that matter publicly. It is a blatant lie to suggest that the Royal Flying Doctor Service is not providing a 24-hour service, seven days a week. The Port Augusta base of the Royal Flying Doctor Service has had a standing service arrangement for a number of years whereby it operates outside normal office hours on public holidays and at weekends. The major elements of the arrangement are that there is always a duty doctor available and an aircraft and aircrew on standby for dispatch upon receipt of a call from outback residents who require emergency service.

When a radio call from the outback is received outside normal office hours and it is not answered at the base, the call is automatically transferred through to the duty doctor at his residence or to the Port Augusta Hospital. I have personally visited the Port Augusta Hospital, as members would be aware, and I have inspected the radio and switchboard facilities. It has never been the case that someone sits bolt upright at the Royal Flying Doctor Service switchboard at Port Augusta answering calls 24 hours a day. I do not know whether or not the Hon. Mr Gilfillan has visited the base but, if he has not, he should make it his business to go there and inform himself.

The Port Augusta Royal Flying Doctor Service is operated from a converted house. Of course, no-one sits at the switchboard through the long dark nights: incoming calls are automatically diverted either to the doctor on duty or to the

Port Augusta Hospital. Therefore, there is a 24-hour service, seven days a week. There is always a doctor, an aircraft and an aircrew available. That situation has not changed in any way because of the resignations of the two officers in question.

Yesterday I explained to the Council that interim arrangements had been made and that one of the persons being brought in, to mind the store as it were, has vast experience after serving for many years at Broken Hill and at Alice Springs. It is business as usual at Port Augusta. I just wish that the honourable member would get that through his head and try to undo some of the unfortunate impressions that he has given abroad in the community. In addition to the arrangements that I have outlined, the duty radio operator is always available on standby to be called in should the duty doctor be in any way concerned about the quality of radio transmissions.

As I have said, it is business as usual at Port Augusta, and there is no cause for anyone to be concerned. I repeat what I said yesterday: the Royal Flying Doctor Service in South Australia offers the best service of its kind in Australia, and that service is unique in the world. I take grave exception to any attempts, particularly irresponsible attempts that are not based on fact, to try and discredit that service. The Royal Flying Doctor Service specifically contacted me and asked me to assure people in the outback that the recent events to which the Hon. Mr Gilfillan has been seeking to give publicity will in no way (and I emphasise that) affect its capacity to continue to provide a very high quality of service as required.

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** My arrival in the Chamber was timely. One of the reasons for my lateness today is that I spent a lot of time this morning on the radio telephone to the outback—incidentally, on request. I received a radio telephone call from people who were very pleased that some concern had been shown in relation to this matter. At no time have I indicated that there was a threat to the medical service. I was concerned about communications. Alarm was alerted to me by others who have experienced the service in the outback. So, I take some objection to the Minister's comments, although I am pleased that the Minister has seen fit to follow this matter through. I do not like the Minister's implication that I have raised this matter recklessly and wantonly simply for the sake of publicity.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** What about some names and facts instead of rumour and innuendo?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** I think it is probably appropriate for me to give the Minister the names and facts at some other time. I do not believe that it is appropriate for me to put them forward in this personal explanation. My conscience is sound in relation to my motives for raising this matter. People living in the outback have expressed concern that the communications—

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** What people?

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** The people who spoke to me on the radio telephone.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Where did you first get your information?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable member has been given leave to make a personal explanation and I want to hear it.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** So do I, but I want to hear—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! If the Hon. Dr Cornwall listens we will all hear.

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** I will list some of the people that I have spoken to. First, I spoke to the two people who

have resigned, namely, Jim Davidson and Bob Allum. I have also been in radio telephone contact with the Uniting Church padre, Trevor Lanthois, who rang through to me this morning specifically to discuss the matter with me. He expressed his appreciation that I had taken an interest in this matter. He also said that there was a strong feeling of concern amongst people living in the outback that they were losing two valuable friends, and he also said that people in the outback were anxious about the standard of service that they would receive from now on. I also received a call from Mike Steele at Innamincka who asked me to repeat what had been said so that others on the radio telephone network could hear. He was most concerned and said, 'A lot of us are very concerned. There were many new and welcome innovations in the service under the management of the two people who have resigned. The morale is low.'

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable member is not making a personal explanation about the question that he asked yesterday.

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** Mr President, I thank the Council for its tolerance.

#### ETSA

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about ETSA.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** I have been careful not to raise matters associated with bushfires in the South-East, and I have been careful not to express any views about who was to blame or not to blame. I believe that that is properly the role of those who are now investigating those fires. However, I was concerned about the implied views that were expressed in a question asked by the Hon. Mr Milne. There is little doubt that most people who were affected by the bushfires fully support the proper clearance of ETSA lines throughout the State, and that is certainly the case in my area. It is one thing to lose a couple of trees because they have been cut down, but it is a bit different when you are in a situation such as mine, for example, where I have lost about half a mile of tree shelter belt because of the fire. I will not express a view as to its cause, but I have a fair idea in that respect.

In view of that and in view of the fact that this is a very important part of the aftermath of the bushfire—and I believe that ETSA is showing a very responsible attitude, indeed, by ensuring the complete safety of its lines for the ensuing season, which will be much worse than last year—will the Minister ensure that any investigations undertaken following the Hon. Mr Milne's question will not interfere with the proper activities being undertaken by ETSA to ensure proper clearance of power lines for the ensuing season?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** I will direct that question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

#### COAL

**The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS:** Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of 11 August relating to coal?

**The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** In response to the honourable member's question asked of me, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, I advise that the Government is aware of the potential importance of the use of *in situ* or underground coal gasification as a means of providing an energy source for South Australia. As a result, a technical and economic feasibility study into the underground gasi-

fication of Leigh Creek coal has been under way since early this year. It is being carried out by Shedden Pacific Pty Ltd for the Department of Mines and Energy and ETSA. The study, which is due to be completed shortly, has concluded from preliminary investigations that activities should be focused on Lobe B at Leigh Creek where 120 million tonnes of coal not amenable to conventional mining are potentially available for *in situ* gasification.

Although the future development of this technology will be dependent on the result of the current studies and staged development programme, it would be fair to say at the moment that this programme is considered both by the Department and by the Electricity Trust to be worth pursuing.

#### RIMMINGTON REPORT

**The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA:** Has the Attorney-General answers to my questions of 18 and 23 August on the subject of the Rimmington Report?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The Public Service Board has directed the Equal Opportunities Branch to establish an interdepartmental committee to develop a plan as a basis for recommending action to be taken by the Public Service Board. The Committee will consider the recommendations of the report and recommend appropriate action for approval by the Public Service Board. The action plan will address the means by which equality of opportunity may be achieved both in recruitment and in advancement through the career structure of people who are of non Anglo-Celtic background. The committee will also consider the question of definition of ethnicity and make appropriate recommendations to the Public Service Board on this matter, as a basis for implementation of the recommendations. The committee has been requested to report to the Public Service Board for approval of the recommendations as soon as possible, prior to the action plan being made public.

#### TREATMENT OF BURNS VICTIMS

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** As the Minister will be aware, there is a continuous small supply of patients to our public hospitals suffering from domestic and industrial burns, and from time to time very great demand is made on burns treatment facilities due to major industrial and bushfire disasters. He will also be aware that the treatment of burns in the acute phase is a specialised branch of medical practice which is advancing and which is better carried out in specialist units than in general medical facilities. He will also be aware that following a burn a patient may be under treatment for several years—treatment involving surgery to correct contractures, to replace skin, and the like.

Unfortunately, the Royal Adelaide Hospital has recently cut the specialist staff on its burns unit by at least 50 per cent. My information is that there were two specialists in this field, one doing somewhat more operating than the other, and that recently the one who did perhaps most of the operating resigned and, in accordance with the hospital's policy of cutting surgical sessions by attrition, is not to be replaced. The Minister, in a previous reply to me, pointed out that the cuts of some 30 sessions amounted to a very minor budgetary saving. He made the point that it was of the order of \$150 000 in a budget of hundreds of millions of dollars and that really it was quite a small thing and not worth the asking of a question.

However, I ask him to consider whether a reduction of this size—50 per cent—in the facilities for surgical treatment of burns is trifling; in other words, whether the effect is trifling, even though the saving may be small. Does the Minister have influence in matters like this? Does the Minister consider such a substantial reduction in specialist facilities in this specialty to be a wise move? Can the Minister exert any influence to correct the situation?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** The Hon. Dr Ritson has been doing grand rounds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital again, it seems. I expected a question when I saw him there at midday today. He seems to be indirectly involved in the small 'p' politics of the medical staff of that hospital. So be it. There is at the Royal Adelaide Hospital a specialist burns unit. It is the specialist burns unit for South Australia. I think from memory that it has 12 beds; I could stand corrected, but it is of the order of 12 beds. It was recently one of the many things at the Royal Adelaide Hospital which came under the scrutiny of the Sax Committee. My recollection, having had a sneak preview of the Sax Committee Report and recommendations, is that it is considered adequate for the foreseeable future.

As to whether I have influence (I forget the other expression—'clout' or something like that), when I see fit to use it, which I do only when it is necessary and in a very responsible manner, I have very substantial clout. However, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, as the Council should know, is by far the biggest hospital in South Australia. In 1983-84 it has a budget in excess of \$100 million. It should be borne in mind that its budget is substantially greater than those of most Government departments; that is the scope and size of the operation that we are looking at. We have at the Royal Adelaide Hospital a Chief Executive Officer, a Medical Superintendent, a Director of Nursing and a Board of Management. It is not my role to act as Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission or as the Chief Executive Officer of the Royal Adelaide Hospital or as any other immediate official at that hospital. It is certainly not my role to act as Chairman of the Board of Management of the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

The hospital is given substantial independence. Some members opposite like to talk about autonomy; they will be aware that I have been at great pains to stress that we have to have integration and co-ordination within a State-wide health service—there is no such thing as literal autonomy.

However, the hospital has substantial independence, and so it should have. There is no point at all in persisting with the notion that we have a South Australian Health Commission and that we have these relatively independent health groups unless we allow that to happen in practice—not absolute autonomy, of course, but independence. What is happening here is that the hospital apparently has made some internal decision. It is no secret that the medical staff are locked to a significant degree in what might be called mortal combat with the Administrator at the moment because the Administrator has, it seems, had the gall to take on some of the Adelaide medical establishment at the hospital.

I believe that he has acted most properly in terms of particular decisions (I am not made aware of them on a day-to-day basis because I see my role, as I said, not as being Chairman of the Health Commission or Administrator of Royal Adelaide Hospital or Chairman of the Board but as Minister of Health and, as such, responsible for macro policy decisions). If there is any evidence whatsoever that a reduction in staff has occurred of the magnitude described and if, as a result of that reduction, there will be any significant reduction in the level of excellent service provided by that burns unit, I would have a duty on behalf of the

people of South Australia to take whatever action was necessary or appropriate. The honourable member knows that when those sorts of actions are necessary I have never been one to shrink from taking them. So, if there is evidence that these reductions to which the honourable member has referred are causing a drop in the standard of service, I would take action. However, the specific details to which the honourable member referred are not within my knowledge at present, but I will make some inquiries and bring back a reply as soon as I reasonably can.

## URANIUM MINING

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** I direct my question to the Attorney-General on a matter of Labor policy. In view of the growing concern by mining companies and following the Attorney-General's assurance that the Government's position on Roxby Downs was crystal clear, will the Attorney ask the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy, first, to publicly state their support for Roxby Downs and the export of uranium mined there? Secondly, will they publicly lobby their Federal colleagues to ensure that Labor policy will enable uranium mining at Roxby Downs to proceed, given the fact that there is a substantial proportion of Federal Caucus who are actively opposed to uranium mining at Roxby Downs? Thirdly, will those Ministers publicly lobby their Federal colleagues to extend Labor Party policy to allow uranium mining to proceed at Honeymoon and Beverley?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** The honourable member asks that the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy restate the South Australian Government's position on Roxby Downs. I have stated that position in this Council *ad infinitum*. The Premier has reaffirmed, if it was necessary, the Government's position as stated before the last election. The Prime Minister, in a statement that I saw, which was made at the same time that the Premier made his statement, indicated his view that Roxby Downs should proceed. It is hard to see what more clear-cut statements could be made by the Premier. The Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy and today I have made it very clear what the State Government's position is on Roxby Downs.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** Will you extend it to include Beverley and Honeymoon?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** No. The policy in regard to Beverley and Honeymoon has been outlined previously. I am sure that the Premier has had discussions with the Prime Minister about Roxby Downs and has indicated the importance to South Australia of that development proceeding if it is economically viable. I have said in answer to a previous question by the Hon. Mr Cameron that I would refer his suggestions about consultation to the Premier. I can assure the honourable member that the Premier has made it quite clear to the Federal Government what the South Australian Government's view is on Roxby Downs, and that policy has been outlined again by me in this Council this afternoon.

