

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 20 October 1983

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

QUESTIONS

CENSORSHIP

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about censorship of Department of Mines and Energy publications.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Honourable members would have recently received a copy of a Department of Mines and Energy publication *Living with Minerals—A South Australian Perspective*. This book deals with a variety of items, including metallic minerals, non-metallic minerals, water, energy minerals, construction materials, exploration, mining methods, and environmental aspects. Under the heading 'Energy Minerals' both fossil fuels and uranium are discussed. Of the over 14 pages devoted to this section, less than one page is reserved for a discussion of uranium.

The detail contained in the uranium reference is scanty, and no mention is made of the Government's decision to prevent the development of the Honeymoon and Beverley deposits. Indeed, as the following quote indicates, the impression is given that Honeymoon and Beverley are being developed normally:

Today, the Olympic Dam deposit is being explored by both surface drilling and from an exploration shaft (see page 26), while at Honeymoon a pilot plant was set up to extract uranium by *in situ* leach mining. An environmental impact statement was prepared for an *in situ* leach-mining operation at the Beverley deposit.

1. Can the Minister assure the Council that no influence was exerted by his colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy to restrict the discussion on uranium or to amend the references to Honeymoon and Beverley?

2. Does the Minister agree that the explanation creates the impression that these projects are still being developed when in fact Government policy has caused them to be lost to South Australia?

3. Does the Minister accept one page in this book devoted to uranium is sufficient to show what an important mineral uranium is for the future of South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will direct that question to my colleague and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

RAPE TRIAL

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In respect of the letter from Ms Rosemary Wighton, Chairperson, Rape Services Liaison Committee, to the Attorney-General criticising a Supreme Court Judge in his handling of an alleged rape trial, and in respect of the letter from the Chief Justice to Ms Wighton and to the Premier—

1. Does the Attorney-General regard any aspect of Ms Wighton's letter as requiring an apology to the Chief Justice and the trial judge?

2. Has the Premier or the Attorney-General made an apology to the Chief Justice and the trial Judge in response to the Chief Justice's request for 'an immediate withdrawal and an apology'?

3. If not, how is the matter to be resolved?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The matter has been resolved, as far as I know. As Acting Premier last week when this issue arose, I indicated publicly the view that I took on this matter. I said that I would discuss the matter with Ms Wighton and that the Premier would discuss it with her when she returned. She was on leave last week and there was no opportunity to discuss it with her. Correspondence was sent by me to the Chief Justice, indicating the Government's point of view on the matter and indicating that, first, it was not an official Government or Executive letter which went from Ms Wighton's office and, secondly, that it did not have the endorsement of the Government. I made that statement last week. Further, I said that the Government had full confidence in the impartiality of the Judiciary and of the judge who adjudicated in the trial that was the subject of the controversy.

On the other hand, I recognised that citizens in this community have the right to raise issues relating to the administration of justice, including the right to criticise the administration of justice and the laws in this State. I also said that the Government had instituted a review into the substantive law of rape, in view of the community concern which had been expressed about it.

The final word on the topic was contained in a letter to the Chief Justice on behalf of the Rape Services Liaison Committee on 14 October in the following terms:

The Rape Services Liaison Committee reconvened today to discuss your letter of 11 October 1983 in the absence of the Chairperson, Rosemary Wighton, who is on leave. In response to your letter, the committee wishes to make the following comments:

The committee did not intend to convey the impression it was speaking on behalf of the Government or any department. The committee did not seek to influence the Judiciary in the exercise of its judicial functions. The committee did not intend to cast any doubt whatsoever upon nor make imputations against the integrity of the trial judge and would appreciate these comments being passed on to the trial judge. The committee did not intend that its letter should be seen as containing or constituting 'thinly veiled imputations that the trial judge did not give the alleged victim a fair hearing and that he accorded the accused privileged treatment by reason of his being a prominent citizen and "on account of his socio-economic status".' The committee apologises if the manner in which it conveyed its observations gave rise to any objectionable implications. As a matter of courtesy to the Government, a copy of this letter has been sent to the Hon. Attorney-General for his information.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Has the Chief Justice accepted that?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I assume so. I have not heard anything from him since. In view of his lack of response to the previous letter that he received I assume that, if the matter had not been satisfactorily resolved, he would have advised me. I would have thought that that letter on behalf of the Rape Services Liaison Committee constituted an adequate explanation. The second last paragraph specifically states:

The committee apologises if the manner in which it conveyed its observations gave rise to any objectionable implications.

As far as I am concerned—and I believe, although I have not heard specifically from him, as far as the Chief Justice is concerned—the matter of that incident is at an end.

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health, representing the Minister for Environment and Planning, a question about the environmental impact statement for Roxby Downs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: In the *Government Gazette* of 14 April this year a miscellaneous purpose licence No. P526

was announced as approved to Roxby Management Services for 'the construction and operation of a pilot metallurgical plant and associated tailings retention system'. Yet, I understand that the Government's official announcement of its acceptance of the environmental impact study came more than two months later on 28 June. My questions are as follows.

1. On what date did Cabinet accept the environmental impact statement for Roxby Downs?
2. If it was before 14 April, why was the Government so long in announcing it?
3. If it was after 14 April, why did the Government grant the licence before approving the environmental impact statement?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I shall be glad to take those questions to my colleague, the Minister for Environment and Planning, and bring back a considered reply.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Local Government, a reply to my question of 31 August in regard to the legislative programme for amending the Local Government Act?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: A major local government revision Bill will be introduced to Parliament before Christmas. Final drafting of this Bill is currently being completed, following which the Bill will be released to local government and interested parties for a 28-day consultation period. This revision Bill, the first of five Bills proposed to update the Act, will incorporate a number of important electoral reforms.

