LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 15 August 1985

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

PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARIAN'S REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the Parliamentary Librarian's Report for 1984-85.

OMBUDSMAN'S REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the Ombudsman's Report for 1984-85.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF PARLIAMENT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the Committee's report, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

Pursuant to Statute—

South Australian Totalizator Agency Board—Nineteenth Annual Report, 1985.

QUESTIONS

LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question in relation to live sheep exports.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I believe that the community as a whole is aware of the value of the live sheep export trade, not only to Australia but particularly to South Australia and the farming community generally. Because of the present financial situation and the problems associated with farms, which are becoming an even more important part of the income of South Australia, many 'traditional' forms of income are becoming less attractive because of the cost structure. For example, in 1959 the fat lamb market—of which the Hon. Mr Chatterton would have some knowledge—had an average price of £10 per head (the equivalent of $20 in the new currency). This year, as last year, we will be very lucky if the average price is $20.

Wool attracts a very good price, provided one has the right type. Crossbred wools have not been very good during the past 12 months, although they have improved somewhat. The end result of any fat lamb production is that one has cast for age ewes, and the general indication this year is that the price will vary from about 45 cents to $2. In fact, the general indication is that the farming community may well be placed in the situation of having to bury many lambs. In contrast, old and young wethers being exported to the Middle East are averaging around $24. Therefore, the economics of the trade are very clear-cut.

Sheep meats are not very saleable in the frozen form. However, in live form the wether and ram lamb trade to the Middle East is very lucrative. The general indication is that the trade is likely to continue with up to 7 000 000 or more sheep, wethers and ram lambs being sent to the Middle East in the coming year. This will mean a very large return to the farming community.

I note that the Senate Select Committee in general terms has favoured the continuation of the trade, although the Chairman of that Committee, for some reason, has indicated that he would like to see it phased out. I suggest that he lives in cloud nine land if he believes that, by phasing it out, we will force these people to eat frozen meat, because their general way of life is such that they tend to favour live sheep. It is certainly much easier in desert countries to take stock around live than to carry it around in frozen form, in which it tends not to last very long. The Senate Select Committee report indicates that if the Middle East market were denied live sheep, importers would simply increase purchases from alternative sources—a view contrary to the expectations of the Meat Industry Union—and it is highly unlikely that the Australian sheep industry would maintain its share of the total sheep meat market. Export revenue from the sale of sheep and sheep meat would be reduced, with consequent reductions in farm gate prices for sheep sold in Australia.

This is a very serious subject because a very large part of the export income of this country is involved. It is very serious indeed if there are any attempts to interfere with it. My questions to the Minister are:

1. Did the Department of Agriculture, and the Minister through it, in its submission to the Senate Select Committee support the live sheep trade?

2. Will the Minister take steps to ensure that the Government does everything in its power to promote and increase the export trade in live sheep to the Middle East?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Hon. Martin Cameron, in his explanation, canvassed a few matters, which I will resist the temptation to go into in detail. However, I agree with him that the live sheep trade is certainly very valuable to the rural industry of South Australia, Western Australia, New South Wales and Victoria. Having said that, I have not read the Senate Select Committee's report, any more than, I imagine, anyone else in this Parliament has. Until I do, it would not be wise for me to comment on the basis of newspaper reports alone.

Also, I assume that this Select Committee was an all Party Select Committee. I am not sure whether any minority reports were submitted or whether the report was unanimous, in which case it would reflect the views of all the political Parties involved, including the Liberal Party. However, there may well have been a minority report, but I am not aware of it.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not sure. I have the same as everyone else—a newspaper report. Until I have seen the report I cannot make any specific comment, and certainly not a comment that would in any way bind the Government.

I understand that the report contains three key recommendations: first, the phasing out of the live sheep trade in the long term; secondly, the immediate stopping of any sheep under two years of age from being exported; and, thirdly, greater Government control of the conditions of shipping live sheep. I believe that the recommendations also go on to propose a much tighter control over the handling of sheep, and in several other respects the recommendations go further than the current code of practice.

Taking those recommendations in order, I do not think that anybody would quarrel that the phasing out of the live sheep trade in the long term would be an ideal situation, provided the farmers concerned were not disadvantaged.

Of course, this would require the sheep to be shipped to the Middle East and other places in carcase form. I think all members would agree that, if it was feasible to bring that about, it would certainly be desirable, and we would have no argument with that recommendation. Whether it is a practical proposition is another question. In relation to the phasing out of the live sheep trade in the long term, it is my personal belief that, given the public concern in relation to this trade, it is probably inevitable that it is stopped over the long term. That may well be a pity, but I think that public opinion will continue to grow against the export of live sheep. I think that public opinion will eventually bring that about.

I cannot place any time scale on that, but I believe that, as the codes of practice continue to be tightened up, and if sheep receive better treatment prior to being shipped and during the voyage itself, the further away the day will be when the trade is phased out. There is certainly a strong incentive for everyone involved in the live sheep trade to ensure that the sheep are treated in the best possible way.

I also believe that the report recommends that the current average period of feed lotting prior to shipment should increase from between five and six days to nine days. It is measures such as this that I believe will ensure that the live sheep trade continues for as long as possible. It is in everyone's interest to make sure that the codes of practice are strengthened and that the safeguard methods adopted by people who ship live sheep are as high as possible.

The recommendation regarding immediately stopping the export of any sheep under two years of age could perhaps be better commented on by my friend and colleague the Hon. Dr Cornwall, who is better qualified than I in that area. I assume that the Senate Select Committee is saying that older sheep are better able to withstand the rigours of a voyage, and that may well be true.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: That wouldn't be the case with you and me.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That may well be true. I really do not know of my own knowledge, and I will have to obtain advice from the veterinarians in the Department of Agriculture as to the significance of that recommendation. The third significant recommendation states that there should be greater Government control over conditions for shipping live sheep. I think that goes back to the first recommendation. I think that this is highly desirable. I think that, if the public sees this trade as in some way detrimental to the welfare of the animals concerned, it may well allay their fears if they know that the Government has very strong control and strict standards over this trade. That may well mean that the trade will last that much longer. I certainly support that.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Don't forget the welfare of the farmers.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Hon. Mr Cameron says that I should bear in mind the welfare of the farmers. I certainly do. However, I cannot trade off the welfare of farmers for the welfare of these animals. It is just not possible to trade off those things and to say that the animals must suffer because—

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: They put on weight on the ships.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes—the farmer is having economic problems: that is not the trade-off at all. I am saying that the Government should have sufficient control to allay public anxiety regarding the treatment of sheep when they are being transported to overseas markets. It is in the interest of farmers that that is done. A couple of weeks ago I read in the *National Farmer* magazine, which appears periodically, an article which stated that New Zealand absolutely prohibits the export of live sheep.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Are we following New Zealand in everything?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The honourable member should wait a moment. That is not the problem. The problem may well be the reverse—that New Zealand is following Australia. A report indicated that New Zealand may enter the live sheep market and, if that occurs, it will have a very quick and devastating effect on this trade from Australia.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: They are different sheep.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Not necessarily, because New Zealand will be able to supply an abundance of some of the younger animals that Middle East customers apparently want. It is a very complex matter. New Zealand has been very successful to date in exporting only carcases. I understand that New Zealand has established freezers in Iran, and there is an agreement that those freezers be used only for New Zealand products. So, it is possible to do it.

The officers of my department have been discussing this matter with the Commonwealth Department of Health, and there will be a further meeting next week. I have asked them to review this report and to get back to me with their thoughts on it. Those who are criticising the report should, first, read it and, secondly, check whether or not the report is an all-Party report.

INDEPENDENT LIVING CENTRE

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about the relocation of the Independent Living Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I am sure that the Minister must have been expecting this question, so I hope that he has a good reply. The August issue of the newspaper *Link* carried an article about disability under the heading 'Questions must be asked', and I guess I am asking those questions. The report stated:

'This is the first I have heard of it.' This was the stunned reaction of the Disability Adviser to the Premier, Mr Richard Llewellyn, to the news last week that the Independent Living Centre is to move to Daw Park at a cost of more than $400 000. 'If it is true then I am surprised that a Government department could spend that amount of money without even consulting the Premier's adviser on disability,' Mr Llewellyn said.

Disabled People's International (SA) was also disturbed by the news, according to secretary, Mr Jules Davison. 'Questions have to be asked,' Mr Davison said. 'Why were none of the bodies which represent the users of the centre consulted about the move during the 12 month search by the ILC for new premises? Why wasn't the Premier's own Disability Adviser consulted? Why is the Government channelling more than $400 000 into a professionally oriented service, when worthwhile projects such as attendant care are crying out for funds? Did the Minister of Health even know about this expenditure? Why is the centre being made even less accessible than it already is by moving it out to Daw Park, half an hour from the city? Is the move really necessary at all?' Mr Davison asked.

Confirming the move last week, the Chief Executive Officer of the ILC, Mrs Lyn McDowell, said the centre was moving because it needed permanent headquarters and the new building was ideal.

'We have always known that our present location, attached to the Julia Farr Centre, is only temporary,' she said. 'The new building has two main advantages: we want to be out into the community rather than attached to an institution and being out of the city means we'll encourage people to visit us who are unable to negotiate heavy traffic. It is a little further out than we wanted but its advantages more than outweigh its disadvantages.

We have a proposal before the Health Commission to provide a taxi service from the city to the new site, which should solve many travel problems,' Mrs McDowell said.

Mr Davison said he could not understand how the centre could justify the cost of a taxi service (which DPI estimated would cost about $50 000 a year), when disability consumer groups were being knocked back over grants of $5 000 to get their members to meetings. Mr Lewellyn said $400 000 would fund many other projects. 'For example $400 000 would provide attendant care for

35 people for a year,' he said. The Minister of Health, Dr John Cornwall, was unable to comment on the situation, his press secretary, Mr John Webb, said last week.

I am sure that, by now, the Minister can comment, and I ask him to do so.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I am delighted to comment. The Independent Living Centre was, from memory, established in about 1977, using a single capital grant of $20 000. It was run mostly on a voluntary basis from time to time until I became Minister of Health in late 1982. During the period of the previous Government the Red Cross (from memory) was inveigled into becoming involved with the management and conduct of the centre. The centre suffered badly at all times and was severely disadvantaged by a lack of guaranteed ongoing recurrent funding.