## ELECTRICITY CHARGES

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

That in the opinion of this Council, all citizens of South Australia who are connected to the Electricity Trust grid system, electricity undertakings managed by district councils or corporations and those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas Development Trust, should be charged for electricity on the same basis, and that the 10 per cent surcharge which applies in certain areas be abolished, and those undertakings operated by the Outback Areas

Development Trust which charge for electricity at a greater rate than any other country area be placed on the same charging schedule as metropolitan Adelaide.

I have spoken previously on this subject and I wish to highlight some of the points that I made previously. The unfair imposition to which I refer in this motion affects only a small section of the community, but clearly a matter of principle is involved. There is an impost on a small section of the community, and the anomaly existing could be corrected by a small impost placed on the rest of the community. As I said, I believe that it is a matter of principle and I will give examples later of how we can even out tariffs.

Electrical power is a fundamental necessity in this day and age and, if any honourable member thinks otherwise, I suggest that he or she goes back 30 or 40 years or even less and cover the period when I lived on my own property. Honourable members should try using a 32-volt power generator for their lighting needs, to power television, and they should try a kerosene refrigerator and see how well that works.

**The Hon. R.C. DeGaris:** What about a kerosene television set?

**The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN:** As yet I have not seen a kerosene-powered television set, but perhaps the honourable member has one in the South-East. Certainly, I recall having to start the motor of a 32-volt system every time ironing was required, and this applied until a short while ago. I would like to relate an incident to the Council involving a farmer who was the only one on his property who could start the motor to generate power. As honourable members would be aware, most farmers have C.B. radios and can talk with one another freely. Whatever is said by one farmer is heard by hundreds. One day when the farmer was out on his tractor a demure and faint voice from a newly-wedded wife came over the radio, 'Dear, would you come home and start the motor?'

In unison about 50 voices said, 'Ha, ha, ha.' Those are the facts. Farmers had to take time off to go home and start generators or engines to generate power—a great inconvenience. Also, nobody could run refrigerators or freezers on such power supplies and one needs a 240v power supply to run a television set. In these days air-conditioning is considered a necessity by all people in the city, including the members sitting in this Council.

**The Hon. Anne Levy:** No, you're wrong.

**The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN:** Well, a large percentage of the city community has air-conditioning and consider it their right to have it. Yet air-conditioning is unavailable if one does not have a 240v power supply. This is blatant discrimination. People pay dearly to live in the country, and goods are more expensive because of the freight paid on them. Freight is paid both to and from rural areas. I, for instance, pay to get my groceries to the country and pay to get my wheat to the seaport. In fact, the impost placed on the rural community by the Government's petrol tax will add considerably to the cost of living in the country, a cost that is already high enough. There are other added costs involved in living in the country. One such cost is that of education because many people have to drive their children to school or send their children to Adelaide to be educated because there is no adequate secondary education available in the area in which they live.

Fuel costs are becoming extremely high and the cost of transporting goods to the country is becoming a great burden on country people. I believe that the evening-up of the electricity tariff would eliminate a discrimination that presently exists against country people. It would also help to lower costs in country industry. All Governments say that they wish to decentralise industry and send it to the country,

yet there is no help for industry with power costs once it is outside the areas supplied by ETSA. In fact, in some areas supplied by ETSA where the power is distributed by local government there is still a 10 per cent impost on the cost of power used by industry.

If we wish to promote tourism we must make our tourism industry competitive. Yet how can city people go and see the sights in the country and rural industry at work if added power costs make the tourism industry in the country more expensive, thus causing them to pay higher accommodation tariffs? To put country dwellings on a similar footing to city dwellings we must even-up these tariffs.

This motion is in two parts and I will deal with the second part first. It deals with the 10 per cent impost on power generated by ETSA and distributed by district councils and asks that this impost be abolished; the district councils involved are Cowell, Cleve, LeHunte, Streaky Bay, Murat Bay, part of Elliston and part of Kanyaka/Quorn. As members are aware, electricity is generated both at Port Augusta and at Torrens Island. There are smaller generating plants, but they need not be included in this debate. The power generated at Port Augusta is distributed to Port Lincoln, on the lower part of Eyre Peninsula, and Tumby Bay via power lines that pass through the District Councils of Cowell, Kimba and Cleve. However, those district councils must pay 10 per cent more for their power than does Port Lincoln, which is at the end of that line. That astounds me! Even more astounding is that part of the Elliston District Council area has its power supplied and distributed by ETSA and while the other half of the area has its power supplied by ETSA but distributed by local government. Those receiving the power supplied by local government pay 10 per cent more for it than do those supplied with power directly by ETSA. This is an unfair and discriminatory practice.

I can quote cases of farmers with farms on either side of the road who are paying 10 per cent more for their power on one side of that road than they are paying for power on the other. Why then, if that is the case, are areas in the South-East, which are much farther away from the generating plants, not paying the 10 per cent extra for their power? Why are the far reaches of the Murray Mallee not paying this 10 per cent extra for their power supplies?

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** You ought to be careful—they might be equalised.

**The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN:** We want them equalised, as the Minister interjects. I will prove that a very small impost on the rest of the community could result in this being done. There are very high costs involved in supplying power to the rural community, especially to farmers, whose average cost of connection in my area is between \$4 000 and \$6 000 over and above the normal connection fee and whose tariff is 10 per cent higher than the city tariff. Many people take their power supply for granted. City people accept it and take it as a right. However, country people consider a power supply a luxury. I was once in that category. I can recall that 10 years ago a sealed road was built and the electricity connected during the same year. If I had the choice today of only one of those two facilities I would certainly choose to have an electricity supply because it brings civilised living to a farm. I think that a power supply is an essential part of living today and that the additional 10 per cent charged is a discriminatory impost on a few people.

I now turn to the first part of my motion which deals with the areas not supplied with power generated by ETSA but generated by diesel generators most of which come under the control of the Outback Areas Development Trust. These generating stations using diesel generators are run mainly by the Cowell Electric Supply Company, which does a super job. It is a very efficient outfit, but by their very nature diesel power generating costs are much higher than

running coal or gas powered generators. The company receives a subsidy from the Government. The areas mainly involved here are Coober Pedy, Kingoonya, Marla, Marree, Glendambo and Penong which, by anyone's standards, are remote areas and which need as much help as we can possibly give them.

If any member was to live in those areas for a length of time he would realise the difficulties that these people face, and the imposts that they have to put up with. Because they are isolated, these people do not get daily newspapers and they do not enjoy many of the more civilised amenities that we in the city enjoy. They put up with extreme heat in most cases, especially those who live in the centre of Australia, and they work hard, because of their isolation.

The disparity in regard to electricity tariffs is enormous, and I can cite some of the charges relating to those areas. Leaving aside Coober Pedy, one sees that there are six steps: for instance, a tariff starting at 15c per kilowatt descends in three steps to about half that rate, then rises in another three steps by 300 per cent from that lowest rate. If the tariff starts at, say, 15c, it ends at 22c per kilowatt after one consumes slightly more than 3 000 kilowatts. By comparison, considering the same first three steps, power in the city would cost about half that sum. If the price starts at, say, 13c in the city and descends to about half that rate, it levels out and increases by a mere 20 per cent after 3 000 kilowatts has been used. So, on the one hand in the city the price of electricity increases by 20 per cent after 3 000 kilowatts has been used but on the other hand in outback areas the price increases by 300 per cent. ETSA has stated that the reason for this is to discourage those people from using too much power. If I was to say to you, Mr President, 'Turn off your air-conditioner, your freezer, or your television set because you are using too much power,' I would be laughed at, but if members go into those areas and say the same thing (and that is what ETSA is telling those people—or that is what the Government is suggesting should be said to them to discourage them from using too much ETSA power), it is a different matter. Who are we to decide what people should do with their power? I would not like to be told that I cannot use X amount of power, but in the city people can use and waste as much power as they like.

People who live in outback areas are discriminated against, and I can cite examples of the different rates that are incurred because of the higher tariff that is imposed on those people. In this case I will refer to the general purpose tariff that is incurred at Marla. The small motel at Marla, by its very nature, requires a reasonable refrigeration service to supply drinks and services to people who go through the area and to some of the people who live in that small town. Over a 23-day period in June, that motel used 20 000 kilowatts of power at a cost of \$3 267. In the city that amount of power would cost \$1 644, almost half the price. Over a 36-day period the motel at Marla used 3 600 kilowatts of power at a cost of \$6 958, but in the city the same amount of power would cost \$2 650. I have rounded off the figures, but they demonstrate very clearly that if one lives in the outback one pays twice as much for power.

If I was trying to run a business and if every 36 days I had to pay a bill of \$6 958 for electricity, I am sure that I would have to charge a very bizarre tariff to tourists. What a disincentive this must be! What a mark-up these people must have to put on their goods and facilities! I believe that the situation is disgraceful. Having demonstrated that tariffs are very high, I now refer to the subsidy that the South Australian Government pays to ETSA to cover some of these areas—because this service is subsidised. In 1982, the subsidy was \$2.6 million. How much would be required to even out the tariffs so that outback areas paid tariffs that

were equivalent to the city rate? About \$1 million would be required.

**The Hon. J.C. Burdett:** Is that additional?

**The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN:** Yes, an additional \$1 million would be required, and so \$3.6 million would have been the subsidy for 1982-83 to even up the rate in country areas. From the Electricity Trust Report, one sees that ETSA has a revenue of \$400 million, so it is reasonable to assume that, in order to raise \$1 million, an increase across the State of .25 per cent would cover all of the country impost. Last December there was an increase in tariffs of not .25 per cent but 12 per cent because of the increase in the price of gas, so an increase of .25 per cent would be relatively small. Might I say that the people in these areas very rarely complain—that is their very nature, and that is why they stay in those areas. The system is very unfair. In this day and age, subsidies are paid; for instance, the *Troubridge* receives a very large subsidy.

**The Hon. I. Gilfillan:** No more than the railways receive.

**The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN:** The State Transport Authority receives a bizarre subsidy, and the E. & W.S. Department also receives a subsidy. Even the hallowed of hallows, the Festival Centre, receives quite a large subsidy. If the banning of tobacco advertising is carried through, the subsidy will be considerably more. I have outlined a few of the problems that are faced in regard to these very high tariffs and I hope that the Council will see fit to support this motion.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### TOBACCO ADVERTISING (PROHIBITION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 September. Page 818.)

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** This is a most important Bill. If passed, its implications will be felt beyond our State's borders. It deserves careful study and a reasoned response. This is the approach that the Liberal Party is giving and has given to the entire question of tobacco smoking.

Unlike the Government, we do not seek to have two bob each way by supporting the banning of tobacco advertising but only at some future date, sufficiently far off so that the legislation will have no effect on at least a generation of South Australians. The Liberal Party respects fully the Hon. Mr Milne's motives in introducing this private members Bill. He is obviously very concerned for the health and well-being of his fellow South Australians. That is not in doubt. His concern is to reduce the consumption of cigarettes, particularly amongst young people, because of the impact of cigarette smoking on one's health. That is an admirable objective. Regrettably, I do not believe that this Bill is the means to achieve that end. I accept, as I am sure do all members on this side of the Council, that we should, for the sake of their health, be encouraging people either to give up smoking or not to take it up in the first place. It is the question of how to achieve this that we must answer.

Smoking is an activity that has been taken up by Australians for many decades now. In economic terms we are a mature market. That is, we have reached an advanced state of market penetration. Unlike some Asian countries, for example, there is little option for substantial expansion in tobacco product consumption or sales. Indeed, recent figures indicate a static to declining Australian market. This being the case, we should ask ourselves 'What is the aim of advertising?' Is it aimed at expanding the market or of changing product consumption within an already limited or saturated market?



I believe that in fact the advertising of tobacco products in the Australian marketplace essentially redirects brand loyalties. A tobacco advertisement does not say 'smoke'—it says 'If you smoke—then choose brand 'X''. This is an important distinction. Such phenomena are not unusual in the market place. A similar example is petrol. Advertising will not cause people to consume more petrol. It aims, instead, to establish a difference between products. Economists call it 'product differentiation'. Despite, for example, all fuel coming from the Port Stanvac Refinery to the various company terminals at Birkenhead, each company markets their product or a mood associated with it (such as 'clean air and clean travelling') quite separately.