ADULT MIGRANT EDUCATION

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 21 September about adult migrant education?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The State Government is committed to improving the employment conditions of lecturing staff in the Adult Migrant Education Service of the Open College of Technical and Further Education. To that end, negotiations with the Federal Government have progressed to a stage where there is general agreement to the type and level of improvement to be offered to the staff of this important programme. It is anticipated that the improved conditions will apply from 1 January 1984.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question of 31 August about the Public Buildings Department?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Public Buildings Department has 'in house' capacity for building construction, and it is Government policy that this capacity be effectively used. The option of paying Government employees to remain idle, while paying contractors to perform work which could be undertaken by idle P.B.D. resources, is not acceptable to the Government. With regard to the statistical analysis undertaken by the Hon. Mr Davis, I am advised that he has unfortunately made an incorrect assumption. The value of contracts for each of the calendar years 1982 and 1983 have been added and it was assumed that these figures represent the value of work undertaken by the private sector in each of those years. In addition, as pointed out in the notes attached to the previous response:

The 'contracts let' figures include some work carried out by the Operational Services Branch of the Department.

The value of work carried out by the Department includes payments to contractors for some part of the work.

HOME VIDEO SCHEME

The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education, a question about the home video scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN: A member of the Correspondence School Council contacted me and expressed his concern that the Federal Budget papers point to a cut in funding to the Outback Education Scheme. One project about which the Correspondence School Council is most worried is the home video scheme. For the benefit of honourable members who are not familiar with that project, I point out that video machines are provided for families who are educating primary schoolchildren who are living in remote areas.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. H.P.K. DUNN: They are educating them by correspondence. Funding includes the provision of tapes and educational material. Personnel in the Education Department acknowledge that it is a wonderful and rewarding scheme but at this stage they cannot say, if the funding is withdrawn, whether other agencies will pick up the funding and continue the scheme. Can the Minister say whether it is the Government's intention to carry on the homestead video scheme if the present funding is withdrawn?

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

'UNIVERSITY DEGREES'

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the sale of 'university degrees'.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I am an avid reader of that intellectual journal the *Australasian Post*.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: In the barber shop?

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: Yes, indeed, in the barber shop. It may indeed be a lighthearted affair, or it may not. For some weeks at least a series of advertisements have appeared in the back pages of the magazine advertising the sale of 'authentic university degrees', with no study required and account taken of past work and achievement. The advertisement carried a Western Australian post box number. It may indeed be that, if one is foolish enough to part with money for one of these degrees, one receives a jocose certificate.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: It's probably a Hutt River address.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: It did not appear to be a Hutt River address. It may be harmless, although it would not be beyond the bounds of possibility that some semi-serious attempt is being made to take money from gullible people. I recall that some years ago, and I am sure that the Attorney-General understands what I am talking about, a sale of interests in the 'Port Lincoln University' occurred.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Boston House.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: Yes. It had quite a serious criminal base. Because of the relative lack of secretarial and research staff available to members of the Legislative Council, I have not been able to work back through past issues

of the magazine to obtain the fine details of the advertisements. I am sure that the Attorney-General's staff could look at the advertisements, examine the situation in a jiffy and investigate whether some breach of the law is involved. I ask the Attorney-General to undertake an investigation in that regard.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, I am prepared to do that.

UNIFORM DEFAMATION LAWS

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about uniform defamation laws.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Have you read the editorial in today's *Advertiser*?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: We'll get you a copy.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Thank you for your protection, Mr President. In recent weeks there have been further reports that the Commonwealth Attorney-General, Senator Gareth Evans, intends introducing further amendments to the proposed uniform defamation laws. The reports that I sighted referred to using public interest rather than public benefit as a defence to an action for defamation. Can the Attorney-General inform the Council about the latest developments in Commonwealth proposals for uniform defamation laws, to his understanding?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There are no latest developments. The latest development occurred in early September when a meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General in Melbourne agreed that a draft of the uniform defamation legislation would be tabled in Federal Parliament by Senator Evans.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Based on what?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It was based on deliberations that had been going on in the Standing Committee for some 12 to 15 months. The Hon. Mr Griffin would have been involved in initial discussions on the matter. My understanding of the decision taken at the standing committee meeting in September was that the question of the defence of justification was to be left open at this stage and that the Federal Attorney-General was to look at alternatives that might be available.

As the Bill was to be tabled and left lying on the table in the Federal Parliament for some time to allow for public comment, there would be an opportunity in December for Attorneys to make a final decision in relation to that issue and, indeed, on other matters that might be raised in relation to the Bill. That is still the position. South Australia's position has not changed. I outlined the position in the Council some time ago in response to questions from the honourable member.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You got some good publicity, too.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As it turned out, my statement got considerably more publicity in the Melbourne *Age* than it did in the local press. My view is still as it was in March, when I attended my first meeting of the Standing Committee: that proof alone would be sufficient to establish the defence of justification. That is still the view I take although, obviously, the Commonwealth Attorney-General is looking at some other privacy protection matters that can be included in the legislation. It is a matter of looking at those drafts and the Bill and considering the options and comments that members of the public make. The original time table was to have it introduced and for comments to be received and considered initially in December. Whether that time table

is being met by the Commonwealth Government, I cannot say.