When I became involved with the centre in 1983, steps were taken after consultation with all of the organisations representing the disabled to have a report prepared on what should be the future of the Independent Living Centre. All options were canvassed—whether, in fact, it should cease to exist through to the possibility of incorporating it under the South Australian Health Commission Act and making it a fully funded body with adequate resources, and, ultimately, adequate accommodation.

I repeat what I said previously, that all organisations for the disabled were represented on the working party set up to investigate the ILC. There were only two dissenters. It was recommended that we should incorporate the Independent Living Centre and that it should be given a degree of certainty: in the words of Dr Peter Last, 'It would be completely unthinkable for the Independent Living Centre to be closed.' The same sentiments have been expressed on many occasions by Professor Dennis Smith, Professor of Rehabilitation at Flinders University.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Mr (what's his name?—that lightweight) Davis interjects and asks, 'Why no consultation?' I was just coming to that point. I will tell him how the Board of Management of the Incorporated Health Unit of the Independent Living Centre is constituted. The Chairperson of that board is Mrs Barbara Garrett, who I am sure would be known to Mr Davis, and to virtually every member of this Chamber. Mrs Garrett was for many years the senior social worker at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. She is one of the most respected figures in the health and welfare field in South Australia. There is a representative from the Disability Information and Resource Centre, a representative from Regency Park, and a representative from the Disabled Peoples International, Mr Ted Dunstan.

There is somebody from the South Australian Council on the Ageing (SACOTA), the South Australian Association of Occupational Therapists, the Australian Red Cross Society, the Australian College of Rehabilitation Medicine (their representative is Professor Dennis Smith) and three representatives nominated by the Minister of Health: E. Sleath, Barbara Worley (who I am sure is very well known particularly to the former Attorney-General because she played a very prominent role in the International Year of the Disabled and has continued her very good work for the disabled) and Judith Cross from the Adelaide Central Mission.

To suggest that that is not about as representative as you could possibly get is to be very foolish indeed. What they did was to reorganise; they have a new Director. They have an annual recurrent budget now of almost $200 000. Their future, in other words, has been assured.

They approached me about six or eight months ago; in fact, it was following a visit that I made to the Independent Living Centre in their cramped quarters behind the Julia Farr Centre. Following that visit, the board approached me and indicated that they would like more suitable premises. After quite a search around the suburban and city areas, they found what they believed were very suitable premises—a building which could well have been built specifically for their purpose. Of course, what they required was a large area in which to display the very many aids that are available to disabled people and, of course, some office and administration space. They had been functioning, from memory, in what are the old doctors quarters behind Julia Farr where the various pieces of equipment were displayed in about six small rooms. That was totally inadequate. I approved the purchase of that building at a capital cost of $365 000. It was purchased by the board of the Independent Living Centre and I am told that it can be made entirely satisfactory for their needs for about $35 000. So all up they will own that building freehold for about $400 000.

The question of whether that money should be spent on the Independent Living Centre is one which has been raised fairly consistently by a very small but very vocal group of disabled people. In fact, the centre has the potential to service in excess of 100 000 South Australians who are disabled for one reason or another—particularly the frail aged, patients who have had strokes, the very many people who suffer from various forms of arthritis, cerebral palsy and Parkinson's disease, to name but four. In other words, it has the potential to meet the needs of literally tens of thousands of South Australians, and increasingly it is doing so. It also provides information not only to the disabled themselves but to the many professionals who provide services for them, including not only doctors and all of the allied health professions but groups as wide ranging as architects and builders. A whole range of people can receive advice and information from the Independent Living Centre.

I regret that this has been made a matter of controversy—I think most unnecessarily and potentially somewhat destructively—but I have indicated that all further questions or queries, whether from the media or anyone else, should go directly to the Board of Management of the Independent Living Centre or to people like Dr Peter Last or Professor Dennis Smith who are able to give independent professional opinions.

All those people tell me in the strongest possible terms that we have done the right thing—not to have purchased this property would have impeded the good conduct and progress of the Independent Living Centre—and there seems to be quite widespread support throughout the disabled organisations generally for the Government's initiative.

COURT REPORTING

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question in relation to court reporting.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: In May 1985 I asked questions of the Attorney-General with respect to the volume of court reporting undertaken by Government employees as against the private contractor. A written reply was provided by the Attorney-General during the recess, and I hope that he will arrange to have that and other replies to questions incorporated in *Hansard,* so that they can be part of the public record.

In his reply the Attorney-General indicated that the Government was continuing to expand the public sector reporting service, particularly by the use of so-called flexible part-time employment and by a reputed increase in productivity. It is difficult to see how this will result in any cost savings to the Government, taking into account salaries, leave or

leave loading, superannuation, machinery and material costs, capital costs and all other overheads. My questions are:

1. What is the current cost per page charged by the private contractor?

2. What is the current cost per page taking into account all the overhead costs for the Government court reporting service?

3. What expansion of the Government court reporting service and reduction in the private contractor's work is proposed in the current financial year, and for what reasons?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not in a position to answer that question at the moment in any detail. Suffice to say, the Government maintained its commitment to a core of manual reporters and reintroduced the training scheme for manual reporters on its return to government in 1982. More recently, the Government has engaged more reporters, but as part of the Government tape service as opposed to manual reporters.

The information with which I was provided, which was assessed by Treasury, was that an extension of the Government tape service in the manner that was done would, in fact, be cost effective compared to private contractors. Therefore, there has been some expansion of the Government tape service, but I do not believe that there has been any expansion of the manual reporting service. What we have done in respect of manual reporters is to maintain the core that existed in 1982 and to recommence training schemes for those manual reporters.

There has been a significant increase in the productivity of the manual reporters since 1982, and that has been very pleasing to see. However, I will obtain the detailed information that the honourable member has requested and bring back a reply, along with the previous reply that I gave.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NATIVE VEGETATION CLEARANCE

The Hon. B.A. CHATTERTON brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received. Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

DA VINCI EXHIBITION

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for the Arts, a question in relation to the suggested Leonardo Da Vinci exhibition at the Art Gallery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I asked a question about this matter last week, and yesterday I received a reply. In that reply the Minister explained the difficulties with which he is confronted in regard to this matter. He said:

> It is really a matter for the Hon. Mr Hill to say which exhibition he would remove from the Art Gallery next year in the event of his being in a position to do so. He must realise that that is what he will have to do.

The final sentence was:

> Therefore, the Hon. Mr Hill must decide what exhibition that has already been booked should be removed from the Art Gallery in 1986 if he wishes to proceed with his commitment.

As it is impossible for me to make any judgments or give further consideration to this matter without knowing the program that the Art Gallery has laid down, I ask the Minister whether he will obtain for me a copy of next year's program of exhibitions. After receiving that information, I will consider the matter fully and give whatever advice I can to the Government.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member has taken my rhetorical question quite literally. However, I will refer the honourable member's supplementary question to the Minister for the Arts and bring back a reply.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY OFFICERS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Education, a question in relation to Equal Opportunity Officers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Honourable members are probably aware that this Government has six Women's Advisers or Equal Opportunity Officers. All of them were first established by Labor Ministers: the Women's Advisers to the Premier, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Community Welfare, and the Equal Opportunity Officers in the Department of Education and the Department of Technical and Further Education. Four of these individuals, as part of their terms and conditions of office, have direct access to their Ministers when required. This situation applies for the Women's Advisers to the Premier and to the Ministers of Health, Community Welfare and Labour. However, the Equal Opportunity Officers in the Department of Education and the Department of Technical and Further Education do not have direct access to their Ministers as part of the conditions of office, both of which were reorganised and changed under the previous Liberal Government.

As I am sure members are also aware, there is currently a large scale reorganisation occurring in the Department of Education, with considerable changes in line management and responsibility. Furthermore, the previous Equal Opportunity Officer in the Department of Education resigned to take up another position, and a replacement has been appointed, although she has not yet started in the position.

My question relates to the terms and conditions for the office that this new Equal Opportunity Officer will take up. Will the Minister of Education consider, with the new officer being appointed, whether the terms and conditions of her position could include direct access to the Minister, as applies to the other Women's Advisers in the Labor Government?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I thank the honourable member for her question, which I will be happy to refer to my colleague in another place, and I will bring back a reply as soon as possible.

POWER GENERATION RESEARCH

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Labour, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about research into the generation of power.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: In the *Financial Review* of 2 August, an article described the research activities of several United States engineering companies. It stated that up to $20 billion will be spent in the next few years on research into the generation of power from the burning of garbage and industrial waste. This enormous amount of money has been committed to power generation research in the United States, because that country offers very real inducements to companies, not only to generate their own electric power, utilising surplus steam or heat from their

manufacturing processes, but to sell surplus power so generated to a power authority like ETSA.

In the United States, under Federal legislation, public power generating authorities are required to purchase surplus power from private producers at a rate equal to the producers' actual or avoided cost of generating that power. While this legislation applies to interstate situations, guidelines are provided also for States to apply the legislation to intrastate situations.

As a consequence of this legislation, a private producer in Hawaii, for example, is paid approximately 7c per kilowatt per hour for surplus power while the power authority charges industrial users approximately 10c. Private producers are encouraged also to generate power from non-fossil fuel—for example, solar and wind power. By contrast, in South Australia, and I believe that the situation prevails throughout Australia, no incentive is provided for companies to utilise surplus heat or steam from their manufacturing processes to generate a source of power beyond their immediate needs. For instance, a company in Adelaide that has the capacity to generate power beyond its needs and to sell it to ETSA receives from ETSA only 2c per kilowatt per hour for the surplus, compared with Hawaii's 7c. However, when that same company has to buy power from ETSA it is charged at a rate of 7c per kilowatt per hour.

At a time when the Government and ETSA are alleged to be concerned about the high cost of interest rates on loan funds to be raised to build a new power station in South Australia, would it not be sound for ETSA to offer to pay companies, other Government authorities and municipal authorities a realistic price for their surplus power? Further, does the Minister agree that if ETSA adopted the policy of paying the actual or avoided cost for the purchase of surplus power generated by private producers, as applies in the United States, companies and the like in South Australia would be provided with an incentive to research new ways to generate power from the disposal of garbage and industrial waste? Also, does he agree that such a change would encourage companies and the like to experiment with generating power from wind and solar sources, recognising that the South Australian coast has very consistent levels of wind throughout the year and also abundant sunlight?