The capacity of advertising, in a 'mature' market such as Australia to expand total consumption is, I believe, limited. Tobacco consumption is relatively fixed, and in many respects the 'normal' market rules do not apply. Increased prices of tobacco products have in the past had little long-term effect on consumption. That is why tobacco (as well as beer and petrol) is an ideal item for increased taxes. Governments know that demand for these items will not change no matter what the price, and so hefty taxes, whilst raising prices, will not cause substantial drops in consumption—resulting in a net gain to the taxation coffers.

All members would have received, like I, a great deal of material from both those in support of and those opposed to the Bill. Each group raises a number of issues which warrant comment. First, however, I wish to deal with the implications of the proposed legislation. They are enormously widespread. For example, the definition of 'Advertisement' is as follows:

Any notice, circular pamphlet, brochure, programme, price list or other document or any package and includes any announcement, notification or intimation to the public or to any person.

If we ban advertising, not only will we be preventing magazine, newspaper, billboard, theatre and other typical advertising but also a small businessman will not be able to advise customers that cigarettes are available; nor will he be able to display even a price list. If a company sends out a price list to tobacco sellers this will contravene the law.

That is ludicrous. It means that it would be legal to sell tobacco products but not to (1) let people know that one has them, (2) let them know what type one has, and (3) what price one has charged. What would this do to competition? More than that, how hypocritical would Governments be to on the one hand accept \$1 000 million in State and Federal taxes and levies from the tobacco industry and then, on the other hand, ban advertising of these legally available products. The State Government is quite happy to take millions of dollars a year from a product which it says people should not consume. That money is not taken to mount an anti-smoking campaign or in an effort to price tobacco products out of the reach of most people. It is a blatant fundraising exercise.

In introducing his Bill, the Hon. Mr Milne said that he had the following three objectives:

1. To try to prevent children from taking up the smoking habit in the first place.
2. To make it easier for those who wish to give up smoking to do so, and
3. To persuade more people that smoking is socially selfish and unacceptable.

The banning of tobacco advertising may seem the simple way to achieve these objectives, but it will not work. There is no doubt that many young people are taking up smoking. They are also drinking alcohol as never before, trying out marihuana on a very wide scale (as the Minister of Health would acknowledge) and resorting to other disturbing activities like petrol and glue sniffing.

Members will be gravely disappointed if they believe that banning advertising of cigarettes, alcohol or petrol in isolation

(if at all) will succeed in driving young people away from drug abuse and risking their health for 'kicks'. Marihuana, of course, is an illegal commodity yet consumption is concerning. We need to search for the underlying causes of these trends and not respond to them in a kneejerk way simply by one-off measures such as this Bill. Problems of disillusionment and concern with materialism, rejection of traditional values, and growing peer and social pressure all contribute to difficulties among the young. These are the issues that we must address.

I do not believe that a ban on cigarette and tobacco advertising will reduce consumption. This view is borne out by overseas experience. In Singapore, for example, cigarette advertising was banned in 1970. Since that time cigarette consumption has grown both in terms of the total market and on a per capita basis.

It has been alleged that this growth can be attributable to large consumption by tourists who take advantage of the duty free market. This is not so. Domestic Singapore sales can be considered separately because a tax is levied by the Government on cigarettes in Singapore. An analysis of the internal Singapore market indicates that per capita consumption of cigarettes had risen from 1 364 in 1970 to 1 667 in 1981 (the most recent date). Singapore alone is not the only example. In Italy a total ban on cigarette advertising commenced in 1967. Since the ban has been in force there has been a 76 per cent increase in the cigarette market. There is no point in banning cigarette advertising unless such a move results in a reduction in the incidence of smoking.

In 1975 all forms of tobacco advertising and promotion were prohibited in Norway. While there has been some switch from smoking tobacco (roll your own) to manufactured cigarettes, there has been again an increase in total consumption. Again, the advertising ban has been ineffective. Consumption has not fallen, it has not even 'held the line'—it has increased.

In Poland we see a similar experience. Since 1972 there has been a total prohibition on any form of advertising or promotion of cigarettes. In 1972, when the ban commenced, 75 418 million cigarettes were consumed; by 1980 this figure had risen to 94 225 million, a 25 per cent increase! Already, of course, we have banned the advertising of cigarettes on television. Unfortunately the best interpretation one can give to the results of this attempt is that consumption has been static. Indeed, in Canada, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States of America consumption has continued to climb quite substantially.

The Hon. Mr Milne, in presenting his second reading explanation, failed to present the hard evidence which shows that a ban on cigarette and tobacco advertising will reduce consumption. Indeed, despite a number of countries having adopted such a prohibition on advertising, he has not referred to the impact of the bans in those countries. He is intent on relying on intuition rather than evidence.

This measure, not surprisingly, concerns many sporting, arts and community organisations which rely on sponsorship for their viability and development. It is a concern not confined just to those groups which rely on tobacco company support. It is shared by others who benefit from corporate sponsorship and who fear that they may be next—that this measure is only the thin end of the wedge. Will alcohol producers soon be prevented from sponsoring events? Will the Australian Democrats, because of their unrestrained hatred of uranium mining, seek to prevent companies such as B.P. and Western Mining Corporation from sponsoring sporting clubs or community events because of some mistaken view about uranium mining? These questions may seem exaggerated, but more than a decade ago the possibility

of a ban on tobacco advertising would have been seen as exaggerated, too.

The Hon. Mr Milne and the Minister have both failed to say where the money will come from if tobacco company sponsorship is withdrawn from sports and the arts. The Hon. Mr Milne has said that the Government will save a lot of money in the health system and will then be able to support the groups that will lose out as a result of his Bill. This is very naive. Sponsorship is measured in terms of millions of dollars. It will not be a sum easily picked up. Neither the State Government nor the Federal Government has said that it will pick up the tab. Indeed, on a recent radio programme the Federal Minister of Sport, Mr Brown, made his position quite clear. During an interview with Mr Ken Cunningham he said:

... It seems to me to be a base form of hypocrisy for society or Governments to, on the one hand, accept large grafts of money that are gained from excise or tax on cigarettes, allow them to be sold legally as non-prohibited products, and then, on the other hand, bar the advertising of them as being dangerous material.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** The same Minister said something about koalas at one stage, also.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** All right.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. R.J. Ritson):** Order!

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I am continuing to quote the Federal Minister (Hon. Mr Brown):

Now I can't subscribe to that view at all because I have got a distinct distaste for hypocrisy which is only transgressed by my distaste for cigarettes. So, wherever they can be legally sold, whatever Governments should accept the large amounts of money from the excise of cigarettes (and in the Federal Government's case it is \$800 million), I could not possibly support any proposition that would ban the advertising of them.

The interview continued:

Ken Cunningham: Well, John, I find that very refreshing; I must say that.

Brown: Let me add something to that, Ken: as yet there has been no evidence to suggest that advertising causes people to smoke. In fact, I rather believe that—I wouldn't say that the opposite has occurred—but, certainly, where advertising has been banned for tobacco products, consumption has gone up.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** He has both feet in his mouth most of the time.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I will not make any comment on the Minister's statements about his Federal colleague. Continuing what the Federal Minister said:

In Australia, where advertising is quite intense, the market is diminishing. Tobacco companies are advertising intensely, trying to recover their share of a diminishing market.

The interview continued as follows:

Cunningham: Well, John, what is the situation now? ... We see Dr Cornwall make the point this morning that they are trying to pass the Bill to ban tobacco sponsorship. Now, they will only do that if ... three other major States do in fact join forces with them. If that happens, what will be the move by the Federal Government? What are you able to do?

Brown: We don't have a formulated position on this subject. There is a Bill coming up before the House, and it is intended to put up a Private Members' Bill along the lines of banning tobacco advertising. If people are going to ban advertising of cigarettes because they are dangerous, what are they going to do about alcohol? There is one thing about cigarettes: if they are injurious to the health of people I subscribe fully to that view, but people very rarely have five or six cigarettes and get out in the car and kill someone else, as someone who is into alcohol does. Cigarettes certainly don't break up homes the way that alcohol does, and alcohol certainly has, in excessive use, a very deleterious effect on people's health. So why do they pick on cigarettes; why not alcohol?

Cunningham: Well, John, where are we with this situation, because I know that tobacco companies are concerned, and I know—and this is the important thing—the various sporting organisations are beside themselves?

Brown: Well, I am only giving my personal view because the Government doesn't have a concerted formulated view on this subject. The amount of money that tobacco companies subscribe to sporting advertising each year for sporting promotion ...

varies between \$10 million and \$20 million, but let's say \$15 million. Now if tobacco advertising was banned, and I don't think it is likely to happen in a democratic society, would it be very difficult for Governments to find the \$15 million? I just told you the Federal Government gets \$800 million out of excise on tobacco. How much do the State Governments get besides in terms of sales tax? Well, let me ask you, would it be much of an imposition on those Governments to replace that amount of money?

Cunningham: Well, they couldn't do it, because ... the State Governments are now saying that if this does happen it is up to the Federal Government to help those sporting organisations.

Brown: What, if the State Governments cut off their amount of funding that the Federal Government pick up the tab?

Cunningham: Yes.

Brown: Well, that's a nice position for them. Bully bully for them.

Dr Cornwall, in an interview with Mr Cunningham immediately following Mr Brown's interview, was very evasive when a commitment was sought from him for State Government sponsorship to take up that loss from tobacco companies. To quote Dr Cornwall:

What we have to do, and I have said this consistently, is to find a transition period. If, in fact, we move to a position, as I think we inevitably will throughout this nation, of banning tobacco advertising, then there has to be a transition period during which your sporting bodies, large and small, are able to find alternative sponsors. Now, that is probably, reasonably speaking, two to three years. You remember, of course, that in 1976 when active cigarette advertising was banned it was going to cause all sorts of difficulty for the advertising industry and for the proprietors of the electronic media. Now that slack was taken up. But I think exactly the same thing can happen with sporting organisations provided they are given a reasonable breathing space. Nobody, least of all me, wants to pull the plug out on the sporting organisations.

Cunningham: But, doctor, isn't that very loose? You know, on one hand the Government is so firm in its endeavour to have it banned, but, on the other hand, when we talk about supplying those sporting organisations with the money they may lose, the talk is very loose. I have got to be honest with you: there is nothing firm.

And, further on, after much pressing from Ken Cunningham—

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

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** The effect of smoking on health I have admitted. I have said that a measure such as this is not likely to reduce the incidence of smoking. So, continuing with this present matter of sports and arts sponsorship, it says:

—the best that we can get from the Minister is, 'I don't want to see money taken out of sport. I am sure that if we have to reorganise our Budget to guarantee that sort of money goes back in, then that is the sort of thing that we will have to think about. Well, thinking about it may be good enough for the Minister of Health but it is little comfort for the sporting and other groups which rely quite heavily on sponsorship. As I have said, I believe we could quite justifiably be criticised as being hypocritical in supporting this legislation on one hand but supporting the taxing of the tobacco industry on the other. I must comment on what I see as the hypocrisy of members opposite and the Australian Democrats in publicly criticising tobacco companies and their sponsorship of the arts and sports and yet only last Saturday, when free tickets were made available to members of Parliament to see the Australian Ballet Foundation's 21st Anniversary Gala Performance, the Australian Democrats and a number of Government members opposite jumped at the chance.

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting President. I refer to Standing Order 193 and ask that the honourable member withdraw his accusation that the Australian Democrats are involved in hypocrisy. The honourable member has broadened the use of the word, which is not allowable, and I seek a withdrawal.

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. R.J. Ritson):** The honourable member has alleged that the word 'hypocrisy' is unparliamentary. He has taken objection to a word which is used frequently in Parliamentary debate and which, whether desirable or not, contributes to the so-called colour

of Parliamentary debate. The term was not applied to any particular member, as I recall the phrase used and, therefore, I ask the Hon. Mr Milne to consider that it is accepted as part of ordinary debate.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I will repeat my last sentence. I must comment on what I see as the hypocrisy of members opposite and the Australian Democrats in publicly criticising tobacco companies and their sponsorship of the arts and sports and yet only last Saturday, when free tickets were made available to members of Parliament to see the Australian Ballet Foundation's 21st Anniversary Gala Performance, the Australian Democrats and a number of members opposite jumped at the chance.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** But not the Minister of Health.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** Yes, not the Minister of Health. I was there. I had no hesitation in going because I see nothing wrong with that kind of sponsorship. It was a great evening and a great credit to the ballet company and its sponsors. Yet, how was this excellent performance made possible? By tobacco company sponsorship! Full page advertisements indicated this sponsorship. Members opposite would have known of it. Could it be that free entry caused them to turn a blind eye? Is the Hon. Mr Milne really saying, "Do as I say, not as I do"? Surely, if honourable members believed strongly that tobacco company association with the arts and sports was undesirable they would not attend any events where this was involved.