MINISTERS' SPEAKING FEES

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question on speaking fees for Ministers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: This subject has generated wide interest in the community since Mr David Combe's disclosure to the Hope Royal Commission that the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, when Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, received a fee of \$1 500 to deliver a speech. Subsequently, the Premier of Victoria, Mr Cain, announced on 30 September that he had banned his Ministers from accepting fees for public speaking engagements or directing to another body any fee offered. Mr Cain's announcement revealed that four of his most senior Ministers have accepted fees for public speaking since the Labor Party came to Government in Victoria last year. Does the Premier agree with Mr Cain that Ministers should not accept fees for public speaking engagements or direct any offer of fees to another body? If so, what was the response from his colleagues and what, if any, was the fee accepted? If not, does he propose to seek such information? Does he believe that concern over this matter warrants a direction from him to his Ministers, as Mr Cain has done in Victoria, that such practices are not acceptable? Also, does he consider that such a discretion should not be limited to Ministers only or only to fees offered for public speaking engagements?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I think that it is completely inappropriate for Ministers to accept fees for speaking engagements, as Premier Cain also apparently believes. I do not know of any Minister in this Government who has received a fee for a speaking engagement. My impression is that there have not been any. This question has been raised in other forums, and the honourable member has now raised it in this forum. I can say, for my part, that I have not received any such fee for a speaking engagement.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Have you been offered one?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I cannot recollect having been offered a fee, either. People would have known, of course, that such an offer would be futile.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: You will have to declare that as an income source now.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As the Hon. Mr Griffin points out, as a result of the comprehensive disclosure of pecuniary interests legislation, which passed this Parliament, I am pleased to say, with the unanimous support of members opposite—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: The wholehearted support of members opposite.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Yes, it was passed with the wholehearted support of members opposite, as the Hon. Mr Lucas has just said. I give the honourable member full credit because he was wholehearted in his support of the legislation.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: And still is.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: And still is. However, there may have been others who were somewhat more reluctant to get to the barrier. Nevertheless, in the final analysis I was pleased to see that such worthwhile and comprehensive disclosure of interests legislation received the unanimous support of the Council.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The statement being made by the Attorney-

General has absolutely nothing to do with the question that was asked.

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: All I wish to say is that I was responding to an interjection, which was out of order, from the Hon. Mr Griffin. That was the context in which I was making those remarks. That is my personal position in response to the Hon. Ms Laidlaw. I will obtain from the Premier the information that the honourable member is seeking.

PORNOGRAPHY

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: Has the Attorney-General an answer to the question that I asked on 13 September about pornography?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Apart from the American *Penthouse*, which is usually classified 'R-Category 1', *Penthouse* comes in at least two and possibly three editions which are distributed in States according to classification standards operating therein. The publishers have apparently decided that their financial return is greater if they can secure, by varying content, an 'Unrestricted classification' in all States than if they issue a franker universal edition which would be 'Restricted' in some States. The differences are mainly in the detail of photographs although the text may also vary somewhat.

The issue sold in New South Wales is traditionally a little 'stronger' than the issue sold here and in some other States. On the occasions when our Classification of Publications Board has seen it, they have generally placed it in the 'Restrictions—Category 1' class. That means it may not be sold to minors and may not be displayed publicly except in a sealed bag (which is usually clear). The covers of the various editions are identical and quite acceptable.

The sale of the New South Wales version is 'Unrestricted' in that State and there is no offence if they sell it through the mail. Bearing in mind that all Governments in Australia (except Queensland) have agreed to uniform censorship standards being introduced (although retaining the right to supersede decisions in particular cases), there seems little point in pursuing the matter at this stage. The New South Wales edition is, after all, only slightly stronger than the South Australian edition.

EXPLOITATION OF SCHOOLCHILDREN

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Labour, a question about the exploitation of schoolchildren.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I have been informed by a constituent (and that information has been backed up in conversations that I have had with other citizens) that there is a team of young people who are still at school and who are employed in a form of door to door selling of stationery, which appears to be very expensive and the quality of which I am unable to vouch for. The name of the firm employing these children was reported to me as being 'Sincerity Products', but I am unable to find the name of such a firm in the telephone book.

In view of the lack of research facilities available to members of Parliament, the Minister's staff might be able to further investigate this matter. The point is that these young people have stated when at the door of a prospective customer that they are doing this work principally for work experience. I am told that their remuneration is extremely

low. One young man said to my constituent that his principal hope in doing this job was that he would get a reference saying that he had had work experience and that that would enable him to obtain a job when he left school.

I wonder where the question of work experience ceases to be of sincere benefit and starts to become exploitation. I know that matters have been investigated by the Department involving another pseudo-religious organisation which was paying people a matter of cents rather than dollars for a 40-hour week and claiming that it was part of that organisation's deep desire to assist the unemployed.

I am therefore concerned at the possibility that under the fiction of work experience some firms may be exploiting youth and giving them perhaps an over rosy picture of the value of a reference informing future employers that they have had this work experience. Will the Minister consult with departmental officers in order to ascertain whether or not there have been any complaints about this matter or whether concern has been expressed by young people or their parents about the rates of remuneration involved in selling stationery door to door or about the value of such 'work experience' in contributing to their future employment prospects?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I will get that information for the honourable member.

HUMAN SERVICES PROGRAMMES

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a very brief statement before asking the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, a question about human services programmes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am sure all members are aware of the job creation schemes that are currently being run by the State and Federal Governments and that applications for schemes under these programmes are to be submitted to the relevant department. I am aware that applications for human services programmes have been submitted for consideration under the job creation scheme proposals. Some of these human services programme jobs, as I understand it, are directed particularly to job creation for those individuals who are either very long-term unemployed or who are members of groups that are particularly subject to disadvantage in obtaining employment and are therefore more likely to suffer considerably from the stresses of unemployment and hence require welfare services.

If these proposals for human services programmes are approved by the Job Creation Unit, can the Minister tell us how many jobs are expected to be created by these programmes, particularly for people in the categories of long-term unemployed, young people, women, Aborigines, disabled people, and members of other disadvantaged groups who are at a particular disadvantage in the job market?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I will be delighted to take those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a considered reply.

CITIZENSHIP REQUIREMENTS

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Ethnic Affairs a question about citizenship requirements for migrants.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: A recent press report indicated that the Federal Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs favoured alterations to the requirements for migrants in gaining citizenship. One change which he explained was

that he favoured—and, as I understood it, the Federal Government favoured—reducing from three years to two years the residential period before migrants could apply for citizenship. There were also some quite alarming proposals with regard to the abolition of the reference to the monarchy in the oath of allegiance, and other suggestions were made in that press release also.