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

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: In May 1985 the Hon. Dr Cornwall as Minister of Health supported a move at a conference of Health Ministers, which proposed as from 1 July 1986 that 20 per cent of the front and back panels of cigarette packets should carry one of four mandatory warnings. The intention was that these warnings should be used in rotation. The existing requirement for cigarette packet health warnings is 'Warning: smoking is a health hazard'.

The proposed new warnings include one that simply says, 'Smoking kills'. It appears from my investigations that this is the harshest health warning required to be carried on a cigarette packet in any country. For example, the warning in the United Kingdom is, 'Danger: Government health warning—cigarettes can seriously damage your health'. However, I understand that at least some of the Health Ministers, including the Hon. Dr Cornwall, canvassed this option and rejected it. We do not live in a perfect world. The Minister constantly reminds us and is, indeed, a reminder of that fact.

There is understandable concern by health professionals about the nexus between smoking and ill health. However, if the Minister supports this draconian warning 'Smoking kills', he surely must also support 'Drinking kills', because, as he would be well aware, drink is a factor in half of the road deaths in South Australia each year and a significant percentage of hospital beds are occupied by persons whose illness can be directly or indirectly attributed to alcohol. My questions are:

1. Did the Minister support the four proposed warnings, to take effect from 1 July 1986, which include the warning, 'Smoking kills'?

2. Does he accept that if a cigarette packet carries the warning 'Smoking kills', a bottle of wine, spirits or beer should also carry a warning 'Drinking kills'? If not, why not?

3. If he believes that a product for human consumption can contain a prominent warning that it kills, does he believe that it is logical to allow that product to be sold?

4. What implications does this proposal have for tobacco advertising in the arts and sport, including the Australian Grand Prix, which, as the Minister would know, carries sponsorship by Marlboro and JPs and Gitanes sponsored car teams?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The first question was whether I support the rotating warnings on cigarette packets and other tobacco products. The clear and unequivocal answer to that is 'Yes'. So do all my colleagues, the Ministers of Health around the nation. The motion was unanimously supported by the Federal Minister and all State Health Ministers, and the Minister from the Northern Territory. It was supported as part of that gathering by the Queensland Minister of Health, Mr Brian Austin, who comes from Australia's principal tobacco growing State and in the past has been somewhat less than enthusiastic about some of the moves that have been made to reduce smoking in other areas. However, I repeat that it was supported unanimously by the Health Ministers, and I will continue to support it.

Of course, the honourable member's second question was stupid. The honourable member asked why, if I supported the four rotating labels on cigarette and tobacco products, I would intend that they should also be on bottles of wine or beer. There is a very clear distinction.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: What is it?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Mr Davis may not have the intelligence to discern it himself, but there is a very clear distinction. No amount of smoking is good for you. Even one cigarette is harmful; twenty cigarettes a day is very harmful, and 40 cigarettes a day will ensure that one is placed in the very highest risk category for cardiovascular disease, emphysema and lung cancer, among others. That risk is present on 20 cigarettes a day, and it may well be there on five cigarettes a day. One cannot refer to a safe smoking level—there is no such thing on all the statistical evidence. However, that is not the case with alcohol.

Alcohol taken in small or moderate quantities can be beneficial. There is no question about that. I am informed by my cardiologist that, among other things, alcohol lowers blood pressure and that a modest amount of table wine, for example, is quite good. Of course, the one disadvantage is that one must count the calories. I would be the first to agree that alcohol abuse is a very large problem and that perhaps as many as 20 per cent of the patients in our hospitals are there in one way or another as a result of alcohol abuse—whether it is acute alcohol abuse resulting in road trauma, and so on, at one end of the spectrum through to cirrhosis of the liver and other end stage diseases.

So, there is a clear distinction to be made: alcohol in small and moderate quantities is not only harmless but also can be positively beneficial. However, I concede that alcohol abuse is one of the great drug problems of our time. However, there is no rationality in placing warning labels on alcohol products in the same way as there is with smoking. Of course, smoking is very much addictive while drinking is not.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: For the great majority of those who consume alcohol it is not an addiction.

The Hon. Peter Dunn: What—alcohol?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Stick to farming, old chap, which you know something about. I assure the honourable member that most people who consume alcohol are not addicted to it. If the honourable member feels that he is addicted to it and that he has a problem, I would be delighted to arrange some help for him. It is a simple medical fact that most people are not addicted to alcohol.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: That was a gratuitously insulting remark. I will not make a reponse; we have come to expect that standard of conduct from the ignorant fellow. The third question was, 'Why does anyone allow a product such as tobacco to be sold when we know that it is harmful?' Quite frankly, my simple and personal answer is that I am unable to stop it.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: You would ban the sale of cigarettes?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: No. Stop your interjections, you silly fellow, and let me get on with the answers. I would not ban it because, as with so many other drugs of addiction—and I have said this publicly on many occasions and in so many other areas of substance abuse—to ban something like that only creates a black market. It would be quite useless as a measure to control the abuse of tobacco, just as it would be in many other cases almost counterproductive. I think that my personal views on that are well known, they are very logical and they are quite right.

In relation to advertising, there was no move at the Health Ministers conference to ban current advertising arrangements or sponsorship in any way. The question of whether there should be restrictions on advertising, particularly in cinemas and newspapers, and whether that advertising should carry the same rotating warnings and carry them as prominently as proposed was referred to a committee of the Health Ministers which will report back in the fullness of time to the next Health Ministers conference.

AIRLINES OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in the Council, a question about Airlines of South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: Today's *Advertiser* reports that Airlines of South Australia appears to have a problem with profitability. The report attributes this to competition by Lloyds Aviation and other competitive sources. It states that Ministers of the Government are having discussions with the airline. Given that a Government can either interfere or not interfere with market forces, what is the purpose of the Government discussions and what Government action is likely?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member seems to assert that market forces in this area should be allowed to apply. I am not sure whether the Hon. Mr Dunn or you, Mr President, would agree with that if the air service to Whyalla or Eyre Peninsula was dramatically cut as a result of the operation of market forces because those routes were no longer economic to run.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr Blevins, always looking to the interests of rural people in this State, interjects and says that many services could be streamlined for country people.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member's question was somewhat simplistic.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: It was open-ended.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No, it was simplistic in the sense that the honourable member said that the Government could only interfere with market forces or not do so. Obviously, any Government would be concerned to ensure that there was a satisfactory airline service for the whole State. I imagine that it is an indication of concern about that situation that has provoked presumably people from State Development to talk to Airlines of South Australia (although I have had nothing to do with that personally).

That is as much as I know about the matter. If the honourable member would like me to bring back a more detailed reply (and he nods his head in affirmation), I will take the matter to the appropriate Minister.

QUESTION ON NOTICE

GRAND PRIX

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN (on notice) asked the Attorney-General: In relation to the sponsorship of the Grand Prix reported to be by Mitsubishi for $1 million—

1. Has the contract been signed and, if it has, when?
2. If it has not been signed, when is it expected to be signed?
3. What are the details of any contract with Mitsubishi, including—
   - *(a)* Is the reported price of $1 million the price for 1985 only or for subsequent years as well?
   - *(b)* If the price is only for 1985, what rights are conferred on Mitsubishi for subsequent years and at what cost?
   - *(c)* If the price is for 1985 and subsequent years, what years are included and is there any further price to be paid by Mitsubishi?
   - *(d)* What is Mitsubishi entitled to as a result of any agreement to sponsor the Grand Prix?
   - *(e)* Are there any obligations placed on the Government's Australian Formula One Grand Prix Board other than the holding of the Grand Prix?
   - *(f)* What are the default provisions affecting each party?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. When fine details have been finalised between Mitsubishi and the Grand Prix office.
3. *(a)* 1985.
   - *(b)* An option for 1986 and 1987 at the market rate at that time.
   - *(c)* Not applicable.
   - *(d)* Naming rights, signage, inclusion in printed material, corporate exposure, entertainment facilities on course, use of logo and various incidental matters such as the opportunity for involvement in press conferences, meetings with press, tickets to the Grand Prix ball and other Grand Prix functions.

(e) No.
(f) Under negotiation.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 14 August. Page 256.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I support the Bill. In doing so, I refer in two respects to the matters that one is allowed to address in debates on Supply Bills. I refer, first, to what I hope would be a logical interpretation of Standing Orders and the second reading explanation and, secondly, to what is commonly known as convention or precedent in the Council regarding such debates. I know that this subject is near and dear to your heart, Mr Acting President, as you, like me, had some difficulty during a debate on a Supply Bill within the past two or three years. The second reading explanation given by the Attorney-General (not by the Minister Assisting the Treasurer) stated:

> It provides $485 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill.

The remainder of the explanation is not really relevant for my purposes. Quite clearly, we are providing a lump sum to enable the Government of the day, through the Public Service, to administer all the normal services and functions that Governments administer through the State Public Service. A sum of $485 million will be provided for functions such as schools, kindergartens, and a whole range of other services in South Australia. Over the past few years an argument has arisen, basically, that 'convention' provides that the Supply Bill is shunted through the Council and that debate on individual expenditure items is appropriate only in relation to an Appropriation Bill and not a Supply Bill. As I said, that is allegedly the convention of the Legislative Council.

The relevant Standing Order, relating to what one may discuss in relation to any Bill or matter before the Council, quite simply provides that a member may not digress from the matter, in this case the Bill, at hand. Basically, in a debate on the Supply Bill one must relate one's comments to that Bill.

As I said, the Supply Bill provides a lump sum for the delivery of a whole range of Government services in South Australia, and so as a necessary follow-on it would appear to be quite logical that during debate on the Supply Bill a member of this Council could debate any expenditure by Government for any service in South Australia, because the service is funded, during this period, by the lump sum allocation under this Supply Bill.

I would have thought that that was a logical explanation of what one can discuss in a Supply Bill debate. Certainly, Presidents have ruled, as recently as the past couple of years, that Standing Orders do not prevent a member from interpreting the debate on the Supply Bill in that way so that, in effect, members can have a wide-ranging debate on a Supply Bill as long as it is limited to the services provided by a Government and funded by the Supply allocation. I would have thought that that was a logical understanding, according to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Council, of a Supply Bill debate.