The most recent polling information which has been made available to me indicates that the great majority of South Australians do not want to see Governments interfere with tobacco company sponsorship of sporting and cultural activities. This poll of 400 South Australians undertaken by the Roy Morgan Research Company (which has an excellent reputation as a polling organisation) sought responses to a number of questions. These were the results:

Question 1: Should the Government ban the sponsorship of sporting events, the arts and concerts by tobacco companies?

Answer:	Per cent
Ban .....	15.6
Allow as now .....	80.7
Cannot say .....	3.7

Question 2: Do you think tobacco companies sponsoring sporting events, the arts, and concerts is likely or unlikely to encourage any member of your family to take up smoking?

Answer:	Per cent
Likely .....	6.6
Unlikely .....	90.1
Cannot say .....	3.4

Question 3: If you are a non-smoker, do you think tobacco companies sponsoring sporting events, the arts and concerts is likely or unlikely to make you take up smoking?

Answer:	Per cent
Likely .....	0.8
Unlikely .....	98.1
Cannot say .....	1.1

This Bill, if passed, could place South Australia out on a limb—perhaps joined by Western Australia but certainly not by the major States, particularly New South Wales and Victoria. The New South Wales Government has made it very clear that it will not ban tobacco advertising and that it believes education is the answer. The Victorian Government is unlikely to act. Tasmanian and Queensland Ministers have expressed opposition to the ban also. Consequently, if this measure was passed we would have the ludicrous situation of all national magazines, newspapers and television broadcasts carrying tobacco advertising being in trouble. This double tier of advertising laws would be just as ludicrous and unacceptable as the Labor Government's 'three types of uranium' policy.

Compounding our isolation on the issue is the fact that the Western Australian Minister of Health is at odds with our Hon. Dr Cornwall, whose proposed amendments he quite rightly describes as a 'cop out'. The Minister of Health

seeks to appease the anti-smoking lobby but does not want to accept the responsibility for action which will deny South Australian sporting and cultural bodies hundreds of thousands of dollars in sponsorship.

We should be under no illusions as to the impact of this Bill on employment and job prospects in South Australia. It would be naive to think that at least \$7 million in sponsorship and promotion funds could be withdrawn from the economy without any guarantee of replacement and that this would have no effect on sporting, cultural and other bodies involved. In fact, it has been estimated that at least 150 jobs will be lost from the outdoor advertising industry alone as a result of this measure. What alternatives does the Hon. Mr Milne propose for these employees? He has given no consideration to their plight. It sounds simple to say that, if tobacco advertising no longer exists, these people will be able to work in advertising other products. What will happen is that the advertising industry will suffer a net loss. There will be no advertising available elsewhere. Certainly not in the short term, and certainly not in the kind of economy that we have at present.

The Liberal Party opposes this measure because it is taken in isolation of other anti-smoking measures. It is not part of a package or set of proposals aimed at reducing cigarette consumption and of educating the public to make them aware of the very serious health risks that they face when they smoke.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Already over \$500 000 has been spent, so—

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I was talking about the mover of the Bill. It seems a simple way out but it is not the answer. The Liberal Party is currently developing an extensive package of anti-smoking proposals which we believe will be more effective in, first, stopping people from taking up the smoking habit and, secondly, encouraging those who do smoke to give it up. I believe our record in Government in extending bans on public transport and funding an extensive anti-smoking campaign indicate that we do recognise the problems and that we are prepared to act with effective measures to combat them. However, we will not act in isolation putting jobs, sporting and cultural organisations at risk without clear evidence that the action which we are taking will be effective in achieving the goals that we seek. For those reasons, I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BALLET INVITATION

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** The Hon. Mr Burdett in his speech, which was otherwise restrained and remarkably fair, in parts, criticised the Hon. Mr Gilfillan and me for attending the ballet performance. I thought that the Council might be interested to know the facts.

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** Did you pay for your tickets?

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** When we received the offer of complimentary tickets from the Australian Ballet for its 21st anniversary we accepted that invitation, as did most members of Parliament who received the same invitation. No mention was made of sponsorship in that invitation. Subsequently we found, from several full-page advertisements, that the Benson and Hedges company was the main sponsor of the ballet.

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. R.J. Ritson):** Order! I ask the honourable member to explain the point on which he claims to have been misunderstood.

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** I am explaining it now, Mr Acting President. As one would expect, we made inquiries and were told the sponsorship figures and that the Benson and Hedges company contributed something less than 9 per cent of the total amount. The main sponsors, of course, are the Governments of Victoria and Western Australia and the Commonwealth Government, as I understand. Having ascertained that information, we felt that we should pay for our own tickets and should not accept complimentary tickets. This proved to be impossible or very difficult owing to the computer programme. Accordingly, we offered to the ballet company a donation equal to the value of the tickets and explained the situation. The offer was accepted by the ballet company, which was very grateful and courteous about it. We received the tickets and attended the performance of Swan Lake, which was an outstanding success. We are pleased that we supported the ballet, as we have done before, and see no reason whatever why we should not have gone to see it.

### TOBACCO ADVERTISING (PROHIBITION) BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** The Hon. Mr Milne's personal explanation serves to clarify what little research he has done into this subject because it has been known for many years that the Australian Ballet receives substantial support from the Benson and Hedges company. I suggest that, had he researched his subject, the honourable member would have appreciated that fact.

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** Do you think that the ballet would have gone on had he not given his donation?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** Perhaps the training of future ballerinas and other matters would have suffered because of that.

I regret that the Hon. Mr Milne has seen fit to reintroduce this Bill, which seeks to prohibit all forms of promotion of tobacco and tobacco products. This Bill is exactly the same as the previous Bill, which lapsed at the conclusion of the last session when I secured the adjournment of the debate.

**The Hon. K.L. Milne:** Was that a smoker's cough that I just heard from the honourable member?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** Yes, the honourable member has made me very angry. I would have hoped that over the recess the Hon. Mr Milne would use the time at his disposal to research this subject more fully and after some reasoned reflection decide to drop this measure. There is no evidence that the Bill will realise its stated aims. Moreover, it is clear from a perusal of the second reading speeches accompanying both Bills introduced by the Hon. Mr Milne that he has neither fully nor rationally considered the flow-on consequences of the measure.

I do not challenge that there is a relationship between cigarette smoking and health. The estimated percentage relationship between smoking and a variety of diseases and illnesses, as provided by the Australian Medical Association and highlighted by the Hon. Mr Milne, are disturbing in every instance. As a concerned citizen, however, Mr Milne is not alone in the view that efforts must be made to curtail the incidence of smoking, and, equally, to discourage people, particularly young people, from taking up the habit. It is easier never to take it up than it is to give it up once one has started.

The Liberal Party's State health policy notes the Party's commitment to initiating and supporting State-wide programmes and campaigns on health promotion and illness prevention. The policy emphasises that one of the focuses of this programme would be the conduct of anti-smoking

campaigns. In fact, it was a former Liberal Government that approved the anti-smoking campaign in the Iron Triangle which was subsequently undertaken by the present Government—the same campaign that the present Minister of Health claims as his own while ungraciously failing on all occasions to acknowledge the significant part played by Mrs Adamson, the former Health Minister, in this matter.

The A.L.P. State health policy also contains a commitment to anti-smoking campaigns. However, it goes further by supporting the promotion of a national programme to restrict advertising and sponsorship by tobacco companies while advocating that sporting bodies be encouraged to find alternative sponsors and that during the transition period they be helped financially. Incidentally, no reference is made in the A.L.P. policy to sponsorship of cultural organisations.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Which policy, the State platform or our fighting platform?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** This is the State policy issued before the last State election.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Have you looked at what the platform says about banning all forms of tobacco advertising?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** You went to the people at the last election on your policy, issued before that election.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** The policy I wrote went half way and the other half comes later.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I am referring to the policy you went to the people with at the last election.

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. R.J. Ritson):** Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** I repeat that the State A.L.P. health policy, which was issued before the last election and which, incidentally, the Minister claimed gave him a mandate for many actions undertaken to date that have been controversial, supports a restriction of advertising and sponsorship. Likewise, the Federal Labor Party's policy states under its health platform that in co-operation with State, Territory and local governments a Federal Labor Party will take further action to inhibit (and I emphasise the word 'inhibit') the promotion of cigarettes. In neither policy is there any reference to the prohibition of cigarette advertising. Members will appreciate that there are vast differences—

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** All that is just not true. If the honourable member reads the Party platform, she will see that that is so because she specifically talks about interim period sponsorship.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** The Minister will get an opportunity to reply later. I have read the policies, and that is what the Labor Party went to the people with at the last election.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Perhaps we should have a Royal Commission?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** Perhaps the Minister had better start considering Bills that are well framed. Members will appreciate that there is a vast difference in degree and emphasis between the meanings of the words 'restrict', 'inhibit' and 'prohibit'. Despite references in its policy to 'restrict', State Labor Party has now opted to support prohibition. It has done so without any reference by the Minister of Health to the fact that the State Government has the support of its Federal counterparts in adopting this course or any reference as to whether or not the Federal Government accepts the State Government's proposition that the Federal Government fund the shortfall in sponsorship moneys that will face sporting and cultural associations if prohibition of advertising and sponsorship is introduced.

I intend to discuss further the significant omissions in the State Government's support for the Bill, but before doing so I wish to outline the fundamental reasons why I do not support this Bill. Prohibition of advertising is being lauded by its proponents as an enlightened measure whereas,

in fact, it is consumer legislation at its worse. It is a weak discriminatory bob each way response to a perceived problem.

The Hon. Mr Milne went to extraordinary lengths in both of his second reading contributions, as did the Hon. Ms Levy last May, to distinguish between the prohibition on advertising of a harmful product and the banning of that product. Their efforts beg the question that, if the evidence is so conclusive that the smoking of tobacco and tobacco products is so appallingly harmful as to warrant a ban on the advertising of the product, why are the honourable members not advocating that the product itself be banned? Why do they restrict their action to banning the promotion of the product? There is no suggestion that cigarette companies have been unscrupulous, deceitful, or misleading in advertising their product—the grounds one normally uses for curtailing the activities of a company.

While adopting the 'cop out' approach outlined in this Bill, the advocates of the measure signal also that they have little confidence in the responsibility of individuals to distinguish between what is harmful and what is not harmful and to determine what is and what is not good for them. If the Australian Democrats and the Government are not prepared to declare smoking illegal, then I cannot accept that it should be illegal for a company that manufactures a product to promote that product. The Editor of the *Advertiser* on Friday 9 September accepted this proposition. The editorial stated:

The greatest truth is that the community has not declared smoking illegal, and for as long as it remains a legitimate, albeit stupid, personal past time, so must there be rights to manufacture, to sell and to advertise the product, subject to the usual restraints of honesty, legality and good taste.

If smokers are to have the democratic right to smoke, if Governments consider that it is legitimate to tax cigarettes heavily (and the Hon. Mr Burdett highlighted the figures—\$30 million in South Australia in the forthcoming financial year, and \$800 million federally) than I believe most strongly, indeed uncompromisingly, that the companies that manufacture tobacco and tobacco products must have the democratic right to advertise their product.

Associated with this concern is the question of the flow-on effect of such a significant move as banning advertising by these companies. Where will it end? What product will be next? Perhaps alcohol, including wine, will be the next target. Certainly, many people are genuinely concerned about the effects on health of the consumption of alcohol, and I can cite a resolution that was proposed by the South Australian Young Liberals at a conference on Saturday 27 August last. The resolution stated:

That this conference believes that in the interest of health and public safety all forms of advertising alcohol beverages should be prohibited.

Fortunately, that resolution was resoundly defeated. While the maintenance of the right that companies legally manufacturing a product should be able to advertise that product, forms the basis of my objection to this Bill, my opposition has been broadened by the fact that, in countries where bans on advertising tobacco and tobacco products have been imposed by Governments, in each instance either the bans have been totally ineffective or their impact in reducing the incidence of smoking has been minimal. It is significant, I believe, that no member who has supported the Bill to date has referred to the experience of countries in which bans have been in force.