Has any formal approach been made by the Federal Minister or the Federal Government to the Minister in this State in regard to such proposed changes and, if so, what has been the Hon. Mr Sumner's response to such an approach? If that approach has not been a formal one, has there been any informal communication between the Federal Minister and the Hon. Mr Sumner in an endeavour by the Federal Minister simply to test the water in regard to responses from South Australia? If that approach has been informal, what has been the Hon. Mr Sumner's reply?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: To my knowledge, there has been no formal approach from the Federal Minister, but if that is not the case and some correspondence has come in on the matter I will advise the honourable member further. That being the answer to the first question, there is no need for me to respond to the second. In respect of the third question, I have not had any informal discussions with the Federal Minister on this topic, although there have certainly been discussions in the community and at various meetings that I have attended over the years on the form of the citizenship ceremony and the oath which attaches to it.

The criticism is sometimes made by some groups that in taking out their citizenship they believe that they are becoming citizens of Australia, and there is for that reason some resistance to the form of oath as it now exists. They are discussions which have taken place in the community and of which the honourable member, I am sure, is aware in view of his very keen interest in ethnic affairs matters and his close contacts with those communities. Until I receive any request from the Federal Government on this topic, I do not believe that it is appropriate for me to canvass the matter further. If I do receive such an approach the matter can be considered then.

As I say, apart from discussions in which I have been involved and of which I have heard in various parts of the community and in various meetings on the general question of citizenship ceremonies, I have not received any informal approaches as such from the Federal Minister.

RUSTPROOFING

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Has the Attorney-General an answer to the question that I asked on 31 August (quite a long time ago) on the subject of rustproofing?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The reply is as follows:

1. Monitoring is carried out only in response to request from consumers for assistance to check the effectiveness of rustproofing carried out on their cars. Resources are simply not available for any on-going monitoring programme. However, in view of the recent publicity given to rustproofing as a result of the article in *Choice* magazine, the Department has advertised again the availability of the special kits designed to assist consumers to check whether rustproofing work has been properly carried out.

2. The Australian Standard for rustproofing products (AS 2662) is expected to be ratified next month. A further draft of the standard for application of the product is expected to be published at the same time, but is not likely to be finalised for several months. If all those in the industry complied with these standards, the problems experienced in the past would be overcome. Therefore, when the standards have been finalised, consideration will be given to making

regulations under the Trade Standards Act so that compliance with the standards will be compulsory. However, it may be necessary to amend the Trade Standards Act to enable this to be done.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Has the Attorney-General an answer to the question that I asked on 31 August on the subject of rustproofing?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The reply is as follows:

1. The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs is well aware of unsatisfactory practices in relation to rustproofing, having carried out its own investigation in August 1982. No further investigation is proposed at this stage, but the Department will continue to investigate any complaints received and to assist consumers who wish to have independent checks made as to the effectiveness of rustproofing carried out on their cars. Special kits are available from the Department, comprising—

- advice on the procedure to be followed;
- a comprehensive check-list to be used when assessing the effectiveness of rustproofing; and
- a complaint form.

Consumers who have had rustproofing work carried out on their cars would be well advised to obtain one of these kits from the Department and to follow the suggestions made in the kit.

2. The results of the investigation carried out by the Department were extensively publicised at the time. The Department arranged for 63 vehicles, selected by the dealers themselves, to be inspected, using the draft S.A.A. standard as the bench-mark. Only three of these were passed as satisfactory. The failures were more serious in the case of rustproofing products applied by car dealers than in the case of treatment by rustproofing specialists. Some dealers and their staff were so ignorant of the proper methods of application that some cars which had been inspected had to be taken back to the dealer two or three times before satisfactory treatment was achieved.

It seems that some car dealers are attracted by the huge profits that are available in rustproofing and pay little or no regard to proper training of their staff to ensure that the products are properly applied. In a sales letter dated 9 May 1983 to car dealers from Repco Auto Parts, dealers are advised that:

The average dealer currently pays around \$85 to have a vehicle rustproofed and charged the customers approximately \$200. With the Waxoyl treatment the dealer can reduce his cost to around \$45 per vehicle. That adds up to heaps of extra profit. For a dealer that is currently selling and rustproofing 20 vehicles per month, he can add almost another \$10 000 profit per year to his business!

The whole thrust of this sales pitch is that the product known as 'Waxoyl' is easy to apply and can generate huge profits for the dealer. No mention is made of the need to train staff to ensure that it is properly applied. As a result of the Department's investigations, the consumer transactions regulations were amended to include as a prescribed service 'the treatment of any motor vehicle for the eradication or prevention of rust.' This means that there is a statutorily implied compulsory warranty that the service will be carried out with due care and skill and that material supplied will be fit for the purpose. A breach of the warranty gives rise to a claim for damages against the dealer.

The article in *Choice* magazine came to the conclusion that rustproofing is a waste of time and money. I am not satisfied that this conclusion is valid. Apart from some serious doubts which have been expressed as to the methodology of the survey carried out for the purposes of this article, I have sighted several letters from large companies which have had fleets of vehicles treated by rustproofing specialists and which have been satisfied with the result. I am quite sure that these companies would not have outlayed

the very considerable amounts of money which they have spent on rustproofing if they were not satisfied that the treatment was beneficial. However, it is important to draw a distinction between rustproofing by recognised specialists in the field, and rustproofing by car dealers. The investigations carried out by the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs suggest that rustproofing specialists are far more competent than car dealers and are more likely to provide a satisfactory service.

The Australian Standard for rustproofing products (AS 2662) is expected to be ratified next month. A further draft of the standard for application of the product is expected to be published at the same time, but is not likely to be finalised for several months. If all those in the industry complied with these standards, the problems experienced in the past would be overcome. Therefore, when the standards have been finalised, consideration will be given to making regulations under the Trade Standards Act so that compliance with the standards will be compulsory. However, it may be necessary to amend the Trade Standards Act to enable this to be done.