I now refer to the alleged convention of the Legislative Council which provides that, in effect, as many a member has said, debate on Supply Bills is not an opportunity for debate on specific expenditure: such debate should be left to Appropriation Bills. I do not believe that that is right, either logically (as I have outlined) or by convention or precedent (as I will demonstrate). I want to refer not to the Council's early history but only to the past four or five years in considering Supply Bill debates, what has been addressed, and what has been allowed by Presidents in those debates.

I refer to the contribution of the now Attorney-General (Hon. Chris Sumner) in the Supply Bill debate of 27 August 1981. The honourable member raised the matter of a Corporate Affairs Commission investigation into a local firm, McLeay Bros, and sought to put forward his point of view on that investigation. Obviously, the matter was associated with a former Liberal member of Parliament, so perhaps the Hon. Mr Sumner, as Leader of the Opposition in those days, wanted to put forward a particular point of view on that Corporate Affairs Commission investigation.

The Hon. Mr Sumner argued lucidly and eloquently that it was quite appropriate for the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber to discuss the matter of a Corporate Affairs Commission investigation into a firm (McLeay Brothers) in South Australia. It was an eloquent and cogent argument from the Attorney-General, the sort of argument we sometimes hear from him in this Chamber.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What Supply Bill was this?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It was the 1981 one.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Which Bill?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It was Supply Bill (No. 2). I agreed with much of the argument put by the Attorney-General on that occasion. It was a good presentation from him on that matter. The President of the day said:

> There is no reason why the Leader cannot discuss the Corporate Affairs Commission.

I agree with that ruling. I think that it was a very good ruling, if one is allowed to comment on a President's ruling. The President continued:

> However, I believe that he would be transgressing if he referred to an individual.

I am not sure why the Attorney-General would have been transgressing had he referred to an individual at that time. I do not know whether the President was referring to the context of Standing Orders in the Chamber or to the fact that the matter was before the courts when he made that comment: I am not sure what the President's argument was. The main thing is that the President, after listening to that eloquent argument from the present Attorney-General, ruled that there was no reason why the Leader could not discuss a matter such as a Corporate Affairs Commission investigation during the debate on a Supply Bill.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I will get to that shortly—that is a famous precedent. On the same day, 22 August 1981—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What point are you making?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am discussing Supply Bill debates.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Are you explaining something?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. R.J. Ritson): Order! I am in receipt of advice quoting precedents back through 1965 to 1906 stating that the Supply Bill does not create a general grievance debate situation but does permit matters contained in the Bill to be discussed. Whilst there has been some dispute as to how wide a view of economic matters amounts to matters contained in the Bill, a debate as to whether or not general grievances exist as a right when speaking to this Bill is certainly not speaking to the Bill.

Although I am not sure of the status of a ruling of an Acting President, I think it fair to advise members that there is a difference between debating a matter of economics and attempting to attach that matter to part of the Bill and debating Standing Orders and precedents as to whether or not a grievance situation exists.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Thank you, Mr Acting President. You, Sir, have quoted precedents going back to 1906. I am quoting precedents from as recent as the past three or four years while the current President has been in the Chair. I have certainly more precedents than the two contained in the advice given to you that this is not a wide ranging grievance debate.

I am not sure what status I have now—whether I am disagreeing with the ruling of the Acting President or whether I am allowed to do that. What I am saying is that there is a much more recent precedent made by the current President of this Chamber, a precedent I have just quoted. If allowed to do so, I will quote a number of rulings given by the current President of this Chamber (and I am not aware of the 1906 ruling) which are obviously in conflict with the ruling given in 1906. I seek guidance from you, Mr Acting President, as to whether you are, in effect, asking me to sit down or whether I am disagreeing with your ruling on this matter by quoting the half a dozen precedents from the past three or four years that I have on record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: I point out to the honourable member that I made no ruling. I took an opportunity to remind the honourable member of the advice I had received concerning previous rulings. In case I was not understood, it would appear from my advice that there is no general right of grievance debate on this Bill, if previous Presidential rulings are followed. There is a right to debate matters raised by the Bill and there is a cloudy area as to how much debate on the economics of the State can be attached to this Bill.

This is quite a distinct thing, this matter of arguing that certain economic factors should be debatable because this is a Supply Bill: it is a quite distinct thing from arguing, as the honourable member is, on the matter of Standing Orders and the matter of whether or not a general grievance situation exists. That is not, in fact, speaking to the Bill, according to the advice I have received. As I made clear previously, I have made no ruling. I have merely made it clear that I am uncertain as to the status of a ruling made by an Acting President but thought that I would advise the honourable member of the matters that had been brought to my attention. I hope that he sees the distinction that I have drawn.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Thank you, Mr Acting President, for clarifying that matter. I will not be pursuing the matter at great length. As the Acting President has indicated he is not giving a ruling but merely providing me with advice, I thank him for that advice and will not be overly long with the matters I put before the Council. I will bear in mind the advice that you have given me, Sir.

As I was indicating previously, in a debate in this Chamber on the Supply Bill in 1981 the Hon. Anne Levy debated the matter of the North Haven kindergarten staffing levels. The President and members of the day did not rule that that matter was not an appropriate subject for debate in this Chamber at that time. In effect, the Attorney-General of the day (Hon. Trevor Griffin) said that the matter to which the Hon. Anne Levy was referring was appropriately within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Education and that her comments would be drawn to that Minister's attention. The inference there was that, because there was a staffing level problem in a kindergarten at North Haven that was funded by the Government through the lump sum Supply allocation, such a matter was an appropriate one for debate during that Supply Bill.

The Hon. Trevor Griffin on that same day touched in his reply on the matter of wealth taxes and the Australian Labor Party's attitude to them. There was an instance on 20 August 1980 when both the Hon. Mr Sumner and the Hon. Mr Griffin during a debate on Supply referred to the question whether or not Estimates Committees ought to be extended to include the Legislative Council.

The Hon. Mr DeGaris gave a very good dissertation on Commonwealth federalism policy and the philosophy behind that policy and some of the financial aspects of the federalism policy of that day during the debate on the 1980 Supply Bill.

I turn now to the debate in 1983 and to the matter to which I referred earlier. On 23 August 1983 the Hon. Martin Cameron, as Leader of the Opposition, during the Supply Bill debate referred extensively to the matter of the Finger Point sewage works in the South-East.

He also referred to the general state of the economy and the Government legislative program. On 24 August, a day later, the Hon. Chris Sumner in the Supply Bill debate referred to a matter of delays in replies to questions during a debate on the Supply Bill.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: That is a financial matter.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Quite clearly a financial matter, as the Attorney interjects there, because in some way it is funded by the lump sum allocation given through this Bill to the Government. The Attorney also referred to a permanent expenditure review committee being established in the Parliament and I am sure the Attorney would agree that that is also a matter appropriate for debate within the Supply Bill as he argued cogently and eloquently for such a committee.

Finally, on the infamous day, 10 May, I debated a matter in relation to consumer affairs and that particular matter was rust proofing. The Acting President (Hon. Dr Ritson) debated quite eloquently on that occasion the health care system in South Australia and the effects of Medicare on that system. In effect, the President of the day ruled during that debate on that day that there was nothing within the Standing Orders to prohibit the Hon. Dr Ritson or me from debating the particular matters—rust proofing and the Consumer Affairs Department, health systems, Medicare and the Health Department in South Australia—in a Supply Bill debate. So, that is basically the argument that I wanted to put on the record in the Chamber today, and if one looks at it logically and if one looks at the Standing Orders, there is quite clearly an argument, as people like the Hon. Chris Sumner and the Hon. Anne Levy have put, that one can debate virtually anything that is funded through the lump sum allocation. That is the logical argument.

If one also looks at, in effect, what is convention or precedent, one finds, irrespective of what might have occurred in 1906 and 1964 or 1965, whatever that particular date was that the Acting President quoted, that recent precedent with the existing President in the last four or five years has indicated that all such matters—rust proofing, health care systems, delays in replies to questions, permanent expenditure review committees, Finger Point, Corporate Affairs Commission inquiries into McLeay Brothers, the state of the economy, Government legislation, staffing levels at the North Haven kindergarten, wealth taxes, the Australian Labor Party, Estimates Committees and Commonwealth federalism policy—can be debated within the province of the Supply Bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! I feel I should once more, for the record, point out to the honourable member that he is not in fact debating one of the many economic matters which he says are proper subjects for debate, but in fact he is debating quite a different question of what should or should not be permitted, rather than the economics of any of these matters. I point out that I am making no ruling since no point of order has been taken, but feel that that distinction should be clear in the record for the future.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I have finished. Thank you, Mr Acting President, but I had concluded my remarks before your eloquent statement and I did not intend continuing them at all.

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

LIQUOR LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 13 August. Page 194.)

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I support the second reading of this Bill. I do so with some pleasure because the Bill implements an aspect of Liberal Party policy. That seems to be so common these days. It so frequently happens that a Liberal Party initiative is announced and then the Government picks it up. I suppose that is one way of doing it. Certainly in this regard the subject matter of the Bill is an aspect of Liberal Party policy which was announced by the shadow Minister of Tourism on 29 April last and supported by the Leader and announced as part of our policy by the Liberal Party on a number of occasions since.

I referred to this aspect when the Liquor Licensing Bill was before Parliament. It is, I suppose, not very surprising with complex legislation like this that it has not taken very long for us to get an amendment to the original Act, but I am certainly pleased that the amendment is in this form. The wine industry is a most important part of our economy and it needs support from the Government. It needs to be deregulated where necessary. It needs to be allowed to operate in a way in which it ought to operate. As well as the wine industry being important to our State, the tourism industry is also important.

This Bill, following a Liberal Party initiative, supports both of those industries. I hope that the federal Budget, which is soon to be brought down, does not try to deal yet another blow to the wine and tourism industries, which are closely related in South Australia. I hope, that we do not have another wine excise. I hope that we do not have to go through all that procedure again and that the Labor Government in Canberra, which is so much aligned with this Government in South Australia, does not try to penalise the wine industry.

This Bill, as I say, follows a Liberal Party initiative and is just another example of 'me tooing', with which we are so familiar. I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading of this Bill.

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

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 13 August. Page 194.)