The Hon. Mr Burdett went to some lengths to highlight the experiences in Poland, Singapore, Italy, Finland, and Norway where complete bans on cigarette advertising have been enforced for some time. Because it is relevant to the measure before us, I shall also allude to the statistics. A ban

was imposed in Poland in 1972, but the total consumption of tobacco and tobacco products increased from that date by 23 per cent; in Singapore, consumption has increased by 44 per cent since 1970; and in Italy, by 70 per cent since 1962. Incidentally, I understand that Italy is considering lifting the ban. In Norway, consumption has increased by 16 per cent since 1975.

In the Communist bloc all countries have imposed a complete ban on all forms of advertising for a long period. That ban has been imposed in Russia for 60 years. Yet there has been a significant increase in cigarette consumption. Since 1970, consumption in Communist bloc countries has increased faster than it has in the Western world. In Australia, where there has been a partial ban since 1976, when direct advertising was prohibited on radio and television, consumption has increased. Although the Hon. Mr Milne suggested that this is not so, the figures provided to me by the Australian Bureau of Statistics on the total number of Australian-manufactured cigarettes sold to adults of 18 years and over confirmed that in 1971, 27.931 billion cigarettes were consumed in Australia; in 1972, 27.547 billion; in 1973, 28.423 billion; in 1974, 30.072 billion; in 1975, 31.663 billion; in 1976, 31.970 billion; in 1977, 31.052 billion; in 1978, 32.626 billion; in 1979, 32.359 billion; in 1980, 32.883 billion; and in 1981, the latest year for which these figures are available, 34.137 billion cigarettes were consumed.

It gives me no joy to refer to the increase in the number of cigarettes consumed since full or partial bans were introduced in Poland, Singapore, Italy, Finland, Norway and Australia, but I do so because it is necessary to highlight in this debate that, where bans have been introduced, they have been ineffective. There is no reason to assume that total bans on the promotion of tobacco and tobacco products will be any more effective in South Australia or in Australia in curtailing the incidence of smoking, and thus I find it difficult to accept the need for such a disruptive measure which has not been proven to be successful elsewhere.

What supporters of this Bill fail to recognise is that people will smoke if they want to do so. Indeed, people will participate in any action if they wish to do so, whether or not that action is illegal, harmful, or is perceived by society to be desirable, and that is not confined to cigarette smoking. For example, a review of data from British Columbia, where a total ban on alcohol advertising has been in force for some years, made clear that there has been no impact on the consumption of alcohol by youths or adults. Likewise, in France, where the advertising of whiskey has been prohibited since 1975, in that year imports of Scotch whiskey amounted to 170 000 proof gallons. In 1979, imports totalled 6 294 000 proof gallons. Whatever caused the increase, it certainly was not advertising.

The use of marihuana is another example. Despite the fact that it is illegal to use this product and the widespread concern about its use (and, of course, it is not advertised), tens of thousands of Australians are reported to be regular users of marihuana. In America, according to *Time* magazine, there are 25 million users of marihuana who spend 25 per cent more in acquiring the product than cigarette smokers expend on cigarettes. The prohibition of advertising tobacco and tobacco products will not discourage people from smoking if they do not wish to be discouraged, any more than advertising will encourage people to smoke if they do not wish to do so.

People smoke for a variety of reasons, ranging from stress to mere enjoyment. As much concern has been expressed by earlier speakers about the increase and incidence of smoking amongst youths, it is worth noting that the various studies into the causes of juvenile smoking, collated by the National Heart Foundation for a paper entitled "Why do children smoke?", point to factors such as parental influences,

peer group pressure, low self-esteem, low scholastic achievement, and the amount of money in one's pockets. Those factors are all responsible for people choosing to smoke.

Advertising does not feature as a significant factor in any of the studies referred to by the National Heart Foundation. However, I acknowledge that the Foundation supports the prohibition of advertising. It is also worth noting that the results of a recent survey conducted by the Roy Morgan Research Centre for W.D. & H.O. Wills indicated that 90.1 per cent of people surveyed thought it unlikely that tobacco company advertising would encourage any member of their family to take up smoking. Of the non-smokers surveyed, 98.1 per cent believed it unlikely that sponsorship would make them take up smoking.

The surveys demonstrate that, notwithstanding whether or not advertising exists, people will still smoke if they so desire. The surveys also support the argument presented by tobacco companies—an argument that the Hon. Mr Milne has conceded is substantially true, that is, that advertising is not aimed at encouraging people to smoke; rather, it is aimed at encouraging people to switch brands.

**The Hon. K.L. Milne:** Where did I admit that?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** The Hon. Mr Milne made that comment in the second reading explanation of his first Bill.

**The Hon. K.L. Milne:** What did I say?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** It is not entirely convenient for me to find the Hon. Mr Milne's actual words.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr Milne can look through *Hansard* and find the relevant passage at a later date.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** It would be nice if the Hon. Mr Milne could remember what he said. The Hon. Mr Milne also said:

Certainly, the most heavily advertised brands and the brands most involved in sponsorship are the most visible in the community.

Considering that a 1 per cent shift in consumption one way or the other can make a \$19 million difference to a tobacco company's revenue base, it is not surprising that competition between companies is so fierce. Advertising is essentially the cutting edge of efficiency in competition. The tobacco industry is a highly competitive industry and advertising is what companies depend upon to outdo their competitors. I am astonished that the Hon. Mr Milne, with sublime naivety (a word that the Hon. Mr Burdett used often in reference to the Hon. Mr Milne), said, 'I do not know what all the fuss is about.' Again, the Hon. Mr Milne said that in his second reading explanation.

**The Hon. K.L. Milne:** That is a misquote.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** No, it is not. If the Hon. Mr Milne reads his explanation he will find that it is a direct quote. I would not misquote the Hon. Mr Milne. The Hon. Mr Milne, by foul means, by denying tobacco companies their legitimate right to advertise their products, is challenging their viability and in turn their capacity to employ many thousands of people in this State and elsewhere who depend directly or indirectly on the viability of tobacco companies for their employment and the livelihood of their families. I suggest that it is an entirely different matter if the profitability of tobacco companies is affected by a downturn in the consumption of cigarettes resulting from a rational decision by a person to either give up cigarettes or not to take up smoking in the first place. That distinction seems to have escaped the Hon. Mr Milne and Government members.

While I am on the matter of campaigns being waged by those affected by this measure, I refer to an amazing statement by the Hon. Mr Milne in his second reading explanation of the first Bill that he introduced. I do so because it seems

to demonstrate my contention that he has failed to consider the consequences and flow-on effects of the Bill. The Hon. Mr Milne referred to a full-page advertisement placed in the Western Australian *Daily News* of 15 November 1982 by the Australian Association of National Advertisers, the Advertising Federation of Australia, and the Authorised Newsagents Co-operative Limited. I spent some days searching for that advertisement and it took considerable effort on the part of the Parliamentary Library in Western Australia to send me a copy of the advertisement.

The advertisement refers to 11 problems that would result from a private member's Bill introduced by a Liberal member in the Western Australian Parliament. The Hon. Mr Milne refused to cite the 11 problems, but I imagine that that is because he did not see the advertisement. However, the Hon. Mr Milne's comment on the advertisement (and I am not quoting him out of context) was:

All of the 11 problems are exaggerated in my view, and most of them do not apply to this Bill, I hope.

The statement that the Hon. Mr Milne simply hopes that the problems, which include diminished employment opportunities, would not apply in South Australia if this Bill passes, is an inadequate response to the genuine concerns of those employed in the tobacco industry, and it is an unsound basis on which to introduce a Bill.

I was interested to read in the *Australian* of 30 June 1983 that the Australian Foundation on Alcoholism and Drug Dependency, the watchdog on alcohol and drug abuse in Australia, in a submission to the Media Council, stated that a total ban on cigarette advertising is unrealistic and a ban on alcohol advertising is unnecessary. The Media Council has been reviewing the advertising codes that relate to the ethics on advertising cigarettes and alcohol. The Executive Director of the foundation, Mr Pierre Stolz, said that it was more important to restrict advertising by the use of stricter controls over advertising that depicts alcohol and tobacco as part of a glamorous life style than it was to ban such advertising at this stage. I support that course. I do so because it is evident from an extensive range of material that any deceleration in the growth of consumption is more likely to be due to changing public awareness in matters of health and not the result of the banning of the advertising of cigarettes. Thus, I also support the use of more education programmes in the community to discourage people from taking up smoking and to encourage smokers to give up the practice.

The anti-smoking campaign conducted in the Iron Triangle earlier this year was obviously successful, because 11.4 per cent (or 2 152 people) of all smokers in the test area gave up smoking during the programme period of three months. The Minister of Health has indicated that, if the most conservative figures resulting from the campaign were projected on a State-wide basis, it could be anticipated that a State-wide programme would result in more than 20 000 smokers giving up the habit on a permanent basis. Therefore, I welcome the Minister's announcement that a State-wide programme will be launched next year on similar lines to that conducted in Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and surrounding areas.

It is pleasing to see also that similar State-wide campaigns have been or will be held in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. I also indicate that I have no objection to increases in the excise and franchise measures on cigarettes, which will amount to \$883 million federally and \$30 million in South Australia this financial year.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** That's a gross exaggeration. I think you have inserted an extra zero.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** If I have, I will correct it in *Hansard* tomorrow morning.

Further, I have no objection to non-smoking zones being created in response to community pressure. I would not support, however, the creation of such zones by Government regulation and intrusion.

A great deal of the discussion surrounding this Bill centres on the effect that the provisions will have on the cultural and sporting organisations and community events that currently receive sponsorship from tobacco companies. While sponsorship of these organisations has been a long-standing practice by tobacco companies, the level of sponsorship has increased dramatically since 1976, when the advertising of tobacco and tobacco products was banned on television and radio. Having been denied access to advertising through these avenues, the companies sought, in addition to direct advertising through the print media, to maintain their public profile through sponsorship. Sponsorship is no substitute for direct advertising which, of course, is the most effective means by which the companies can communicate with the people who wish to smoke.

An assumption underlies the arguments of both the mover of this Bill and of the Government members who have indicated support for this Bill that when tobacco companies are no longer able to advertise the fact that they sponsor an organisation there will be a queue a mile long of companies falling over themselves to fill the gap. The very fact that they put forward the argument that the gap left on radio and television following the decision to ban tobacco companies using this means of direct advertising would be quickly filled by other companies seeking to advertise their products conveniently overlooks the fact that direct advertising is a cost-effective form of advertising. Sponsorship is not, and it is at best mischievous to suggest that there is a bottomless pit of money that companies can use as they wish for sponsorship.

Indeed, in this year alone, the Rugby League in New South Wales is in considerable financial difficulty, as is the South Melbourne Football Club, because of the decision of sponsors to withdraw from supporting those clubs. Colgate, Mazda and Philips also have announced recently that they will not continue to sponsor a number of the organisations which they have supported heavily in the past. In fact, over the past 12 months, \$7.5 million has been withdrawn by private sponsors throughout Australia and has not been replaced. If any member seeks to ask any cultural or sporting organisations to relate their experience in gaining sponsorship, they will hear a tale of hard and time-consuming work, or a tale of woe. It is not surprising, therefore, that sporting and cultural organisations will not accept the platitudes offered by the Hon. Mr Milne or the Government that sponsors will in time come to fill the gap that the supporters of the Bill will have created by denying cigarette companies the right to advertise the fact that they sponsor an event.

While the sponsors of this Bill blithely accuse cultural and sporting bodies of exaggerating the effect of the Bill on their organisations, its supporters have compounded this anxiety by refusing to accept any responsibility for the outcome of their decision. The Minister of Health, for example, has made it quite clear that he does not see that it is the State Government's responsibility—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I must appeal to honourable members. There are four audible conversations going on, each one almost as loud as the member who has the call. Will members please refrain from this loud communication.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** The Minister of Health, for instance, has made it quite clear that he does not see that it is the Government's responsibility to fill the void in sponsorship left by the exit of tobacco sponsorship.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** The State Government?

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** That is what I said: it is not the State Government's responsibility.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** It is the State Government that is making the decision to ban the advertising. All that the Minister has said in relation to the State Government is that it will continue to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** All that the Hon. Dr Cornwall has said in relation to the State Government is that it will continue to press the Federal Government to provide adequate financial assistance for a realistic period during which these groups can seek alternative sponsors. He has given no guarantee that the Federal Government is prepared to accept the role that he believes that it should fill. He has given no indication of what he means by adequate financial assistance. If he wishes to be considered (and, in turn, if he wishes the Government to be considered) responsible for the actions that are being proposed, surely he should be reassuring recipients of sponsorship that he and the State Government will call on the Federal Government to reimburse in full the sponsorships that have been lost by their actions.