TRANSPORT OF DECEASED PERSONS

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question on 18 October about the transport of deceased persons?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The reply is as follows:

1. If a medical practitioner is not at the scene of an accident, death cannot be certified. In such cases the body should be transported to the nearest hospital (or medical practitioner) in order that certification of death may be made by a qualified medical practitioner. This is, I understand, the present practice of the St John Ambulance Service.

2. As I have said, in an accident situation the St John Ambulance Service would transport the deceased person. If death occurred at home, I would expect a medical practitioner to be called to certify death and would also expect that an undertaker be called to attend to the deceased.

3. If the St John Ambulance Service is in attendance, it is at liberty to transport the body if it wishes or is requested to by, say, the police or a relative of the deceased. As I have said, in these cases the body should be transported to the nearest hospital (or medical practitioner) in order that certification of death may be made by a qualified medical practitioner.

4. I understand that the policy pertaining to the payment of accounts varies within the St John organisation although generally all accounts for transporting deceased persons from the scene of a traffic accident are forwarded to the State Government Insurance Commission. In other instances accounts are sent to the deceased's estate. Where the Coroner has requested or authorised that a body be transported for pathological or other examination, payment of accounts will be made by the Coroner's Office. I understand that the 'problems' the honourable member has referred to in his question have arisen out of accounts being forwarded to the State Government Insurance Commission or where accounts have been forwarded to the Coroner's Office in matters which have not involved the Coroner.

HEALTH COMMISSION SURVEYS

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about Health Commission surveys.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: In the *Advertiser* of 7 October 1983 there was a letter to the Editor signed by Dr G.E. Dutton, senior full-time specialist. This was the letter indeed where Dr Dutton first made his allegations about a crisis in the Intensive Care Unit at Adelaide Children's Hospital which was initially publicly derided by the Minister of Health but later found to be correct. Also in that letter to the Editor, Dr Dutton made the following observation:

Over the past few years there have been two surveys at our hospital and we believe that inaccurately collected data formed the basis to our supposed high bed-to-patient ratio. In fact, that last survey of surgical procedures was a farce, as was a great part of the subsequent report. It demonstrated too clearly that only hospital staff with years of experience can understand how hospitals run. Production-line surveys based on time and motion studies have no place in quality patient care.

The allegations about the crisis in the Intensive Care Unit rather overshadowed the other observations regarding Health Commission surveys contained in the letter by Dr Dutton. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Has the Minister investigated Dr Dutton's allegations regarding inaccurate information from two surveys?

2. What is the outcome of those investigations?

3. Was the data collected through those surveys used by the Sax Committee when making its recommendations about the Adelaide Children's Hospital?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: If the honourable member had taken the trouble to read the Sax Committee Report, as I have done, I am sure that he would be in a position to acknowledge that it is an outstanding document. I would have thought that anyone who was willing to take on Dr Sax and challenge his competence in this particular area would very much do so at their peril. Dr Sax's extraordinary competence in the various fields in which I asked him to conduct the review is unmatched in this country, and certainly unchallenged in this country by persons far more knowledgeable than is the economist/accountant/lawyer/investment adviser who asked the question.

I suggest that the honourable member should restrict himself to what, on his own huffing and puffing lately, are his fields of expertise. Dr Sax says, or the Sax Committee collectively says, quite specifically in the report that they have been extremely impressed (I think that was the expression, but certainly that was the thrust of the phrase) with the Data Collection and Information Services Division of the South Australian Health Commission. One of the surveys in regard to nursing staff was carried out by Miss Sally Boxall of the central sector. She is a very senior and experienced nursing sister. That survey was undertaken in conjunction with the Director of Nursing and other people at the hospital. At present, a role and function study is also being conducted at the hospital. In fact, the terms of reference of that role and function study have now been expanded to recommend suitable ways of incorporating the hospital.

The other point that was made by the Sax Committee, very strongly, referred to the accountability of boards. The Sax Committee pointed out that for far too long most hospital boards had not been involved in ensuring that there were adequate quality-care programmes within hospitals or adequate patient review mechanisms. This matter is currently being pursued very vigorously by the working party that I set up following complaints about the Adelaide Children's Hospital.

I most certainly refute the allegations about inaccurate data. Again, I return to what Dr Sax and his colleagues had to say about that matter. They were almost fullsome in their praise of the data collecting systems of the Health Commission and the data analysis undertaken by senior people such as Mr John Cooper.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Have you specifically investigated Dr Dutton's allegation?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Dr Dutton works in a particular department in a particular hospital. As I have said several times in public, preliminary investigations have certainly indicated that there appears to be some stress on staff in the Intensive Care Unit—that is yesterday's news. There is always stress on nursing and medical staff in the high-dependency areas of all hospitals. As to what constitutes an adequate level of staff, that is a value judgment, sometimes a subjective judgment, which can be made by a number of people.

Certainly, if one is looking at the overall staffing levels of any hospital, particularly teaching hospitals, or the public hospital system generally, one must take a fairly broad view. I think that that view can more adequately and more competently be taken in administrative terms by someone outside the immediate system, such as the very senior and competent medical and hospital administrators employed in the South Australian Health Commission. I am certainly not going to test Dr Dutton's allegations. In fact, it would be very foolish of me to do so, particularly at a time when I have specifically set up a working party to investigate them.

I repeat, at times, a 'can't see the wood for the trees' syndrome is evident in that specialists working in an intensive area in a particular department are not necessarily best qualified or best able to speak for the overall staffing levels of a hospital. That situation is best handled by a system of accountability to a board of management that has responsibility to the Health Commission and the Minister of Health. Those two things must come together, and that is what the Sax Report is all about. The Sax Report has been acclaimed already by those who have read it and have appreciated it as an outstanding blueprint for the hospital services of this State for at least the next two decades.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I desire to ask a supplementary question and, in fact, I repeat my original question, because the Minister failed to answer it. Has the Minister investigated Dr Dutton's allegations regarding inaccurate data resulting from the two surveys? On the first occasion, the Minister ignored the allegations about the I.C.U., which later proved to be correct. There may well be some substance in Dr Dutton's other allegation about inaccurate surveys.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I have already answered the honourable member's question at great length; I see no need to add to my remarks.