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this Bill. The attitude of the Government is surprising when one considers that the former Liberal Government in 1979 produced legislation to abolish land tax on the principal place of residence, and the present Premier, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, indicated that the only reason he supported the measure was because of the former Government's mandate. He said:

We—

that is, the Labor Party—

—believe that land tax is an important tax and should not be forgone. But the Government clearly believes otherwise.

On that occasion he also said that the Labor Party felt very strongly about land tax. He said:

It considers that, although it has to support the Bill at this time, it does not feel fully in one mind with the Government over its approach to this matter.

The ALP Convention in March this year adopted a policy that urged the Government to maintain progressive taxation on unimproved land values. It is clear that there has been an about face. The Opposition welcomes the about face and, because it is an election year, I predict that this is the reason why the Government is showing such an interest in this tax. Land tax relief has been called for by the Liberal Party since August 1984 when a survey of businesses in the metropolitan area demonstrated the extent to which land tax bills were escalating. Those escalations were based on the old land tax system which meant that the higher one's valuation the higher the rate of tax. Consequently, this led to enormous increases.

Recently the Premier has taken it upon himself to compare some South Australian economic indicators with those of Queensland. It is funny that in doing so some cases are always left out. It would be interesting to carry out a similar exercise in relation to the impact of land tax in South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria—all Labor Governments. I am sure that the Government would want to compare Labor Administrations. New South Wales and Victoria are the traditional yardsticks in monitoring the competitiveness of South Australian business.

In relation to land tax revenue, South Australia for 1984-85 received in money terms $32.8 million and in real terms $23.6 million—an annual movement in money terms of 17.1 per cent. In New South Wales for 1984-85 the annual movement was 13.8 per cent and in Victoria for 1984-85 the increase was 3.4 per cent. In fact, land tax revenue in real terms in Victoria was minus 1.1 per cent. The five-year movement in money terms in South Australia was 89.6 per cent, compared with New South Wales 58.3 per cent and Victoria 22.4 per cent.

That is a hefty difference and indicates why South Australia is now one of the highest taxed States in the Commonwealth and why our tax burden on the community has increased by over 50 per cent.

In 1980-81 the indexed value of land in South Australia rose by 53.8 per cent while the amount of tax collected went up by 89.6 per cent.

I give this indication on behalf of the Opposition: that a Liberal Government will keep land tax under continuous review, not just prior to elections, to ensure that it is levied on a more equitable basis than it has been in recent years. The Liberal Party has taken a profile over the past 12 months or so in relation to land tax which pointed out the inequalities in the bracket creep which has created such a bonus for the Government. In the other House the Leader of the Opposition asked whether the Minister representing the Treasurer would provide the Opposition with an estimated number of taxpayers, the estimated amount of tax and the estimated amount of site values for each of the revised steps 1 to 6 for 1985-86. No answer has been received to these questions so far. I understand the reasons for the Bill going through, but I ask that at some stage in the near future the Minister should answer those questions because answers were promised before debate of the Bill in this Council.

The Opposition supports the Bill, but asks the Government to be more expeditious in looking at the rates of land tax in the short term it will be in office. If there are to be increases, such as have been seen, then in the future those matters should be rectified for the taxpayers before a five-year period, before a three-year period, and certainly not just before an election, but on a continuous basis.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): The Hon. Mr Cameron has raised one or two matters that, as a courtesy, require a reply. I do not have the answers immediately at my fingertips, but I am prepared to undertake to bring him the answers informally.

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

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 13 August. Page 195.)

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): Without doubt, this is the most undesirable tax levied by State Government. It raises the cost of labour relative to other factors of production, thus distorting the production process and discouraging employment. It is really a tax on employment and, as such, it can only reduce employment. It is an iniquitous tax, and I do not think that there is any divergence of view between the Government and the Opposition in relation to the net effect of payroll tax.

For that reason, both Liberal and Labor Governments have gradually increased the base exemption levels as they relate to payroll tax. Recently, at the Constitutional Convention—which, in spite of all that has been said about it, had some very encouraging signs of unanimous opinion about certain matters—State taxation and the transfer of tax powers were discussed. I am sure that the Hon. Mr Griffin will have something to say on that matter. Certainly, there was an indication from the States, except for one, that they would be delighted to get rid of this tax altogether if there was a transfer of some other taxing power in the form of excise duties. Unfortunately, while there was a unanimous feeling from the State of South Australia, the delegates and almost every State, one State, New South Wales, did not seem to agree, and certainly the Commonwealth seemed violently to disagree.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: The Commonwealth Labor Party did not.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The Commonwealth Labor Party did not agree. That was disappointing because afterwards I saw a lot of comment on the convention and an indication from the Commonwealth Attorney-General that he thought that the whole convention was a waste of time. It was a waste of time to him because the decisions did not come out in the way that he wanted and he refused to accept them. His attitude was disappointing, but that is away from the Bill. I do not intend to canvass that area at any great length, except to say that it is certainly one way in which the final abolition of payroll tax could proceed.

I am pleased that the Government now proposes in this Bill to rectify the anomaly by which reimbursement to an employee for the use of a motor car on a per kilometre basis was regarded as taxable while the refund of an expense incurred in relation to the use of a motor vehicle was non-taxable. This was in contrast with the federal Taxation Act, which permits payment to employees for car expenses on a per kilometre basis. We are pleased that at least that inequity, as highlighted last year by the Opposition, has been picked up in this legislation.

The State Treasury in South Australia collected about $254 million from this tax on jobs in the last financial year. That is the equivalent cost of more than 12 300 jobs at the average wage. This is a clear indication of how many extra jobs there could be in South Australia if we did not have to have this tax. One of the ways in which we can further reduce this tax is to put a curb on Government expenditure—something that this Government has seemed unable to cope with.

Over the past 10 years payroll tax as a proportion of total tax collections has dropped, but it still accounts for about one-third of all taxes that this State collects. The Commonwealth holds most of the purse strings, so, if we are to eliminate payroll tax, it can be achieved only by a co-operative approach by the Commonwealth and the States. As I have indicated, the Commonwealth must consider returning or transferring to the States a broad based source of tax revenue that can or could replace payroll tax. That, coupled with a curb on Government expenditure, will mean finally that this tax can be got rid of and that extra employment will be created as a result.

Indeed, it has been proven at the last budget that payroll tax collections by the States in the last financial year were the equivalent of 1.8 per cent of the Commonwealth total outlays. That would not involve the Commonwealth in a huge transfer of revenue. It would be comparatively minor and would certainly be of great assistance in creating employment. In the meantime, exemption levels from payroll tax must be kept under annual review to provide as much relief as possible to ensure that South Australia is not placed at a cost competitive disadvantage, as compared with New South Wales and Victoria, and also to ensure that the greatest capacity is given to business to create job opportunities. That will certainly be the highest priority of the next Liberal Government, and we support the initiatives in this Bill for this reason.

Of course, we have other disadvantages, the most important of which is the FID tax that this Government has introduced, which some of the States do not have. In fact, some States have taken to advertising the fact that they do not have it, and I expect that they receive some advantage from that. So, while it is important that we keep ourselves in a competitive situation in relation to payroll tax, we have been put at a disadvantage by this Government in relation to other areas of taxation. This is a question that will be addressed very promptly after the election in the near future.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 14 August. Page 263.)

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Yesterday, before I sought leave to continue my remarks, I said that the Minister of Agriculture had agreed to retain Sims farm and offer it to the community so that it could be used as an adjunct to the area school for the education of students who wished to go into agricultural pursuits. I said that it was a wise decision by the Minister but that I thought he handled it in a messy and uncoordinated fashion.

It took months to reach an agreed decision, and in the meantime there was a great deal of heartburn and to-ing-and-fro-ing between local members of the community, the Minister and the Education Department. There were indeed many problems. However, the matter has now been resolved in a manner that I think is acceptable to the community. However, it has not resolved itself in a manner that I believe is suitable to all and sundry. In fact, I believe that the nigger in the woodpile in this matter has been the Minister of Education.

The Minister of Agriculture offered the farm to the Minister of Education, but he refused to take up the offer. It is the first time in my life that I have ever seen something of this value offered and not accepted. I find the reasoning of

the Minister of Education very difficult to follow. If we look at the history of the matter, we find that the Minister of Education set up a committee to investigate the purchase of the farm as a residential college. I think the Minister was confused about the residential component.

Membership of the investigative committee included people from the Education Department (in fact, the Regional Director for the western region), and representation from the Department of Agriculture, local government, the Agricultural Bureau movement, the school council, the United Farmers and Stockowners, Roseworthy College and Urrbrae school. The committee spent some time and made some effort before recommending to the Minister that he purchase the farm and set up a residential college.

I am sure when the committee made that finding that it did not specify a time limit as to when or at what stage the college should be established. I do not think it needed to be established in the immediate future or in the mid term future. However, I think that it may have been wise to establish a residential college at some time further down the track. For the Minister to refuse to take on the property was, I believe, a foolish mistake, because one of these days such an institution will be required. The Minister has locked the Education Department into a situation where it will be difficult for it to purchase the property. The Minister's excuse was that it would need to be duplicated in other parts of the State. I agree with that, and I will point out shortly that that has occurred in other States where they have found that people involved in agriculture need education if they are to survive in the coming decades.

I believe that the Minister has clearly implied, by not accepting the property and by not accepting the challenge that was given to him, that these people in the rural community should not be educated. That begs the question: what do we require for the future in relation to agriculture education? In that respect, I turn first to the programs currently on offer in this State. First on the list are the universities, which supply a Bachelor of Education Science degree, which is largely completed at the Waite Research Institute. That is a four year course which can be extended.

Secondly, the Roseworthy college offers degrees and diplomas in applied science. It also has available a plethora of other courses—the main one being a farm management diploma course, which includes many facets, such as equine studies. Roseworthy not only offers courses in agriculture: it also deals in oenology, the study of wine marketing, and so on. Thirdly, the Department of Further Education offers an on-farm training course, which was relatively recently established in conjunction with the United Farmers and Stockowners.

I believe that the on-farm training course provides a very real need in the community to educate those people who left school at an early age for one reason or another and have now decided that it would be in their best interest if they upgraded their knowledge of agriculture. It could be that they have become managers or owners or have greater responsibilities on farm properties and have therefore decided to extend their education in relation to agriculture. The TAFE course offers a very good course with conditions that are similar to the apprenticeship scheme. I believe it is a very worthwhile course which needs to be further promoted.