However, all that the State Government is calling for is 'adequate financial assistance'. I wonder what the Minister means by 'adequate'. Does he mean 100 per cent, 80 per cent, 50 per cent or 30 per cent? This he has not been prepared to disclose to date. Nor has the Minister or the State Government given any indication of the length of time that they envisage for the transition period—

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Three years will be adequate.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** That is the first indication. The Minister says that he thinks that three years will be adequate. It will depend on what his Federal Government colleagues say, because he is seeking that they fund the cultural and sporting organisations during that transition period of three years. What if those organisations which currently have a long-standing, amicable and beneficial arrangement with a tobacco company as sponsor are not able to find an alternative sponsor prepared to sponsor at the same level as the current sponsor during that period of (and I quote the Minister) three years? Will the Minister after that transition period of three years simply sit back while that organisation is required to curtail its programme, reduce the payments that it makes to athletes and performers, or cease its training courses for youth and talented individuals?

This Bill, and the Government's support for it, has been inadequately researched. Too many basic and major questions remain unanswered. The Bill is based on assumptions that the banning of advertising will be effective in reducing the incidence of smoking and on hopes that the fears of those employed in tobacco companies, either directly or indirectly, and the fears of organisations currently receiving sponsorship will not be realised. That basis is a most inadequate one for any Bill before the Council, but especially one such as this Bill which is more than likely to be used as a precedent for further bans on other products which companies are legally allowed to manufacture. I do not support the second reading.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I rise to indicate my support for the second reading of the Bill before us, while indicating my support for the amendment which has been circulated. I do not intend to speak at length in view of the fact that I stated my opinions quite clearly in the debate on 1 June. I was interested that the Hon. Miss Laidlaw said that she had read my speech from that time, but then showed lack of knowledge of what is A.L.P. policy, which I clearly outlined and quoted in my speech.

*The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** The Federal Labor Party policy states under its health platform:

In co-operation with State, Territory and local governments, a Federal Labor Party will take further action to inhibit the promotion of cigarettes.

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** Inhibit!

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** Yes, to inhibit the promotion of cigarettes. The State A.L.P. policy, as part of its health platform, states:

Labor will prohibit advertising and promotion of tobacco products.

If the Hon. Miss Laidlaw would like to look at my speech of 1 June again and also at the *Hansard* of today's speech, she will then no longer need to say that she does not know what is Labor Party policy on the matter.

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** If that is Labor Party policy, why did the Minister not refer to that in his speech in support of the Hon. Mr Milne's Bill?

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** He does not have to refer to everything—

**The Hon. Diana Laidlaw:** One would have thought that it would be to his advantage.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** He might have taken it for granted that other people had read my speech, which set out this matter, and remembered it so that there was no need to keep stressing the obvious. If the honourable member will excuse me, I will get on with my speech. On 1 June I indicated clearly my support for the approach which has been adopted of preventing advertising of tobacco products but not doing it unilaterally in one State only. Many of my reasons are set out in that speech.

Quotations have been given this afternoon suggesting that a matter such as this does not have popular support and that in other countries such prohibition has been ineffectual. I wish to counteract those statements with some facts. The most extensive survey ever carried out on the advertising of tobacco was conducted by McNair Anderson in 1981 and surveyed over 11 500 people, a large sample indeed for a survey of this type.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** Was that in Australia?

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** Yes, in Australia. In response to the question, 'In your opinion should smoking advertisements be banned totally from newspapers?' 56 per cent of Australians said, 'Yes'; 56 per cent also said, 'Yes' to that same question in regard to magazines. Asked about cinemas, 67 per cent of Australians said, 'Yes'. In regard to outdoor posters, which can be seen by children, 66 per cent of Australians said, 'Yes', that advertising should be banned.

There can be no doubt that a survey of this magnitude and with these results gives the lie to the suggestion that there is not popular support for the banning of smoking advertisements in this country. It has been suggested that a ban on advertising does not work and has no effect. The Hon. Miss Laidlaw tried to suggest that there has been no effect in the Scandinavian countries or Singapore. True, there has been no decline in cigarette sales in Singapore, but honourable members should remember that since the advertising ban was applied in Singapore there has been a doubling of the number of tourists visiting Singapore and, as anyone who has visited Singapore will know, it is a place where tourists buy their duty-free cigarettes before leaving for home.

In Norway there is considerable data showing that cigarette consumption has fallen in many age groups, particularly amongst children. In the case of children 13 years of age, smoking rates fell from 7 per cent to 5 per cent. It dropped in 14-year-olds from 17 per cent to 12 per cent, and from 25 per cent to 21 per cent in 15-year-olds. Likewise, in Sweden there has been a considerable drop in cigarette

consumption amongst children. Amongst 16-year-old boys in Sweden, cigarette smoking has fallen from 41 per cent to 21 per cent and for 16-year-old girls there has been a similar fall from 47 per cent to 34 per cent in terms of the numbers who are smoking.

In my mind there is no doubt that in countries where smoking advertisements have been removed there has been a fall in the number of children smoking cigarettes. To me, this is an extremely important fact. It is often claimed that cigarette advertising does not induce people to smoke and that the advertisements are designed merely to promote one brand as opposed to another. However, there is much evidence that cigarette advertisements do have an effect on children, and I refer to one study that is being done. The Western Australian National Heart Foundation in co-operation with the Western Australian Education Department undertook a study in 1980. The survey of children to determine what was their reaction to cigarette advertising showed that 87 per cent of children surveyed named four of the top advertised brands in Australia. A Sydney survey at about the same time showed that, amongst the children who smoked, 67 per cent smoked the four most advertised brands out of the 130 brands available in Australia.

At the same time only 53 per cent of adult smokers smoked those four most advertised brands and, to me, this is a clear indication that children who smoke are more likely to be influenced by advertising than are adults, because we have the top four most advertised brands being smoked by only 53 per cent of adult smokers but smoked by 67 per cent of children who smoke.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** Is this from the MacNair Anderson survey, too?

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** No, this is from work done in Sydney by Chapman and Fitzgerald, in a paper called, 'Brand preference and advertising recall in adolescent smokers: some implications for health promotion'. I have the reference here. The Bill before us suggests a ban on advertising of tobacco products only. It is not a ban on sponsorship. Sponsorship can continue as much as the tobacco companies wish. However, they will not be able to advertise the fact that they are sponsors. If they are so completely philanthropic—

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** Its absolutely illogical to argue that point.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** If they really wish to sponsor sport and cultural activities, there will be nothing whatever to prevent them from so doing. However, they will not be able to advertise that fact, so their philanthropy can be really determined. The comments of members opposite suggest to me that they are well aware that current sponsorship is not undertaken because of philanthropic motives.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** You are just terribly naive.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** Me?

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

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** There have been suggestions, which I understand have come by way of telegram to some members of Parliament, that a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into all aspects of the proposed legislation on tobacco advertising. I have a telegram here from Mr Roach, General Manager of the South Australian Football League Incorporated. One wonders just how much support there is for this idea of a Select Committee in sporting circles, but it is undoubtedly being pushed by Mr Roach from the Football League.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** He is the only one.

**The Hon. C.M. Hill:** What is your view?



**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** It is certainly an interesting proposition, but I wonder whether the promoters of it realise quite what this might involve.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** A Select Committee has many of the powers of a Royal Commission. It can send for books, papers and records and can subpoena witnesses. It can examine in great detail the affairs of the relevant bodies. I suggest that a Select Committee would be able to call for the records of all the tobacco companies, could accurately determine just how much sponsorship—

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Is that how you see a Select Committee working?

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I am merely telling the Council what a Select Committee can do. It has the powers to do these things.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** And the duty.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! There have been enough interjections.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** Reconvene the uranium Select Committee.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I ask the Hon. Mr Davis to cease interjecting.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Why don't you name him?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Miss Levy.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** A Select Committee would have a duty to investigate the full effect of tobacco sponsorship which to me indicates the examination of books and records, both of sporting bodies and of tobacco companies. I fail to see how it could carry out its job without doing this. I respectfully suggest that the sender of the telegram is perhaps unaware of the full ramifications of calling for a Select Committee and that there may, indeed, be consternation in certain circles if a Select Committee is set up.

However, I am sure that the people to whom the telegram has been sent will seriously consider the merits or otherwise of having such a Select Committee. I will not take up further time of this Council with this matter. My position has been made very clear on a previous occasion, and I merely wish to add my support today to the mover of the Bill and to answer some of the misrepresentations which have been emanating from speakers on the other side of this Chamber. I support the second reading.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition):** That was a most unusual speech from the Hon. Miss Levy. She demonstrated, first, her lack of knowledge of what goes through the mind of the Minister of Health.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** That is a challenge.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Yes, it is. I recall quite clearly that the Minister of Health rose in this Chamber and had a lot to say about McNair Anderson and a survey that they did on drugs.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** That is the 1981 survey.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Yes.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Do not worry, Mr President, I will be right over the top of any problem. The Minister said the following:

Frankly, your McNair Anderson survey did not stand up at all.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** Is that the survey that Miss Levy quoted?

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Yes. I think that there is need for more liaison and co-operation between members of the Government if they are going to use statements that the Minister has previously found embarrassing. The Hon. Miss Levy has just left the Chamber—probably for a cigarette! I am sure that her speech created great embarrassment

for the Minister because of his previous words. I have looked at the *Hansard* report, which I think is a bit short and which I think might have had a few things that were said taken out of it. I have no proof of that without looking up the original proofs, but a lot more was said. The only other reference I can find has the Minister saying the following:

The result can be quite bodgie if one hires a crook company.

That was said by the Hon. Dr Cornwall.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** About another matter. You are a bigger rogue than I thought.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** That comment aside, the Hon. Miss Levy is now trying to say that that was a good survey. We thought that in the first place, but the Minister rubbished it. Having started thinking that perhaps he was saying the right thing, we then find the Hon. Miss Levy wanting to refer to it. It is a matter of using things when they are suitable.

Let us look at how genuine the people are who are actually promoting this Bill. The Hon. Mr Milne got quite upset this afternoon when a Liberal member on this side accused not him personally but his Party of being hypocritical in taking up the invitation to go to the ballet. Then, somehow, they cleansed themselves by sending a bit of money to the ballet. If one is going to be genuine one has to be totally genuine, and that does not include taking advantage of such things at all.

The ballet would not have been on except for the cigarette company's sponsorship, so the honourable member was taking advantage of something that was happening purely because of the sponsorship of a cigarette company. The sending of a few dollars makes no difference to whether or not they continue in Adelaide. I think honourable members would find that the ballet was not waiting for the \$30 or \$40 it received from the two honourable members.

**The Hon. K.L. Milne:** This is entirely irrelevant and nothing whatever to do with the Bill.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** No, it is not.

**The Hon. K.L. Milne:** It has nothing to do with the argument.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** The honourable member is quite prepared to accept the benefits from cigarette companies. I was told that the Hon. Dr Cornwall's wife accepted free tickets on his behalf, so that is another example—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** I am referring to the Bill.

**The PRESIDENT:** The honourable member is a long way from the Bill.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** Leave my wife out of it. You are absolutely in contempt. You are a diseased man.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** My wife attended the ballet, so I will bring her into it, too.

**The Hon. J.R. Cornwall:** You are in contempt, Cameron.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** It is a fact of life that if one is genuine about these things, one does not accept the benefits. If we do not believe in things, we must maintain a genuine point of view and we must not take advantage of what is offered by these people. If the two members who have been promoting this Bill were genuine, they would have included liquor under this Bill, because that is another factor that causes problems in this world. In fact, it is a greater problem, because it affects innocent people. What is being done about that?

*The Hon. K.L. Milne interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** The Hon. Mr Milne is promoting this action. If he were genuine, he would have

included liquor, but he is not genuine because he is not including both aspects. When the Hon. Dr Cornwall was challenged on this matter on that radio programme, he made certain remarks. A member on this side quoted at length from an interview by Ken Cunningham. Cunningham asked:

Where do we go from here?

That was in reference to the cigarette advertising ban. The Hon. Dr Cornwall replied:

Oh, I think we keep talking, Ken.

Cunningham said:

No, I mean with other products, like with alcohol.

That is when the embarrassment started, because the Hon. Dr Cornwall said:

Oh, alcohol.

I could hear his mind going around as I listened. I wondered how he would get out of that one, because it was a bit of a problem. Cunningham said:

With fast foods . . .