KLEMZIG PIONEER CEMETERY (VESTING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 19 October. Page 1162.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This Bill was prepared at the request of the Lutheran Church and the City of Enfield. It simply involves the transfer of land from the Lutheran Church to the City of Enfield. On the surface there appears to be substantial agreement between the two groups concerned. The Opposition is happy to support the Bill to the second reading stage to enable the establishment of a Select Committee. The Select Committee will enable all interested parties, for and against (if there are any opposed to the proposal), to present evidence to the Select Committee. Of course, in supporting the second reading of the Bill the Opposition reserves its final position and consideration of the Bill until the Select Committee's report is presented to the Council. I support the second reading.

The PRESIDENT: As this is a hybrid Bill it must be referred to a Select Committee, pursuant to Standing Order No. 268.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hons B.A. Chatterton, C.W. Creedon, K.T. Griffin, Diana Laidlaw, R.I. Lucas, and Barbara Wiese; the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the Select Committee be fixed at four members, and Standing Order 389 to be so far suspended as to enable the Chairman of the Select Committee to have a deliberative vote only; the Committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place; the Committee to report on 8 November.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.
(Continued from 19 October. Page 1167.)
Clause 2—'Commencement'.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I ask the Minister to report progress and seek leave for the Committee to sit again. There were some rather extraordinary scenes last night during the second reading debate of the Bill. I have given instructions for amendments to be placed on file, but that has not yet happened. For that reason, I ask the Minister to report progress.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: This Bill is very important.
Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I tabled the Alexander Report as a public document months ago, which I had absolutely no need to do, I hasten to add. However, I made it available in the spirit of open government which categorises this Administration. It is part of a review of the whole operation being conducted by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, under the chairmanship of Mr Bruce Guerin. The Bill is tantamount to the recommendations of the Alexander Report so that the taxpayers of this State can get better and more efficient value for their money.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: So you accept everything that is in it?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: There ought to be a restructuring of the Commission itself and the commissioners. The Bill was introduced by me four weeks ago. We had the Estimates Committees for two weeks, we got up for one week recess, and there has been more than adequate time for the Opposition to consider the matter. For some extraordinary reason, it is embarking yet again on this obstruction to perfectly legitimate Government business. I do not believe that that is good enough. It seems, in the circumstances, that I have little option.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: We gave you time when in Opposition.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: In Opposition, we were given one week, and that was all.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: That is not true. I know very well what time I was given to consider legislation concerning me as shadow Minister. The normally agreed convention throughout the period in which we were in Opposition was one week.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The interjections are not relevant to the subject before us.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The debate centres on whether or not we should adjourn the debate. In that respect, it is entirely relevant. I have no option it seems but to agree

to the adjournment. However, I must say that I consider that the Opposition is verging on taking legitimate business out of the hands of the Government, and I want it registered that I object in the strongest possible terms.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: As the Minister has not asked that progress be reported, I would like to make a short statement.

The CHAIRMAN: The question now is whether the Minister will seek to report progress.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I reluctantly ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

BUDGET PAPERS

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

That the Council take note of the papers relating to the Estimates of Receipts and Payments, 1983-84.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 1070.)

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I support the motion that the papers be noted. I wish to address myself in the first instance to just one aspect of the health budget. Part of the overall Budget relates to payments to recognised hospitals. These payments are set out in appendix 1 of the Estimates of Payments.

A quite considerable part of the total sum is applied to the Adelaide Children's Hospital. This excellent paediatric hospital, of course, does derive most of its funds from the Government. It does, however, generate a very significant part of its funds from the private sector—from donations in various forms. All members of this Council, of course, will recall the recent most undignified confrontation between the Minister and Dr Dutton—the medical officer in charge of intensive care in that hospital.

The Minister took on the doctor in public and he did not win. This somewhat unsavoury incident did have the advantage of exposing the Minister to the public. The Minister eventually had to back down (*Sunday Mail* 9.10.83). I will never cease to wonder why this Minister always has to take on anyone who disagrees with him. I am thinking of the Board, medical staff and nursing staff of the Port Augusta Hospital. I am thinking of the Mayor of Port Pirie. I am thinking of the Chairman of the Board of Management of the Hillcrest Hospital (which recently became the first psychiatric hospital in Australia to win accreditation). I am thinking of the much maligned Board of the Julia Farr Centre.

Now coming back to the Adelaide Children's Hospital, the Minister did disgrace himself on television when he took on the medical practitioner in charge of the relevant unit in that hospital. He did make a sort of half-hearted attempt to apologise (*Advertiser* 11.10.83) but he did not keep it up. On Thursday 13 October the Minister presented an accreditation certificate to the Hillcrest Hospital (another recognised hospital funded by this Budget), and I do congratulate this hospital on attaining this meritorious award. When I spoke in the debate on my no-confidence motion on the Minister, I referred to the unacceptable behaviour of the Minister and, in particular, to the occasion when he attacked the Chairman of the Hillcrest Hospital in front of psychiatric out-patients of the hospital.

On the occasion of the presenting of this meritorious accreditation, the Minister could not refrain from having a tilt at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and, in particular, at the doctor who had raised this issue. On the occasion to which I have referred, the Minister, in public, made an allusion which could only be taken to refer to the doctor to

whom I have referred, from the Adelaide Children's Hospital as a 'rogue bull'. This was despite the fact that, as reported in the *Advertiser* of 11 October 1983, the Minister had apologised for his disgraceful references to the doctor in question. He did not apologise in those terms, but he did apologise.