Finally, certificate courses are available from places such as Urrbrae, Cleve, Maitland and Naracoorte, among others. These certificate courses are at years 11 and 12 of secondary education. That probably makes them unique, because students are being taught vocational courses at secondary level. The four sections of agricultural education that I have described make up a package which caters for a wide demand within the Department of Agriculture. However, I will look briefly at an emphasis on one or the other. My interest in this led me to visit several other States where these courses have been given greater emphasis.

Therefore, the students who do those courses have a greater interest in agriculture. It has been proved, particularly in Queensland and Western Australia, that students who take agricultural courses in years 11 and 12 go on to tertiary education at places like Roseworthy Agricultural College, Dookie College, Hawkesbury College and Gatum College, and that is to be commended. In addition, other students go to university. Having been triggered off at secondary level, some students continue with their interest in agriculture. That is not always the case, but certainly greater numbers of students who undertake agricultural courses at high school are going on to tertiary education.

In Queensland, colleges that teach agriculture at years 11 and 12 have been set up. I admit that it has cost the Government an enormous amount, but the Government deemed that that was in the interests of the community, because agriculture is a very big part of the economy. It has been decided that that expenditure has been worth while. Four colleges have been set up under a separate Act—at Longreach, Dalby, Burdekin and Emerald. They are not small colleges: in fact, they make Roseworthy pale into insignificance in terms of size and area. I will refer to the structure under which the colleges are set up to emphasise my point.

Four rural training schools were established under the provisions of the Rural Training Schools Act of Queensland, 1965, to specialise in the training of the young people hoping to become managers for the principal rural industries in Queensland. The education offered at these residential colleges stresses the practical skills that will be needed for a student's career in a rural industry.

The rural training schools are administratively independent of the Queensland Department of Education and are run by individual school boards which comprise nominees of the Minister for Education, the district, the Department of Primary Industry and local authority representatives. The school boards are responsible directly to the Minister for Education. The admission standard is grade 10 (or three years of high school) or its equivalent. However, entry is competitive, and generally selection is made using the following criteria.

Preference is given to applicants 16 years of age or older. This does not exclude 15 year olds, but simply recognises the fact that the older students have a better chance of successfully completing the course. Regarding educational qualifications and industry work experience, preference may be given to applicants with higher educational qualifications or industry work experience. Preference may also be given to applicants with an established rural background, that is, those who are definitely going to return to the land.

Each of the colleges has been set up to deal with a different section of the rural industry. The Burdekin College teaches primarily subjects relating to sugar cane growing and cattle raising; Dalby is a broadacre dryland farming college; Emerald is involved with cattle raising, broadacre dryland farming and irrigation; and Longreach deals predominantly with the pastoral area. Other aspects of farming are not neglected.

Each course is residential and of two years duration. The schools stress that the primary aim of their courses is to give the student skills to 'industry acceptance level': that is, a graduate must be able to be trusted by his employer immediately effectively to carry out a range of duties with minimum supervision. However, the schools emphasise that, since most students will quickly attain supervisory positions, an introduction is given to the basic principles of farm management, particularly record keeping, budgeting and marketing. Each course comprises approximately 25

per cent classroom theory, 25 per cent routine farm work, and 50 per cent skills training visits and field days.

The schools are not colleges of advanced education; the courses are not accredited; and the schools see disadvantages in accreditation of their courses as, for example, associate diplomas. Under the ACAAE guidelines, admission standards would be too low, the skills component too great, and the academic level not high enough for an associate diploma. Instead, the schools prefer to respond directly to the wishes of their school boards, which are composed largely of the most successful farmers in the district. The major concern of these farmers is that graduates should be able, on graduation, immediately to embark on successful farm careers leading to responsible positions.

These colleges form a very important part of the education of rural children in Queensland. Apart from Dalby College, which was opened in 1979, they were opened in the mid 1960s. I visited three of the colleges and I saw both male and female students undertaking a range of tasks. For instance, at Burdekin College the students, including girls, were spaying and hoof trimming cattle as well as welding, rebuilding engines, constructing sheds, crutching, and a wide range of other practical activities. I also saw students in the classroom situation and I noted that the education was extensive.

A slightly different mechanism applies in Western Australia. The colleges have not been set up independently but are generally attached to high schools. This is closer to the South Australian situation, and I refer to Urrbrae and Cleve colleges. I believe that the Sims Farm project would have led to something similar. There are a number of such colleges in Western Australia, four of which I visited—at Cunderdin, Morawa, Denmark and Kojenup.

The most highly developed college that I visited was at Cunderdin, about 70 or 80 miles east of Perth. It was certainly a very impressive establishment, which was built in the 1960s and which has continued to develop since then. The college, which is of solid construction, comprises 2 500 acres and has about 40 students, whom it trains fundamentally for wheat and sheep farming and other smaller enterprises. For instance, its courses relate to small seed production to some degree and the college has some cattle. The local students participate very extensively in the activities of the surrounding farms.

The students help out with such activities as mulesing, shearing, crutching, some seeding operations and, if a property undertakes a specific operation that cannot be carried out at the college, they spend time on that property observing and helping. Students participate in the community even though they are residents of the college. There are male and female students at the college who participate in local netball, football, cricket, basketball and other sporting teams in the town. It is a good college with strict rules.

The students to whom I spoke were extremely happy with the college and pleased with the results that they were getting. I spoke to several graduates of three years previously who said that they were pleased that they had attended the college. There is also a college at Denmark—an older college in a high rainfall area. It is a similar size with approximately 40 students who live in a dormitory style building. They work in a dairy and a piggery, and in more intensive cultivation. The students travel the State to gain experience in other farming areas; for instance, they went to the Morowa College about 450 miles north to assist in seeding operations and to gain experience that they could only gain in that area.

I attended Morowa College, a college that could be paralleled with the Cleve school. It was decided several years ago by the local community that the college needed an agricultural course. However, the Education Department said that such a course was too expensive to establish. The community decided that it would establish the course itself. It set up a cropping project from which it raised about $65 000. At that stage the Western Mining Corporation, which was mining iron ore in the area, had established a single men's camp in the town. The operation became uneconomic, so Western Mining pulled out.

The committee raising money from the agricultural project at the school leased the single men's quarters in which it was able to accommodate 35 students. It continued to do that, the students being under the supervision of a married couple and ancillary staff. They started with a small area, 24 acres, which has now been extended to in excess of 2 000 acres. This was achieved by reinvesting money that the farm raised. When I was there the other day they were erecting two new sheds. The scheme was so successful that the Education Department decided it should take it on. It purchased the whole complex and is to build a new residential college for the students.

Other States are doing something for their rural community. It saddens me that in South Australia we are not travelling the same track, or at least endeavouring to look at requirements in this area. The rural community is under an enormous strain at the moment. Costs are extremely high. A rural producer need only make one or two simple and basic mistakes—

The Hon. J.C. Burdett interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Indeed. If a rural producer makes mistakes he becomes a burden on the rest of society because he cannot afford to get into debt. One sees this in Western Australia where the rural industry has grown at a rapid rate and where there are in the vicinity of 2 000 farms for sale. Banks are not lending money on farms as freely as they did in the past.

People must therefore make correct decisions and can only do that if given adequate education. I think that all honourable members would agree that the rural community has not had an image of a high standard of education in the past. In fact, it has been an image that has meant that if one boy in a family was not too bright he was sent to the country. That is unfortunate because this is an industry that produces a large amount of money for this State and this nation and we need the best brains we can get in farming.

There have been other efforts directed towards training students which have, in some cases, not been successful. One of the problems which the TAFE course that I mentioned earlier is that there is a gap between students leaving secondary school and starting that course. That gap has an undesirable effect in that boys in particular do not continue to write or read after leaving school. If one speaks to the lecturers trying to conduct these TAFE courses one finds that they have great difficulty in getting boys to write. It was explained to me that in one case a boy aged 21 years had not, since the day he left school, put a pen to paper except to sign an agreement to borrow money for his motor car, or to sign his name for legal matters.

The Minister has not accepted the challenge about Sims Farm, and that is a pity. However, I believe that the community has taken up that challenge and will run the property for the betterment of the people—not just people from the area but people from other parts of the State. There are students from all over the State now boarding privately in the town. This has created a problem, because the town only has a population of 900 people and saturation point is reached quickly. It has reached the point where there are 10 students now boarding privately. In the long run there will be good results obtained from retaining this property. I hope that the Minister will see fit to listen in future to

what people in the community are asking for. I hope that future Governments do this, also.

I picked up a piece of paper the other day which gives reasons why agricultural education has not proliferated in the country. I do not know who is the author of the paper, but he sets out the following reasons:

(1) *Finance:* No money will be available for agricultural training of this nature because all influential positions within government and civil service are city based. The logical argument of the value to the South Australian economy of an educated, trained and better managed rural export industry has little bearing on decisions made as to where the educational dollar shall be spent.

(2) *Empire Building*—All existing training areas will oppose any new institution because it could pose a threat to their empires. The practical question of whether the training now offered achieves the purpose or not will have little influence on the case that existing institutions will mount to retain their share of available moneys and their employment.

(3) *Political Support*—There are few votes to be gained by any party in supporting agricultural training. It will call for a Statesman to publicly support a project that needs 10 years before the effects will show on the South Australian economy.

(4) *'Educationists'*—Science graduates without any industry experience will oppose a practical college. It is a belief held by many academics that agriculture can be a theory subject and that with computers and text books the farmer of tomorrow need not have the need for any practical skills and the many physical jobs now happening in agriculture will go away.

(5) *Soft Living*—Many academics and bureaucrats believe that farm work can be a 9 to 5 job, with a 35 hour week and pigs, sheep, cows and crops can be taught this. They also believe that it never rains before public holidays and would resent any thought of working farm hours subject to the demands of season and stock.

(6) *Location*—Should a college be proposed, then every district will want it in their area, teaching their subjects. Few farmers will be prepared to support the concept or accept the fact, that any practical training institution is better than none at all.

(7) *Old School Tie*—Many rural leaders will believe that what was the best education for them, be it tertiary, college or shearing team, was the best education and will not accept the facts of change. Many successful agriculturists of the past may not repeat their success if faced with the problems now confronting our next generation.