And Dr Cornwall replied:

Alcohol is not always harmful in moderation—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** The Hon. Dr Cornwall stated:

Alcohol is not always harmful in moderation, as I am sure you know yourself.

Cunningham said:

Doctor, gee . . .

I do not know what Dr Cornwall said after that, but he obviously went off the air. Cornwall then said:

It is not harmful. Surely . . .

Cunningham said, in a very surprised voice:

It is not harmful? How can you say that?

The Hon. Dr Cornwall said:

In moderation. I can say it because it is a fact. It is when we get people abusing alcohol that it is . . .

And he was stopped then, because Cunningham was obviously very surprised, and said:

Yes, well that does happen and that does cause the death of innocent people.

Cornwall said:

Sure.

Cunningham said:

Well, isn't that a concern also?

And the Hon. Dr Cornwall said:

Of course it is a concern. But what is the point you are trying to make?

At that stage I burst out laughing, I must say. The point that Mr Cunningham was trying to make was fairly obvious to me, and the point was that alcohol was just as big a problem as, perhaps a greater problem than, cigarettes. Cunningham said:

Well, I am saying that if you start on tobacco companies—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** It is all right.

**The PRESIDENT:** It is not all right at all. I said 'Order!'

I want a lot less noise in the Council while the debate is continuing.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Cunningham then said:

Well, I am saying that if you start on tobacco companies then obviously you have just got to follow through such as alcohol.

The Hon. Dr Cornwall said:

You are talking advertising.

Everyone except the Minister knew that Ken Cunningham was referring to advertising. The Minister knew as well, but he was trying to get out of trouble. Cunningham said:

Yes I am.

And Cornwall replied:

You are not talking about prohibition I trust?

Everyone except the person on the other end of the phone knew that Ken Cunningham was not talking about prohibition. Cunningham said:

No, I am talking about advertising, the same as they talk about tobacco advertising.

The Hon. Dr Cornwall went on to talk about how there was to be a pre-Christmas education programme on the evils of alcohol abuse and drink driving. That is the sort of concept that is a great idea in regard to alcohol and cigarettes, if that is what the Government thinks is proper. I do not object to an education programme, but on the one hand the Government says, 'We will have an advertising campaign to tell people of the evils of alcohol,' and on the other hand it says, 'We will ban the advertising of cigarettes.' There are two concepts. We must be straight with people. We have to do one thing or the other. As the honourable member has decided on that course in regard to alcohol, he should stick to it. We know why the two members who are promoting this Bill will not consider the two aspects.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** What about random breath testing?

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Yes. We know that alcohol and wine in this State are a major industry, and the honourable members do not want to touch that because it is too embarrassing. However, tobacco that is produced in Queensland is another matter, and the honourable members believe that they might get some support from the community in regard to that product. It is pure hypocrisy. The Bill is stepping into this field and is disturbing, unnecessarily, a lot of relationships between sporting groups and tobacco companies, and the honourable member is not even genuine, because the Bill is now to be amended.

The Hon. Mr Milne has fallen for the three-card trick. He will introduce amendments which, in my view, will almost erase the thing from the record unless some other States agree. There is a proper course of action that the Minister of Health of this State could take if he believed that this action was required, and that is to take the matter to the conference of Federal and State Ministers so that a decision can be made by all Health Ministers and brought back as a proper Bill with proper action being taken by all States, not in this piece-meal fashion that the Minister is trying to achieve. That is the proper way to go about it, but the Minister is not taking that course. He will try to slip in underneath a Bill that was introduced as a private member's Bill.

I do not believe that that is a proper course to take, and the Minister should withdraw his support for this Bill. If he wants the matter to be discussed properly, he should raise the issue at the Commonwealth and State Ministers level, and that is where the matter should be discussed so that one view is expressed for the whole of Australia. Let people then discuss the problems that will occur in regard to financing. The Minister said today that if money is to be replaced by sporting bodies, the Federal Government will have to do it. If that is not the most incredible proposition, I do not know what is.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** The Minister said 'Bully, bully for them.'

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Yes, because he received an answer from the Federal Minister for Recreation and Sport, who said, 'Bully for them.' I can well understand that.

**The Hon. L.H. Davis:** He gave them a koala to hold.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Yes. How on earth can the State Minister expect the Federal Minister to replace the funds that will disappear from this State because of a decision

made by the State Minister without discussion with the Federal Minister? That would have to be the most naive proposition I have ever heard. Somehow, the Minister expects that this money will magically appear from the Federal Government. What the Minister does not say is that it does not matter where the money comes from, because it all comes from the people and, if money is to be replaced, it will come from the people in any case somewhere along the line.

However, the Minister should raise that matter not in this State but at the Commonwealth level through the Federal Government. We have already been told by the Federal Minister that that is not on. I can understand the Federal Minister's taking that point of view when the matter is not being raised as a result of discussion at the proper level—at the level of the Commonwealth and State Ministers of Health. That is the way it should be done. I urge members to reject this Bill.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BALLET INVITATION

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** During the course of the diatribe to which we have become accustomed from the honourable Leader of the Opposition (and I use the word 'honourable' purely in the formal sense), the Leader referred to ballet tickets for *Swan Lake* last Saturday night. I make clear to the Council that when I received the invitation (and as Minister of Health I receive a lot of invitations), I accepted it in good faith thinking that it would be an enjoyable night at the ballet. Subsequently, it was drawn to my attention, particularly when the four-page colour advertisement started to appear around the country, that the ballet was partly sponsored by the Benson and Hedges company.

By that time, I had been sent two tickets and my wife was looking forward to attending the performance. I did not believe that I could or should attend as Minister of Health, so I gave my ticket away to a young lady who is a student at Flinders University (she is not one of my daughters or a member of my family). My wife subsequently attended the performance. The Hon. Mr Cameron has attempted to score political points. My wife is not a member of Parliament and, therefore, is not able to defend herself in this forum. For the Hon. Mr Cameron to try to use my wife for political purposes is despicable and beneath contempt.

#### SHOP TRADING HOURS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 31 August. Page 629.)

**The Hon. C.W. CREEDON:** I move:  
That the debate be further adjourned.

**The PRESIDENT:** I put the motion: that the debate be further adjourned. For the question say 'Aye', against 'No'. Is a division required?

**An honourable member:** Yes.

**The PRESIDENT:** Ring the bells.

*While the division bells were ringing:  
Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Council has not adjourned. I ask honourable members not to get into any great flap at this stage.

The Council divided on the motion:

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

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

Pair—Aye—The Hon. Anne Levy. No—The Hon. K.T. Griffin.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried; debate further adjourned.

#### DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health)** brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

Ordered that report be printed.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health):** I move:  
That the report be noted.

On 21 April 1983, the Legislative Council referred the Dentists Act Amendment Bill, 1983, to a Select Committee for inquiry and report. The Committee also had to consider possible amendments to the Principal Act relating to—

- (a) increased penalties;
- (b) the provision of dental prosthetists and registered dentists to operate through registered companies;
- (c) the provision of a system of registration of dental prosthetists, dental laboratories and dental technicians; and
- (d) the establishment of a para-dental committee of the Dental Board.

The First Session of the Forty-Fifth Parliament was pro-rogued on 23 June 1983, and the Committee was empowered to sit during the recess. On 4 August 1983, the first day of the current Session, the Committee was granted an extension of time to report until 13 September 1983, and subsequently was granted a further extension until 25 October 1983.

Mr President, the Committee met on 12 occasions. To assist with the Committee's inquiry a visit was made to the South Australian Dental School, where clinical and laboratory denture procedures were observed.

Advertisements were inserted in the *News*, the *Advertiser* and the *Sunday Mail* inviting interested persons to submit evidence. In addition, an approach was made to various organisations inviting evidence.

The names of persons who appeared before the Committee are listed in Appendix 'A', and Appendix 'B' contains names of persons and organisations who made written submissions.

Mr President, the Committee recommends—

1. That the Dentists Act Amendment Bill, 1983, be not proceeded with but that the recommendations which follow be incorporated in the Dentists Act. (I have indicated that the Dentists Act will be revised in the current Session of Parliament and have, therefore, undertaken to include the recommendations of this Committee in the revised legislation.)

2. That the responsibility for recommending registration of clinical dental technicians should be vested in a statutory Dental Technicians Advisory Committee. The members would be appointed by the Governor and include members of the Dental Board.

- (a) The Advisory Committee should consist of a lawyer as Chairman, two dental technicians, a dentist and a consumer.

- (b) The Dental Board should be restructured to include a lawyer and a consumer member. The lawyer and consumer member of the Board would be the lawyer (Chairman) and consumer member of the Advisory Committee. The dentist member of the Advisory Committee would be nominated by the Dental Board from amongst the dentist members of the Board. The dental technicians should be nominated by the Minister.
3. That the Dental Board should be responsible for the registration of clinical dental technicians, acting on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. A separate register should be established for clinical dental technicians.
4. That applicants for registration should be required to have completed an approved course.
- (a) This course should be operated by the Department of Technical and Further Education at the School of Paradental Studies at Gilles Plains.
- (b) The intake to the course in 1984 should be 10 students, with a further 10 students commencing training in 1985.
- (c) Subsequently, the South Australian Health Commission's proposed Dental Policy Committee should study the effectiveness of the programme.
- (d) The course should be open to all dental technicians who wish to apply, but applicants would need to satisfy such other mature age entry requirements as the educational institution may specify.
- (e) The course should be between 120 and 150 hours duration of supervised clinical experience augmented by seminars at which candidates would be required to make presentations.
- (f) The course should be funded on the 'user pays' principle. The estimated cost of conducting each course in \$12 000 to \$15 000, or \$1 200 to \$1 500 per student.
- (g) A certificate of proficiency should be presented by the Department of Technical and Further Education upon successful completion of the course.
5. That registered clinical dental technicians should be restricted to constructing full upper and lower dentures. There should be no provision permitting the supply of partial dentures or any reference to certificates of oral health as is presently proposed. (The existing arrangements under which dental technicians supply a full range of prosthetic dental appliances on the prescription of a dentist will continue.)

6. That registered clinical dental technicians should be permitted to form companies with the same restrictions as will apply to dentists under the new Dentists Act.

It is emphasised that at present the practice of clinical denture work by persons other than dentists is unlawful. It is strongly recommended that those persons who are conducting clinical denture work but who are unlikely to be approved under the new scheme following the first two intakes should rearrange their business affairs during the interim period. It is anticipated that, when registered clinical dental technicians are operating in the community, peer group pressure, the full vigour of the law and substantial penalties will help to ensure that the illegal practice of clinical denture work will cease.

The committee received considerable evidence that the incidence of persons needing full dentures has decreased and will continue to decrease to a significant extent. This is due to preventative measures such as fluoridation and improved techniques in restorative dentistry. Some witnesses were of the opinion that there is an excess of practitioners generally in dentistry and that to create a new class of practitioner would only exacerbate this problem.

It is stressed that these recommendations would not create a new class of practitioner, as the technician operating in the area of clinical denture work is already in the workforce. The recommendations merely seek to formalise the present situation based on proper standards.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I support the motion. Once again, the Parliamentary Select Committee system has proved successful. When the amendments which the Minister has undertaken to make are in fact made (that is, when the comprehensive Dentists Act Amendment Bill is introduced), the provisions in regard to technicians will be immeasurably better than those in the Bill as it now stands.

All the matters which I raised in my second reading speech have been addressed. The grandfather provision has been removed, and clinical dental technicians will have to undertake a realistic course. They will be permitted to practise, not by the Minister but through registration by a committee which will have representation from the newly constituted Dental Board and from the technicians themselves. The power of revocation will also be removed from the Minister and vested in the committee. Perhaps most important of all, the right of technicians to deal directly with the public in supplying partial dentures (that is, fitting artificial teeth in a mouth where there are also living teeth) is removed, and clinical dental technicians when dealing directly with the public will be able to supply only full upper and lower sets of artificial teeth.

The number of places available at the training facilities, as was mentioned in the report, will prevent the number of clinical dental technicians eligible for registration from becoming excessive. When technicians have had the opportunity of becoming registered (and this was set out in the report which the Minister read), it will be realistic rigorously to enforce the Act and prevent unqualified persons from practising. I support the motion.

**The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW:** This was the first Select Committee that I have sat on and contributed to; I enjoyed it as a challenging and most interesting experience. As the Hon. Mr Burdett has indicated, it certainly vindicated the work of Select Committees. The Dentists Act Amendment Bill, which we were to look at, sought to allow a number of dental technicians to be admitted to practise in a clinical capacity.