In the course of the press coverage of this issue (that is, the issue related to the Adelaide Children's Hospital), the Minister made a number of disparaging references to 'chook raffles'. This was quite disgraceful. The Adelaide Children's Hospital has historically relied for some of its finance on voluntary donors in the community. We have such magnificent and truly charitable sources of funds available to the Adelaide Children's Hospital from, for example, the Rogerson Trust, and I hope that the State Government does not intend to get its sticky fingers on that.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: How much is paid from voluntary fundraising? Not one zac! Face the reality!

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask members to desist from arguing across the Chamber. Each member will have an opportunity to speak.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I am not sure of the reference to argument across the Chamber.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: The Minister said he didn't like the Chairman.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Yes, but I will take note of what you have said, Mr President, and I will not answer interjections from across the Chamber. I will continue with what I have to say.

It really was disgraceful to disparage the voluntary input of funds into the Adelaide Children's Hospital. Perhaps at some levels support for the Adelaide Children's Hospital is by 'chook raffles'. What is wrong with that? Surely the Minister would not disparage the large-scale fund raising efforts made on behalf of the hospital (and I think that he is in trouble if he does). I think particularly of the Good Friday Appeal.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: Of course I would not. However, they should stop kidding themselves that this is a cottage hospital. It does not run exclusively on charity, which is the mentality shown in views expressed by some of the board members.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister can make all these points later.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The Good Friday Appeal is magnificently supported by people from the newspapers, radio and television stations, the entertainment industry and by thousands of good citizens throughout the State. This, of course, relates to the Budget because it is money that goes to the Adelaide Children's Hospital. This is a true exercise in charity and is a very great credit to those artists, entertainers and others who undertake this work. To characterise and denigrate this work as being on a par with a 'chook raffle' is disgraceful and is characteristic of this Minister.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: What about the accountability for \$24 million of taxpayers' funds? What do you say about them, Mr Burdett?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I make the point firmly that the Minister will have every opportunity to reply to the statements made by the Hon. Mr Burdett and must cease interjecting. I refer to Standing Order 181, if the Minister wants something to occupy his mind.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: It is very clear, of course, that, as a result of this disgraceful outburst, the Premier has spoken to the Minister and admonished him. I must say that I am quite impressed at the seriousness with which the Minister is working on his 'gentle John' image, although that image got rather seriously tarnished last night during the debate on the cigarette advertising Bill and again today

in reference to the Health Commission (and, more recently, while I have been speaking). As a result of the inquiries which have been conducted into the Adelaide Children's Hospital, I trust that the budgetary and other problems which clearly existed at that hospital will be solved.

I noted the Minister's reported intention (reported in the *Advertiser* of 11 October 1983) to set up a 'hot line' to the Minister whereby, presumably, people somewhere down the track can go behind the backs of the medical superintendents, administrators and boards and directly to the Minister. I should think that this is a good recipe for disaster. I appreciate the Minister's desire to have an early warning system instead of reading about a problem for the first time in the correspondence column of the *Advertiser*, but such communications should go through the proper channels. I should think that the Minister's budget is likely to get severely mauled through the 'hot line' procedure. Professionals will have direct access to the Minister and will be able to present in isolation individual claims for the expenditure of money in particular areas which will be well documented and which will demonstrate a need and be hard to resist. Oh well, it could not happen to a nicer Minister, but I will look with interest at the next Budget to see whether or not there are signs of the hot line having caused additional expenditure. I might add that this procedure is likely to cause money to go to those who shout the loudest on the hot line rather than to be equitably distributed to the best effect across the board.

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: I would, first, support the views expressed by the Hon. Legh Davis on the problems facing all Governments in Australia on the provision of superannuation in the public sector. As most honourable members would know, I have drawn attention to this growing problem for a number of years. The taxpayers' contribution has multiplied 10 times in 10 years and, while the annual percentage increase has been relatively stable at approximately 20 per cent in the past six years, an increase of 20 per cent per annum will see the multiplication of the taxpayers' contribution of another six times in the next 10 years. For those who are interested in this problem I would recommend a study of the Senate Committee's Report on Superannuation at the Federal level.

The Hon. Lance Milne also has shown his interest in this question and in a press release this week is calling for a Royal Commission. I do not oppose the idea of a Royal Commission, if the Government decides to support it, but I believe that a Royal Commission is an expensive way to tackle the problem, particularly at the level of one State embarking upon that course. However, a thorough examination is required and that examination needs to be undertaken by all States and the Commonwealth, with all political Parties involved. Unless we achieve some general consensus on public sector superannuation, we will continue with the expanding growth of benefits that the taxpayer has to meet.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: I do not know how to do it, but I cannot see any reason for a Royal Commission operating at State level regarding superannuation. One of the big problems we have with superannuation is the fact that one State makes a move and then pressure comes on all States to follow that move. Fundamental changes need to be made and made quickly. First, the scheme must be funded each year by the Government—not meeting the pension payment when the superannuant retires. Secondly, we should consider lump sum payments on retirement only. Thirdly, an indexed pension based on C.P.I. is unjustified, and the recent 12.3 per cent increase in a wage pause period illustrates the disquiet felt in the community, and one can understand that view. The scheme began with a 50 per cent contribution by the superannuant and a 50 per cent contri-

bution by the Government. In the last financial year the contribution was 83 per cent Government, 17 per cent Fund.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: That is not quite true, if one analyses it. There is a contribution from the Commonwealth in relation to the total amount of superannuation with regard to the railways. One has to make that adjustment in the figures. If one looks at the contribution to the State superannuation fund one will find that the 83 per cent and 17 per cent are the correct figures. It is difficult to arrive at a figure because there is that contribution from the Commonwealth in relation to the railways. Not only have we to consider the public sector, but what do we know of superannuation arrangements in our statutory authorities? We are only looking, at this stage, at the question of Public Service superannuation. However, what has happened in some States? I would like to report on this to the Council. I have been informed by the people conducting a survey in one State into statutory authorities that within a short period it will not be possible for statutory authorities in that State to meet their commitments. I will make the prediction now that within the next 10 years there will have to be a reneging of superannuation payments in either the public sector or statutory authorities somewhere in Australia. I believe, also, that political influences have been one of the contributing factors to the problems we are facing and it appears necessary that superannuation should be removed entirely from the political scene. How often have I seen a superannuation Bill come before a Parliament in Australia with the bold comment by the Government on its introduction that 'This Bill is the most advanced in Australia'.