South Australia needs a nucleus of skill-trained ordinary, practising rural people who have had, regardless of their academic ability, the opportunity to be directed toward being better trained managers. Any unemployed young person who has the desire to be employed in agriculture should be given an opportunity. I believe that future generations of Aboriginals will seek training to be able to manage the large areas of pastoral country that have been granted them.

As generations and tribal customs change, these people will need trained management and working staff to operate these areas as self-sufficient units. The next generations of rural South Australians deserve the opportunity to achieve training at all levels for their future. We are supposed to be the best dry land farmers in the world, let us keep it that way.

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 14 August. Page 262.)

Clause 2—'Commencement.'

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: There are a number of issues that I could deal with briefly. First, with respect to the first home concessions, the figure of $50 000 was adopted as being reasonable in all the circumstances. In fact, it was suggested by the Master Builders Association recently to the Government as being appropriate. The concession applies on the $50 000 although it is probably true to say there would be many homes that in fact cost more than that, but it is still quite a substantial concession.

A question was raised with respect to the effect of the decision to give an interim benefit on workers compensation premiums with respect to persons under 25 years of age. As honourable members know, consideration is presently being given by the Government to changes to the workers compensation legislation. However, that has obviously not yet passed the Parliament as it is still being considered. It was considered worthwhile to introduce this interim reduction irrespective of the final resolution of that issue.

The question was raised by the Hon. Mr Lucas with respect to difficulties that employers might have with the benefit relating to workers compensation premiums with respect to persons under 25 years of age. However, I understand that the Insurance Council and the employer groups have conferred about this in an attempt to minimise those difficulties as far as practicable. Of course one would see that, as it is a concession, it is something one would expect employers and insurance companies to support, even though there may be some minor difficulties in administration.

The Hon. Mr Lucas also raised the question of the backdating of the exemption of premiums for workers compensation for employees under the age of 25. The concession was specifically backdated to 1 January 1985 so that in January 1986, when insurance companies are due for their 1986 licence fees, they will not be required to make payment in respect of workers compensation premiums for employees under 25 years of age. If the exemption was dated from 5 August 1985, consistent with other changes, insurance companies would be liable to pay a licence fee in 1986 which included 8 per cent on premiums received from 1 January 1985 to 4 August 1985. Insurance companies therefore benefit from adoption of the 1 January 1985 date as against the 5 August 1985 date.

There is some validity in the argument that insurance companies pay up front, but there are many factors that can influence whether or not the insurance companies can recover those payments. The Insurance Council, with which the Government has discussed the implications of the changes proposed in this Bill, has indicated that members of that council will all propose to make immediate reductions in the amount of premiums payable arising from the deletion of the workers compensation under 25 content of annual licence payments.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Insertion of new section 5ab.'

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I want to address a question to the Attorney-General on this clause. It introduces a new section which provides in essence that, where there has been an overpayment of duty in consequence of amendments affected by this Act, presumably in circumstances where duty has been paid up to the present time, but need not have been paid if the Act had in fact come into operation on 5 August, then the Commissioner may refund to the person who paid the duty the amount of the duty found to be overpaid. I know that there is a constant argument about whether 'may' means 'shall' and whether 'shall' means 'may', and of course it depends on the context.

I wonder why in this clause there appears to be a discretion on the part of the Commissioner to refund, yet in clause 9 on page 3, line 42, there is a reference that the Commissioner 'shall' refund certain duty. Is there a reason for that? If so, what is it?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Of course, there is no reason for it. The honourable member is quite right in assuming in this case that that is certainly what the Commissioner of Stamps will do. Parliamentary Counsel advises that in revenue legislation 'may' in these sorts of clauses is interpreted as meaning 'shall'. That is certainly the Government's intention.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: As long as there is a commitment that the Commissioner will refund, so that it is not a

discretionary matter, then I am happy to leave it at that. However, if there is some ambivalence about it, we should perhaps look more carefully at it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am not sure that the Commissioner of Stamps is very enthusiastic about the administrative problems. I understand that a record has been kept of every transaction since 5 August and that refunds will be made.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Statement to be lodged by registered person.'

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I support the clause, although I notice that, consistent with what is already in section 31f, there is a difference in the level between the point at which the rental duty becomes payable and the level at which annual, rather than monthly, returns may be required. In the principal section the monthly statements need not be filed if the amount of rental received annually is less than $3 000. However, the duty is payable if the annual rental exceeds $2 000.

In the amendment duty is payable after $15 000, but a monthly statement is not to be required if the amount of the annual rental received does not exceed $20 000. However, if the amount is between $15 000 and $20 000, duty is payable on that. Why is there that distinction? Why should there not just be a cut-off point below which returns are not required, above which returns are required, and above which, at the same level, rental duty is payable. I suppose that that is a question of practice and is not directly relevant to whether or not this clause passes. Does the Attorney-General have any information as to why this distinction is being maintained?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: As I understand it, it is merely to continue the existing practice.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I will not pursue the question at this stage. I hope that as Stamp Duties Acts are reviewed this section may also be reviewed. It is an unnecessary difference between the level at which duty becomes payable and the level at which monthly returns are required to be filed. It seems to me to be somewhat anomalous that there is that distinction.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Commissioner of Stamps advises me that the section needs examination, and he will do it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—'Amendment of second schedule.'

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: In my second reading speech I sought clarification of the estimated revenue from stamp duty on conveyancing for the current year, which was estimated at $187 million. The previous year there had been an increase of $50 million. This seems to be a modest estimate of the increase, and I have been unable to obtain statistics from departments to find out what it is based on.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: In 1984-85 stamp duty estimates were determined after making allowance for a higher than usual increase in stamp duty revenue in 1983-84, because of the increase in annual licences in 1983 from 6 per cent to 8 per cent. The 1984-85 figures included a reduction in those measures which offset the introduction of FID, loan duty, and the like. Conveyance estimates were increased to provide for a 15 per cent increase in average duty and 5 per cent in the number of transactions; that is, some 20 per cent greater than the previous year. This was consistent with indications at the time that those estimates were made.

The Treasurer has released a statement of revenue to 31 May 1985. At this stage no release of the June figures has been made, but I anticipate that this information will be made available later this month when the budget is presented.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I am not sure that I clearly interpret what the Attorney-General said. I take it that the estimates were made on a 20 per cent rise, which tallies with my calculations. I understand that accurate figures up to 31 May have been published somewhere. Does that reflect compliance with the estimated 20 per cent rise, or is it above or below it?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member should not necessarily draw conclusions from the figures at the end of any particular month, but it appears that the revenue has come in over estimate, certainly on the indications of 31 May figures. The extent to which they are over estimate will be revealed when the budget is brought down.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: There was a $50 million rise in the year previous to this one, and the increase in the transfers and figures that I have was from 45 965 in 1982-83 to 58 836 in 1983-84. To repeat for my clarification, it seems a remarkably conservative estimate that, with an increase like that, there was so much less estimated for the year finishing 30 June 1985.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: This is no doubt a matter that the honourable member can comment on during the budget debate, but there have been difficulties, obviously, in the estimations because, on the best predictions that are available, it was thought that there would be a levelling off in activity in land and having sales. What has occurred, as the honourable member knows, is sustained activity in those areas, increasing values and increasing activity. The best estimates were made. It appears that those estimates will be exceeded in terms of revenue. That is indicated from the May 1985 figure.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Does the Minister have that figure?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That figure is public.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I realise that.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The stamp duties estimate was $187 million for 1984-85, and receipts for the 11 months ended 31 May 1985 were $190 994 000.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I am pleased that the schedules are being amended to remove some duties, but I am surprised that the Government has not looked at the 20c duty stamp on agreements or on any memorandum of any agreement. It has been 20c since 1971. Prior to that, from 1965 to 1971, it was 10c; and before that it was even less. That 20c can be affixed by either an impressed stamp or an adhesive stamp. It is nothing more than nuisance value, and I wonder why the Government did not address the question of dispensing with this 20c duty stamp, which now costs more to obtain from the Commissioner of Stamps and to affix than the Government recovers from it.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member is being very cooperative today in making suggestions. Like the previous one, this matter could well be examined, and it will be. It may be that some change will be forthcoming in the future.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I ask that that matter be looked at by the Administration because 20c these days is not worth collecting. I hope that that will come up in some subsequent amending Bill.

In relation to the schedule in respect to a conveyance or transfer on sale and the conveyance operating as a voluntary disposition *inter vivos*, the rates have been fixed since 1974 without any appreciable adjustment. Since then there has been a dramatic increase in property values particularly, which means that the marginal rates come in at a much earlier stage for those purchasing property. The proposition has been put to me by members of the legal profession who have been asked to comment on the Bill that the 3.5 per

cent and the 4 per cent rates should really come in at a much higher level than the $100 000, which is the present level at which they become payable. Even $300 000 has been suggested rather than the $100 000. The 4 per cent is a crippling cost on many small businesses particularly. I am told that some of them do not pay it anyway. They just put the agreement in the top drawer and hope that it is never litigated. However, I do not know any legal practitioners who follow that practice. I understand that some small businesses decide to take the risk.

The point has been made to me that duties at this level are counterproductive in terms of insuring that the revenue is properly collected. I merely make the point that there is a general disappointment, not just about the level of tax relief but particularly that the opportunity has not been taken to review the scales applicable to conveyances, and particularly at the higher level where the 4 per cent becomes payable. I really just want to have that on the record.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That matter no doubt could be considered. Obviously, when one makes adjustments to revenue measures, careful consideration has to be given to the effects of the concessions that are given. This package was carefully worked out and costed. At this stage, given that there are in the whole package significant tax concessions, it was not considered that the change suggested by the honourable member could be implemented, but he has made the point. It is basically a matter of policy. One would not wish to argue in general terms with what the honourable member is saying, given the increase in values, particularly recently, but in preparing a package of tax concession measures it is always necessary to see the concessions as a package, and the Government did not feel that it was able to move on this point at this time.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 322.)

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I support the motion. I thank His Excellency for the speech with which he opened Parliament. I take this opportunity to reaffirm my allegience to Her Majesty, and I join with other members who have preceded me in this debate in extending my sympathy to the families of deceased members.