When I spoke on the second reading debate of this Bill I indicated my opposition to the proposal on a number of grounds. I do intend not to go over those now but simply to indicate that the evidence given before the Select Committee vindicated my opposition to the Bill.

I was highly delighted when the Select Committee decided not to proceed with the Bill, but to come forward with this report which, I believe, will answer the problem that is most evident in regard to dental technicians' practising illegally at present. It will give them (admittedly, a limited number of them) an opportunity to gain registration after completing a course, and in the interests of public health such a course and registration was very important before we as a Parliament allowed people to practise in a clinical capacity.

I was pleased to work with the Select Committee, and I am very pleased that after a series of meetings we were able to come forward with a very good approach to the future of dental technicians. I am pleased that they will not be practising without qualifications and providing partial dentures. I am pleased, also, that after a number of technicians have completed the course further pressure will be applied to those who have been practising illegally but have not done this course to cease that illegal practice, because that is highly unacceptable.

**The Hon. K.L. MILNE:** I will not weary the Council with a long speech, but I will just add to what the other speakers have said about this Committee. When I spoke before I said that I was most anxious that the dental technicians should have professional status and dignity. I think that we have achieved that, as far as possible, in these recommendations.

I am always interested in the handling of the professions and the control of them. Here we have a profession being created, in effect, with registration, a proper course and with peer review. The solution that the committee came to was certainly accepted unanimously, and I hope that Parliament will back it up. I would like to congratulate the Minister on the way he handled a difficult problem, and I only hope that the dental profession and the profession of dental technicians also feel the same. I agree with the Hon. Mr Burdett: success will depend upon strict administration of the Act to prevent the same sort of situation recurring which would then need to be rectified. That would be a great pity because, if we work on this Bill as recommended, all sides of the professional people in dentistry should be pleased and satisfied.

Motion carried.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Health Commission Act, 1975. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I move:

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

The main purpose of this short Bill is to make important changes to the constitution of the South Australian Health Commission. Honourable members will recall that in January of this year, as part of the general review of Government management and operations, Cabinet approved a review of Health Commission management arrangements and performance, focusing particularly on the central management and co-ordination functions of the Commission, including the sector offices. Members of the review team were Mr Don Alexander, Deputy Director-General of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Mr Don Faulkner, Director of the Management Systems and Review Division of the Public Service Board and Mr Mel Whinnen, Director of Administration and Finance in the Department of Mines and Energy.

On 12 May the report of the review was tabled in Parliament. The report recognised that the Health Commission had undergone significant change in its organisation and role since its inception. It acknowledged that the Commission had been subjected to close scrutiny; areas of poor performance had been identified and improvements had been made progressively. The report surveyed the prevailing management climate in the Commission, its objectives, functions and organisation. It identified further areas for improvement in general management, resource allocation, financial management, computing, planning and policy development.

The review was another important step in the process of critical evaluation aimed at constructive change. In the words of the Review Team:

The report is considered to be a framework or guideline for the Minister, the new Chairman, the Commission and the senior officers of the Commission to further develop the organisation and management processes of the Commission . . .

Broadly, the recommendations in this report are directed towards creating a climate of clarity of purpose and role of the agencies involved in delivering health services, tighter management processes in the Commission and a recognition of the importance of

the health units managing their affairs to the maximum possible extent within the essential restraints of policy, finance and staffing plans formulated by the Commission in accordance with the Government's policy for health services.

An essential feature of the managerial thrust of the report is the restructuring of the Commission itself. Honourable members will recall that the Commission originally consisted of three full-time members and five part-time members. So structured, the Commission relied heavily on collective decision making, a situation not conducive to the establishment of clear lines of authority and accountability.

In 1980, the Commission was restructured to consist of one full-time member (the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer) and seven part-time members. The review team found that, under this structure, the Commission itself has had little opportunity to contribute to the ongoing management of the organisation. There has been confusion among part-time members as to whether their proper role was of a general advisory nature, policy development or day-to-day administration. The review team commented that the nature of Commission membership has not lent itself to addressing managerial issues.

It recommended that the Commission be reduced in size, to comprise the Chairman and Deputy Chairman (both full-time) and three part-time members. The Commission's role should be revised so that it acted more like a board of management; it would advise the Minister and assist the Chairman/Chief Executive Officer in the management of the Commission's affairs. The Deputy Chief Executive Officer, who is presently not a member of the Commission, should become a member through the additional designation of the office as Deputy Chairman, thus overcoming problems of accountability during the Chairman's absence. The three part-time members of the Commission should be selected primarily for their potential contribution to management.

The Government endorses these recommendations of the review team. It considers that change in the constitution and role of the Commission is of fundamental importance to the upgrading of the Commission's management function. Indeed, as a preliminary step towards implementing the recommendations, the Government recently filled three vacancies in part-time membership by appointing persons with the background suggested by the review team, namely, a senior, or recently retired public sector manager (Commissioner Mary Beasley—Commissioner, Public Service Board); a private sector appointee (Mr R.H. Allert—Chartered Accountant) and a respected health administrator (Dr B.J. Kearney—Director, Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and formerly Deputy Chief Executive Officer of the Health Commission).

The provisions of this Bill restructure the Commission in line with the recommendations of the review team. The other important change proposed by this Bill is the abolition of the Health Services Advisory Committee. This committee is a 14-member body, made up of nominees of various organisations and having broad advisory powers in relation to the provision and delivery of health services. The review team found that the committee had not played a useful role in the Commission's affairs over the years. Some of the reasons for this were that it duplicated the role of the Commission to a certain extent; its membership was too large and comprised of sectional interests; more effective and quicker advice could often be obtained through the directed efforts of Commission staff.

Honourable members may recall that the Committee was not a feature of the original Bill. It was inserted by way of amendment in the Legislative Council. With a considerable degree of foresight, the then Minister, in speaking against the committee (or council, as it was then to be called) said:

If the council goes ahead, I believe it would virtually take over the role of the Commission.

In the event, the amendment passed, and successive Ministers, Commissions and the committee itself have been unable to find an effective role or reason for the continued existence of the committee. The Bill therefore seeks to abolish the committee.

The review team also recommended the establishment of a Community Health Advisory Committee. That proposal is receiving detailed consideration by the Chairman of the Health Commission taking particular account of anticipated expansion of the community health programme, with additional Federal funding as from 1 February 1984 as part of the Medicare package. In summary, the Government believes that the proposals embodied in this Bill are of fundamental importance to the upgrading of the South Australian Health Commission's management function. I commend the Bill to the Council and seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the appointment of two full-time members of the Commission, one being the Chairman and the other the Deputy Chairman. Provision is made for the appointment of three part-time members instead of the seven as at present, and all current offices must therefore be vacated upon the commencement of the amending Act to allow for fresh appointments to the reduced number of part-time positions. Sundry amendments are made that are consequential upon the fact that there will now be two full-time members instead of only one. Clause 4 re-casts the section providing for the appointment of deputies. The Deputy Chairman will act as the deputy of the Chairman. All other members of the Commission may have suitable persons appointed as their deputies. Clauses 5 and 6 effect consequential amendments.

Clause 7 provides that the Deputy Chairman will preside at Commission meetings in the absence of the Chairman. A quorum at any meeting will now be constituted by three out of the five members. Clause 8 repeals the section that provided specifically for the establishment of the Health Services Advisory Committee. The Minister of course still has a general power under section 18 of the Act to appoint such advisory committees as he thinks fit. Clause 9 provides that the Deputy Chairman will also hold office as Deputy Chief Executive Officer of the Commission, just as the Chairman also holds office as the Chief Executive Officer of the Commission.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### STATUTES REPEAL (HEALTH) BILL

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal certain Acts relating to health. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I move:

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

The Health Commission has been reviewing Statutes in the health area with a view to recommending repeal of those which are no longer necessary. This Bill aims to repeal those Acts so far identified as anachronistic and inappropriate to retain on the Statute books.

1. *Infectious Diseases Hospital Transfer Act, 1947*: Earlier this century local councils were responsible for the treatment,

care and custody of persons suffering from infectious diseases. Councils were required to pay the daily average cost of caring for such patients in what were then public hospitals, notably the Royal Adelaide Hospital. When the cost of the councils rose, the councils claimed they could probably look after their patients more cheaply themselves and so built a hospital—the Infectious Diseases Hospital at Northfield. However, by the mid-1940s, with improved public health measures and resulting low bed occupancy, the councils found that the cost of running their own hospital had become too high and they sought to have it taken over by the Government. The Government took over the responsibility for the hospital by means of the Infectious Diseases Hospital Transfer Act, 1947, under which the hospital became the Northfield Wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The Royal Adelaide Hospital (including the Northfield Wards) is now an incorporated hospital under the South Australian Health Commission Act. It is obvious that the Infectious Diseases Hospital Transfer Act, 1947, is no longer relevant and can be repealed.

2. *Mental Institutions Benefits Act, 1948*: The purpose of this Act was to enable the State Government to enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth Government under which that Government paid a daily mental institution benefit to the State Government in respect of each qualified patient bed day. Under this arrangement the State Government agreed not to impose a means test on or charge fees to any patient in respect of whom the benefit was payable. The agreement ceased to have any effect over 15 years ago. The State Government now charges fees for long-term patients on the basis of a means tested assessment of ability to pay. The Act is therefore redundant and can be repealed.

3. *Tuberculosis (Commonwealth Arrangement) Act, 1949*: At a conference of Commonwealth and State Health Ministers in Canberra in August 1948 it was agreed that the Commonwealth and State Governments should participate in a campaign to reduce the incidence of tuberculosis in Australia and to provide adequate facilities for the diagnosis, treatment and control of that disease. The Tuberculosis (Commonwealth Arrangement) Act, 1949, was enacted to enable the State Government to enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth Government which related to hospital treatment costs of tuberculosis patients, public health investigations and surveys and the capital and operating costs of these services. This arrangement, in so far as it related to hospital treatment costs, was superseded by the Commonwealth/State Hospital Cost-Sharing Agreement as from 1 July 1975. There was provision for the arrangement to be terminated subject to six months notice by either party of intention to withdraw. The Governor-General on behalf of the Commonwealth terminated the arrangement with the States on 31 December 1976. The Commonwealth Government's view at the time was that, since tuberculosis had been effectively controlled, there was no further need for a specific campaign. It is considered, therefore, that there is no need to retain the Act and its repeal is recommended.

4. *Vaccination Act, 1936*: The original Vaccination Act has been in operation since 1882. In 1936 that Act and several other Acts relating to vaccination passed between 1882 and 1917 were consolidated. The consolidated Act has not been amended since and remains on the Statute books. The Act provides basically for vaccination against smallpox. It includes a power to require vaccination in cases of outbreak of smallpox in this or any other State and the keeping of records in relation to vaccination. Smallpox has now been eradicated as a human disease, and the only known stocks

of the virus are held in high security laboratories overseas for scientific purposes only. Also, the Commonwealth Quarantine Act now contains broad powers to deal with outbreaks of disease and smallpox is defined as a quarantinable disease under that Act. The Vaccination Act therefore no longer has any operation and can be repealed.

5. *Whyalla Hospital (Vesting) Act, 1969*: This Act was introduced in light of administrative difficulties being experienced at the time in relation to the hospital at Whyalla. The hospital was originally operated by an association known as the Whyalla Hospital Incorporated. The Government of the day decided that it should be taken over and operated as a public hospital under the Hospitals Act. To effect that transfer, an Act of Parliament was necessary. The Act provided for a corporate body to supersede the association and provided for that corporate body to have the rights and obligations of the association. Any payments due to the corporate body were to be paid to the Treasurer to the credit of general revenue and any sums payable by the corporate body were to be paid by the Treasurer. In addition, provision was made for the Treasurer to approve arrangements between the City of Whyalla Commission and the corporate body for repayments due by the previous association to that Commission. The hospital was incorporated as the Whyalla and District Hospital Incorporated under the South Australian Health Commission Act on 19 April 1979. Under that

Act any prior incorporation of the Hospital, or any body by which it was administered, is dissolved upon incorporation and the rights and liabilities of any body whose incorporation is dissolved are vested in the incorporated hospital. Treasury has advised the Government that the repeal of this Act will have no repercussions in relation to arrangements involving Treasury. Accordingly, it is clear that this Act can be repealed.

The Health Commission is continuing to review legislation in the health area to ensure that it is relevant and appropriate to today's health needs. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the repeal of the Acts set out in the schedule.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of the debate

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY LAW, PRACTICE AND PROCEDURES

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's resolution.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.59 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 22 September at 2.15 p.m.