Both Government and Opposition are frightened politically to face the real problems that they are creating for some Government of the future. If the Government had to fund the superannuation each year I am quite certain that Governments would not have been so lavish in their commitments to future Governments' contributions to superannuation. The Parliament itself is incapable in such circumstances of facing the facts of the situation. There is no question that the superannuation problem will not go away; it will continue to expand as a financial problem, and sooner or later it must be faced, but it must be faced in fairness to the contributors and to the taxpayers and outside the realm of confrontation-style politics.

The Budget papers show that the Government intends to transfer another \$28 million from capital funds to the Recurrent Budget during this financial year. If the Budget runs along its present lines, in four years this State will have absorbed \$1.85 million of capital funds for recurrent expenditure. Although this Government has said that it proposed not to continue with this capital absorption, it is necessary for Parliament to take a stronger line in this area. As I have said before in this Council, all American States have constitutional or statutory provisions placing restrictions on Governments in the use of capital funds.

Because of the power of Governments in the House of Assembly there is no way, except the defeat of the Government, for that House to influence or change the structure of a Budget. While this Council has clearly a right to amend the Budget in certain circumstances, the ability to influence is limited. The American States faced the same sort of problem; so they now have restrictions by Statute on the utilisation of capital funds. Of course, as far as we are concerned, the only way that the Parliament can influence the structure of a Budget is along those lines. There is no other way in which the Parliament can influence the Budget and the Government continue except by placing that restriction in Statute or in the Constitution.

From the taxpayers' point of view, it is necessary that the Parliament takes such an interest because it is not in their interests that continuing policies of capital absorption be permitted. The Premier has already commented on this matter. I direct the question to the Attorney-General, representing the Premier and Treasurer in this Council: has the Government given any consideration to this point—legislation of a similar nature to the American provisions on the use of capital funds? While the American States have all made this move for a very good reason, which we can understand in this State, there is also a gathering pressure in America to place a similar restriction on the Federal Government.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. R.C. DeGARIS: I am not saying anything about whether it will pass or not. All I am saying is that, having adopted this principle in every State of America, there is now a growing pressure in America for the same thing to apply in the Federal arena. During my time in this Parliament I have seen the Budget presentations of seven Treasurers. Although State Budgets do not change dramatically from Treasurer to Treasurer, the change from the Playford Budgets to the present Budgets shows a general decline in percentages in what may be called the developmental departments, but a huge percentage increase in expenditures of a non-developmental kind. Although this change began during the Dunstan period, there has been a tendency in all democracies to increase expenditures in the non-productive areas.

In the present economic conditions, perhaps we should examine more closely the need to reduce much of our Government expenditure on the non-productive areas. With this increase in public sector expenditure we now have reached the point where public expenditure in Australia is very close to 50 per cent of the gross domestic product. That is a staggering figure which must concern all of us. It includes expenditure of Federal, State and local government and statutory authorities. When one considers that in 1900 the public expenditure in Australia was 7 per cent of the gross domestic product, one realises that we certainly have made progress in public expenditure in the past 80 years. One must begin to wonder where the expansion finishes.

This expansion has also had an effect on the ability of Parliament to fulfil its functions. I hope that the Select Committee appointed from the Parliament is able to come to grips with this problem and make recommendations that improve the ability of Parliament to fulfil its role. In difficult circumstances, the Budget is not a bad Budget, although one could criticise a number of areas. No doubt, when the actual Appropriation Bill comes before the Council I will once again speak on this matter. However, I intend to touch on one matter that I received from the Attorney-General in reply to a question on financial institutions duty. I quote from the reply which I got yesterday:

As pointed out by the Treasurer in Attachment II to this year's Financial Statement, the Government's target is to achieve a net increment to revenue from the introduction of financial institutions duty and the reduction of stamp duties of \$16 million in a full year and \$8 million in 1983-84. These figures will be the outcome of several factors, including the rate at which f.i.d. is introduced, the range of exemptions offered and the accompanying reductions in stamp duties.

To the extent that the figure for stamp duties receipts included in the Budget is overstated by containing no allowance for the foreshadowed reductions, the figure for f.i.d. receipts is understated. Little point would have been served by guessing at the extent of the stamp duties reductions which will constitute one part of the final outcome.

I point out to the Council that in Victoria when the f.i.d. was introduced the Government anticipated an income of \$100 million per year. I believe that its income in the financial year will be somewhere around \$60 million. Therefore, one can say that in South Australia we should receive somewhere around \$20 million in f.i.d. This means that when the figure given for stamp duties, which is overstated in the Budget, is reduced as f.i.d. comes in it will be quite misleading. I do not believe that f.i.d. will return the net amount that the Government says after the reduction in stamp duties in other areas. The Attorney-General may make further comment when he replies in this debate, but I see quite a great difficulty for the Government in this matter.

Although it is clear in the Budget that increases in taxation had to occur, I would have liked to see smaller increases with larger cuts in expenditure, particularly in the non-productive areas. Public expenditure in Australia has now reached the staggering figure of being very close to 50 per cent of the gross domestic product. The increase in expenditure in the Budget is 7.36 per cent; the increase in receipts is 11.7 per cent, which still leaves a deficit of \$33 million. This will be covered by the transfer of capital funds. I hope that this will be the last Budget that I see following that policy.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

In Committee.

(Continued from 18 October. Page 1071.)

Clause 2 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.55 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 25 October at 2.15 p.m.