The Minister of Health with his usual enthusiasm for hyperbole has, over the past week, glowingly defended the Central Linen Service. As honourable members would be aware, the Central Linen Service is a Government laundry and linen facility which is operated by the Government in direct and, I believe, unfair competition with private enterprise. All members of this Council, I am sure, accept the legitimate role for Government in a variety of areas. But, I believe that such Government activity must be confined to areas where legitimate public benefit can be demonstrated. This is not the case with an operation such as the Central Linen Service. The reality is that, no matter how much the Minister of Health wishes to argue otherwise, the Central Linen Service competes against private enterprise operators who can do at least as good and in many cases a better job. It is also a fact (a fact which the Minister attempts to ignore) that the Central Linen Service does have an unfair competitive advantage.

This is a point which I wish to develop. Let me consider some of the things the Minister of Health has said about both the Central Linen Service and the way it operates. On 7 August 1985, the Minister put out a press release of some four pages in which he sought to justify the continued operation of the Central Linen Service by the Government and in fact to justify its expansion. In his press release he said:

> The benefits of a successful commercially competitive laundry would be lost to South Australian taxpayers if the Central Linen Service were sold under any privatisation scheme.

The fact is the Central Linen Service is not commercially competitive. It does not pay land tax, which, until the Premier's announcement last week, has escalated enormously during the past three years. The Central Linen Service does not pay sales tax on items it uses, and, when one considers that there is a 7½ per cent sales tax on linen and a 20 per cent sales tax on soap and soap powder (which are the principal inputs into a linen and laundry service), the fact that the Central Linen Service does not have to pay such a levy is a clear competitive advantage.

The Central Linen Service is a Government instrumentality. It does not have to pay council rates, so it has an advantage over private companies. The Minister of Health may argue that this is beneficial to the community, but we all know that there is no such thing as a free lunch, for example; because the Central Linen Service does not pay rates these funds are unavailable to the relevant local government body. If there is a shortfall, other ratepayers, particularly residents, have to pick up the tab.

The cost advantage unfairly given to the Central Linen Service, however, does not end there. The Central Linen Service does not pay interest on the value of the land where it is situated at Dudley Park. In other words, the land is a free asset available to the Central Linen Service. Additionally, the Minister of Health constantly argues that there are now taxpayers' funds being expended on the Central Linen Service, but he ignores the fact that there are millions of dollars in assets (funded by taxpayers) tied up in this service and available to the Central Linen Service.

The Minister of Health earlier this week indicated his intention to dispose of some property to free up taxpayers' funds for redeployment elsewhere. In the same way he could dispose of the Central Linen Service, reducing the burden on the taxpayers' funds tied up in the assets, and therefore eliminating the unfair competition with private enterprise and giving the health sector better and more efficient service.

The Central Linen Service has incurred losses for four out of the past five years. The cost advantages to which I have referred obviously provide the Central Linen Service with the capacity to approach a whole variety of potential clients within the health sector and to offer cut-price rates. It means that the Central Linen Service operates not on a truly economic basis but on a subsidised basis. The Minister's claim, therefore, that the Central Linen Service is a commercially viable enterprise just does not stand up to analysis. The other inaccurate claim from the Minister of Health is that the Central Linen Service has a productivity level of 35 kilograms per operator hour which he said in his press release was, 'a better performance than any other large-scale laundry in Australia'.

In response to a question by me in this place, he said:

> Let me tell the Council and the people of South Australia (because they ought to know) in the context of this debate that that is the highest productivity for any large-scale laundry in Australia—that is an incontravertible fact.

Well, as is frequently the case with this Minister, just because he said it to be an incontrovertible fact does not mean that it is.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: Don't resort to personal denigration, because it does you no credit.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: It is not personal denigration. It is a plain cold hard fact that the Minister often says that certain things are incontrovertible facts when they are not. The fact that he says something is factual does not necessarily mean that it is. In fact, the output per operator hour for a large-scale laundry in Australia is in the range of 39 to 47 kilograms, substantially higher than the 35 kilograms to which the Minister refers. This information has been obtained from an analysis of a cross-section of private sector linen and laundry services around Australia.

An assessment of the implications of the additional funds put into the Central Linen Service over the past two years shows that the increase in output from 27 to 35 kilograms has come about by the injection of $3 million in capital equipment, not by any improved efficiency on the part of the employees. In other words, there has been an improvement in the base level of productivity not because of employee performance but rather because of an injection of additional funds. So, when the public hears the Minister of Health describe the Central Linen Service as the most efficient in Australia, they can dismiss his claims for they represent yet again the triumph of rhetoric over fact.

The Liberal Party believes that the best service for consumers (and that must be a fundamental basis for any assessment of the Central Linen Service) will come from private sector operation. We are also philosophically opposed to unnecessary competition between the public sector and the private sector, particularly in the case of the Central Linen Service where such competition is based on grossly unfair advantages.

The Central Linen Service does not pay rates, land tax, or interest on the cost of the land from which it operates, and therefore the Minister's statement that it competes fairly is totally untrue.

I now refer to the situation in regard to the health commission. On 20 September 1983 I asked in this Council how Professor Andrews would be able to carry out his onerous duties as Chairman of the Health Commission while also undertaking duties in connection with the World Health Organisation and a clinical professorship in primary care and community medicine at Flinders University.

In his response the Minister indicated that there were provisions in the Chairman's contract which enabled him to devote some time to the World Health Organisation and his professorship at Flinders. In what I have to say on this subject, no reflection is intended on the Chairman, who has every right to operate within his contract. My criticism is of the Minister, who has left the South Australian Health Commission inadequately staffed at the decision making level.

Recently the Chairman was overseas and there had been no Deputy Chairman for some months. That position had been vacant for some time and is still vacant. A number of people in the field of health care had complained to me that they could not get to anyone in the Health Commission at the appropriate level. I believe that there is some unrest within the staff of the commission itself. No doubt such unrest is contributed to by such incidents as the hounding of a former member of staff by the Minister after he left the commission—

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: I will tell you about him on Tuesday.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Right. No doubt such unrest is contributed to by such incidents as the hounding of the former head of the Health Promotion Unit, who was referred to by the Hon. Mr Lucas yesterday in explaining a question. This hounding was pursued over several areas after that person left the Health Commission. If the Minister wants to refer to that on Tuesday, I guess that he will just be pursuing his hounding a further stage.

Obviously, this sort of thing causes unrest amongst the staff. It is my observation that the staff of the Health Commission is doing an excellent job. They are doing the best they can, but within the framework established by the Minister there are not enough man-hours at top management level to make the commission run as it ought to.

I refer now to Medicare, unpleasant a matter though it is. The operation called Medicare has been an absolute disaster to the health care system. In the first place, of course, it has done absolutely nothing to enhance patient care. This has not been improved by Medicare in any respect. What Medicare has done is to take away the right of choice of the individual. I refer especially to the gap. Gap insurance was originally totally prohibited. This was socialism gone crazy and a complete denial of the individual's right to sort out his or her own affairs. In regard to the 15 per cent gap, why should the individual not have the right to decide whether he or she will cover this gap by meeting it himself or herself or by insurance?

The Commonwealth and State Governments have belatedly partly resiled from this position. When a patient is in hospital, he or she may now have their own doctor and the bill can be picked up in full by insurance. But, in regard to treatment in a doctor's surgery, the individual is ruthlessly deprived of his basic human right to cover a risk by insurance if someone is prepared to cover it. I do not believe in bills of rights in a democracy but, if we are to have one, this right is one which ought to be written into it.

One of the many appalling aspects of Medicare is in regard to country doctors serving patients in country hospitals. Country doctors are currently paid only 85 per cent of an officially negotiated schedule fee. One wonders what the attitude of unions and workers would be if employers proposed to pay workers 85 per cent of an award rate. For some considerable time the AMA, on behalf of the country doctors, has been putting its claim to the Minister. The Minister has insulted the doctors by referring to the dispute as a Clayton's dispute. It is all right for the Minister to dismiss the dispute in this way. He said some time ago that the dispute was almost resolved, but it has not been.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: It has as far as I am concerned.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Well, it has not been resolved as far as the doctors or the patients are concerned, and that is what counts. The Minister said some time ago that the dispute has been almost resolved, but that is not so. The Minister said by interjection that as far as he was concerned the dispute has been resolved. I hope that when the *Hansard* report of this speech goes out to doctors they derive some satisfaction from it.

The doctors rightly claim that they have elected, as is their right, to practise in the country as general practitioners. For the Government to reduce their remuneration below a negotiated figure in respect of an important part of their practice is to make them compulsorily salaried medical officers under another name.

It has been said that the schedule fees are fixed in respect of practice by doctors in their surgeries. It is also said that when doctors attend patients in hospital they are provided with a nurse, with the premises, and so on. This is a ludicrous suggestion. A country doctor's practice is a total practice covering both components—surgery practice and hospital practice. When the doctor is attending to patients in hospital, he cannot really send his nurse home or stop paying the rent for that period. The landlord would not be amused. The suggestion made previously by the Minister of a separate country doctors schedule does not make sense. The people who are likely to suffer because the Government is not serious in settling the dispute are the public. Make no mistake—members of the public living in the country have been well served—

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: It is a dead issue.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: It is not. Members of the public living in the country have been well served in the past by their doctors. The Minister says that this is a dead issue. Apparently, he implies that people in the country are no longer disturbed about the matter. If the present iniquitous system continues, doctors will be forced out of country practice in some areas and patients will suffer. But the Minister does not appear to be concerned about patient care, which he really is—

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: Didn't you read about the settlement with the Federal AMA?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Yes, but this is not a question of the Federal AMA: it is a matter of the State AMA.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: You're out of time. The party's over.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The State AMA is arguing very much on the side of the country doctors who are not getting justice. Make no mistake—the Minister says that, as far as he is concerned, the dispute has been settled. He says that it is a non-issue. It is not a non-issue. In the unlikely event that this Government remains in office after the election, and if nothing is done to settle the dispute effectively, undoubtedly in country towns where there is one doctor there will be no doctor, where there are two doctors there will be one, and so on. Those who will suffer are the patients. They are the people about whom I am concerned.

Probably the most disgraceful act of the Minister was to call on the country hospitals to negotiate with their doctors on the basis of 90 per cent plus some other benefits. This cowardly act caused stress in some country communities. The problem is the Minister's. It is not the hospital's problem. He should not pass the buck. He should do something realistic about this longstanding dispute now before country communities are seriously damaged by his antics. Despite the problems that I see the Government having, I am pleased to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.26 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 20 August at 2.15 p.m.